

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Directorate: Education, Learning & Skills

Name of policy, procedure, project or service:

Proposals to change the discretionary elements of home to school transport provision

Type: Policy

Responsible Owner/ Senior Officer

Scott Bagshaw, Head of Admissions & Transport

Date of Initial Screening:

May 2011

Screening Grid

Characteristic	Could this policy, procedure, project or service affect this group differently from others in Kent? YES/NO	Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group? YES/NO	Assessment of potential impact HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW/ NONE/UNKNOWN		Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes, why? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why? c) Explain how good practice can promote equal opportunities (see <i>note at end of grid</i>).
			Positive	Negative	
Age	N/A (children are not within the statutory provisions under this protected characteristic)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disability	Unknown (the proposed change may not impact on disabled children because there is provision made through Statements of Special Educational Need for children who need home to school transport as a result of a disability to access appropriate provision).	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Further assessment required to establish if disabled children would be impacted on by the proposed changes.
Gender	Potentially as some Grammar schools are for boys or girls.	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Further assessment required to establish whether boys or girls are disproportionately impacted on by the proposed changes.
Gender identity	No	Yes as the proposed changes are to remove discretionary elements that only benefit some pupils.	Low	Low	No further internal action is required.

Characteristic	Could this policy, procedure, project or service affect this group differently from others in Kent? YES/NO	Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group? YES/NO	Assessment of potential impact HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW/ NONE/UNKNOWN		Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes, why? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why? c) Explain how good practice can promote equal opportunities (see <i>note at end of grid</i>).
			Positive	Negative	
Race	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Further assessment required to establish whether different ethnic groups would be differentially impacted (positively or negatively) by the change to the criteria.
Religion or belief	Yes	Unknown	Low	High	Further assessment required as there is a potential negative impact on some faith groups as a result of the proposed changes.
Sexual orientation	No	Yes as the proposed changes are to remove discretionary elements that only benefit some groups.	Low	Low	No further internal action is required.
Pregnancy and maternity	No	Yes as the proposed changes are to remove discretionary elements that only benefit some groups.	Low	Low	No further internal action is required.

Additional Note: The withdrawal of free transport on denominational or selective grounds will remove the current inequality for families and this will have an overall positive equality impact as all children will be treated equally regardless of their religion or belief, or their ability (see page 5 (i) – (iv) for examples).

Part 1: INITIAL SCREENING

{This policy requires a full Equality Impact Assessment and therefore part 2 of this form is considered almost immediately after the completion of part 1 of this form. The public consultation informed both the screening and the full impact assessment.}

Context

The current policy on home to school transport provision was last considered by the Education Committee on 25 January 1994 and the Education and Libraries Committee on 18 October 1999. The latter was to consider denominational transport. Within the current provision for home to school transport the Local Authority (LA) exercises its discretion to provide free transport above the statutory distance to:

- Children assessed to be of selective ability as long as the pupil does not live in a comprehensive area of the county¹.
- Children attending the nearest (voluntary aided) church school if it is of the same denomination of the child.

It is the discretionary elements of provision that are being reviewed. The context for the proposed changes to home to school transport provision is set against:

- (i) The considerable pressures on public services due to reduced funding levels. For 2012/13 and 2013/14 this equates to a saving of £2.5m on the home to school transport budget.
- (ii) The availability of the Kent Freedom Pass² which was introduced by Kent four years ago. This means that there is low cost travel to and from school for the majority of children aged between 11 and 16 in the county. 26.6%³ children have a Kent Freedom Pass (KFP) and within this cohort there are 3,096 children who attend denominational schools and 9,088 children who attend selective schools.
- (iii) The changing education landscape with the growing number of schools becoming academies across the county. These academies are able to cater for children across the entire ability range and therefore will often be the nearest appropriate school for those who are assessed as suitable for selective education. 41⁴ secondary schools have changed to academy status, 6 secondary schools are in the process of converting and a further 10 secondary schools have expressed an

¹ These are: Tenterden & New Romney; Paddock Wood; Isle of Sheppey; Swanley, Longfield and Swanscombe.

² Kent County Council introduced the KFP to make travel easier and affordable for young people. From September 2011 this will cost £100 per annum. The KFP allows 11-16 years old in Kent to use public bus services, not only to and from school, but in the evenings, weekends and during school holidays.

³ 26,916 of the pupil population for the secondary phase.

⁴ 16 of these schools transferred to academy status prior to the establishment of the Academies Act 2010.

interest in becoming an academy. This means that academy provision is now approaching 50% of secondary phase provision in Kent.

- (iv) The Council's Medium Term Plan 2014/15: Bold Steps for Kent which says: "*The challenge we face as an Authority is how to bridge the significant gap between reduced revenue and funding pressures that grow over the next four years and beyond.*"

Aims and Objectives

It has been over 17 years since the Council formally reviewed its policy on home to school transport provision. Additionally, discretionary provision to denominational schools was formally reviewed by the Council some 11 years ago.

The proposed changes to home to school transport provision are to remove these discretionary elements⁵. The proposed changes would be introduced in September 2012 but those children already in receipt of the discretionary transport assistance would continue to retain this entitlement until they leave their current school or are no longer of statutory school age. It is recognised that there are some groups of children who do not currently benefit from discretionary free transport because they are excluded by the current criteria. For example:

- (i) Children (girls or boys) who wish to attend a single sex school where this is above the statutory distance and is not their nearest appropriate school.
- (ii) Children who wish to attend a school of a particular denomination where they do not meet the criteria for the discretionary free transport. For example, this might be because they are from another Christian denomination, world religion or are not a practising member of the denomination in question. Out of the 733 applications received for denominational transport in the academic year 2009-10, 38 applications were refused (5.2%).
- (iii) Children who wish to attend a school with a particular curriculum specialism where this is above the statutory distance and is not their nearest appropriate school.
- (iv) Children assessed as suitable for selective education but who live in a comprehensive area of the county. There were 250 children attending primary schools in comprehensive areas of the county that were assessed suitable for grammar school and were offered a place in a grammar school in 2011.

In the main provision in other neighbouring Local Authorities for discretionary home to school transport⁶ shows a pattern of changing and reduced provision. For example: East Sussex provides free home to school transport to church aided denominational secondary schools where families meet low income criteria; Essex has just undertaken consultation to remove all subsidy for

⁵ Some children have the right to free transport and this is protected by law and will not be affected.

⁶ There is selective provision in Medway and Essex (partial).

discretionary home to school transport; Medway offers assisted travel on denominational and selective grounds; Surrey is consulting on proposals so that transport to denominational schools would no longer be offered to new applicants; and, West Sussex introduced a charging policy in 2008 but is now consulting on proposals to stop providing home to school transport on denominational grounds.

The consultation on the home to school transport provision will provide the opportunity for the LA to:

- Review policy that has been in place for a number of years and consider whether it is appropriate to operate policy that benefits particular groups of children and excludes other groups.
- Achieve the necessary reduction in its home to school transport budget. For 2012/13 and 2013/14 this equates to a saving of £2.5m.
- Re-think provision within a changing landscape (as set out in points (ii) and (iii) on page 3) that provides an opportunity to bring about change in such a way as to minimise the potential for a negative impact on children⁷.

Beneficiaries

The community of Kent, including families, will benefit from the proposed changes. In particular:

- Home to school transport provision that has been reviewed and is appropriate given the context, budgetary and school provision, within which the LA operates.
- The prioritisation of resources by the LA in order for it to meet its statutory obligations for home to school transport provision and delivery of its Medium Term Plan savings.

Consultation and data

Consultation

KCC has consulted on its proposals during the period 21 March 2011 to 6 May 2011. The public consultation is in line with KCC policy to ensure that before any important decision is taken on matters of policy and service, consultation is inclusive and involves all people with an interest in the matter, including those that are considered to be from 'overlooked groups'. The following stakeholders were included within the scope of the consultation:

- Parents (the consultation has been promoted by various means, including by schools, local community groups, Children's Centres, the Children's Disability Teams, the KCC web-site and the parenting e-brief)

⁷ Those children who would have received the free transport if the discretionary provision were to be maintained. This would include some children who are assessed as suitable for grammar or pupils from a particular denomination wishing to attend a school of the same denomination.

- Kent schools, academies and FE colleges
- Diocesan Boards
- Chief Executives of District and Borough Councils in Kent and neighbouring Local Authorities
- Kent MPs and KCC elected Members
- Kent Children’s Trust
- KCC officers
- KCC Staff Equality Groups (these groups represent the equality strands of age, disability, race, sexual orientation and transgender)
- Kent Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education
- Kent Youth County Council

There has been interest from local media and because of this the consultation has been brought to the attention of the wider community of Kent.

Data⁸ (2010/11)

For the current cohort of children receiving free transport in denominational primary and secondary schools, and selective schools the position is:

Children receiving free transport on denominational grounds to primary schools	213	0.6% of the total pupil population in denominational primary schools	0.2% of the total primary pupil population
Children receiving free transport on denominational grounds to secondary schools	1,709	15.1% of the total pupil population in denominational secondary schools	1.7% of the total secondary pupil population
Children receiving free transport on selective grounds	7,685	23.7% of the total pupil population in selective schools	7.7% of the total secondary pupil population

Other

The Equality Act 2010 now means that the current policy may be vulnerable to challenge, if for example:

- A parent who applies for home to school transport for their child to attend a non denominational school on the grounds of non belief, where this school is beyond the statutory distance and a denominational school is nearer.
- A parent who applies for home to school transport for their child to attend a single sex school on the grounds of their culture and background, when this school is beyond the statutory distance and is not the nearest appropriate school.

⁸ There may be some children who would get free transport as part of statutory provision

The current criteria means that should a new school be opened of a world faith other than Christian then discretionary home to school transport can be provided if parents apply on the grounds of their religion, where the new school is beyond the statutory distance and is not the nearest appropriate school.

The impact of the increase in the KFP has not yet been fully assessed⁹ but it is expected that the increase in cost from £50 to £100 will potentially reduce demand for the pass. Current thinking is that if there was no change there would be an increase in take-up from 26,916 to around 28,600 but numbers could reduce to around 25,144 when the increase in costs is applied in September 2011. However, if the proposed changes to the discretionary home to school transport are applied then demand for the KFP could increase from September 2012.

Potential Impact

The proposed changes will not impact on the children who are:

- Currently in receipt of discretionary home to school transport on denominational or selective grounds
- In receipt of discretionary home to school transport on denominational or selective grounds prior to September 2012.

For the above, the proposal is that they will retain this provision until they reach statutory school leaving age.

Adverse Impact:

The proposed changes will potentially have an adverse impact on future generations of children who would no longer be entitled to home to school transport in accordance with the current criteria for denominational or selective schools. This initial screening has identified that there is potential for an adverse impact on the following groups:

- Disabled children
- Girls and/or boys
- Children from ethnic minority groups
- Children from different faith groups

Positive Impact:

The proposed changes would have a positive impact on the majority of children in Kent by providing a more equitable basis for school transport provision by removing an entitlement which only applies to a small cohort of children.

⁹ An equality impact assessment (EIA) will be carried out on the change in cost to the KFP. This is a separate exercise to this EIA.

JUDGEMENT

Option 1 – Screening Sufficient **YES/NO**

Justification: N/A

Option 2 – Internal Action Required ~~**YES/NO**~~ N/A

Option 3 – Full Impact Assessment **YES/NO**

A full impact assessment is required as:

- A potential impact has been identified on a group that has a protected characteristic.
- The potential impact of the changes to the provision are unknown for some groups with a protected characteristic.

Sign Off

I have noted the content of the equality impact assessment and agree the actions to mitigate the adverse impact(s) that have been identified.

Senior Officer

Signed:

Date: 7 June 2011

Name: Andy Roberts

Job Title: Interim Corporate Director for Education, Learning & Skills

Directorate Equality Lead

Signed:

Date: 7 June 2011

Name: Emkay Magba-Kamara

Part 2: FULL ASSESSMENT

Name: Proposals to change the discretionary elements of home to school transport provision

Responsible Owner/ Senior Officer: Scott Bagshaw

Date of Full Equality Impact Assessment: May 2011

Scope of the Assessment

To look at the potential impact of the proposed changes to remove discretionary home to school transport on denominational or selective grounds on groups with protected characteristics that have been identified as a result of the screening (part 1). The screening identified that the following groups should be included within the scope of this assessment:

- Disabled children
- Girls and/or boys
- Children from ethnic minority groups
- Children from different faith groups

Information and Data

KCC has carried out analysis:

- (i) To assess how many children will no longer be eligible under the proposed changes. The analysis focused on the children currently attending denominational and selective schools, and this model enabled the LA to see if there were any groups who in the future are likely to be disproportionately affected by the proposed changes. In relation to the scope of this assessment this included groups with the following characteristics:

- Gender
- Special Education Needs
- Ethnicity (and English as an additional language)

It was not possible to look at children by their religion or faith as it is not a statutory requirement to collect this data and it is not collected as part of the school census. KCC holds very limited data on pupil level data for disability and this is therefore not reliable. However, its data on children with statements of special educational needs is considered to be a close proxy.

- (ii) On the responses to the consultation on its proposals relating to discretionary home to school transport provision. Information from the findings of the consultation is set out in the following section: Involvement and Engagement.

In relation to the analysis carried out on pupil level data (reference (i) above) and based on the methodology used the findings are set out below:

General – pupil level data¹⁰

Denominational Primary	It is estimated that 45% of children attending denominational primary schools included in the analysis would still be entitled to transport on statutory ¹¹ grounds. Of those entitled under the proposals, the majority retain their eligibility because they live more than the statutory distance from the nearest school. A significant proportion also retain their eligibility on SEN and low income grounds. Approximately 55% (352) of pupils would no longer be entitled to free transport as there is a nearer appropriate school within the statutory distance.
Denominational Secondary	37% of pupils would still be entitled to transport on statutory grounds, mainly because they live more than 3 miles from the nearest school. A significant proportion of children would also be entitled on low income and Special Educational Needs grounds. 63% (1,128) of pupils would no longer be entitled to free transport as there would be a nearer appropriate school less than 3 miles away.
Selective	39% of pupils would still be entitled to transport on statutory grounds, nearly all because they live more than 3 miles from the nearest school. 61% (4,199) of pupils would no longer be entitled to free transport as there would be a nearer appropriate school less than 3 miles away.

Impact on groups

If the profile of the current cohort remains the same for future cohorts then this would be the potential impact on the groups included within the scope of this assessment:

	Denominational Primary	Denominational Secondary	Selective
Gender	Of the pupils who retain their eligibility under the proposals, a slightly higher proportion of male pupils (49% of male pupils) retain their eligibility than female pupils (40% of female	No impact has been identified.	No impact has been identified.

¹⁰ Figures do not take account of where other local schools may be full and as a consequence the LA may still be required to provide transport if a parent has named their nearest appropriate school but been unable to secure a place.

¹¹ Statutory provision is provided on grounds of low income (Free School Meals), SEN and distance. The methodology used for low income is based on families whose children are entitled to free school meals or where the family is in receipt of maximum working tax credit.

	pupils).		
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	There is a potential impact on 61 pupils out of 640 pupils, who are identified as "School Action Plus".	No impact has been identified.	All children with a statement of SEN were assumed to be potentially eligible for home to school transport under statutory grounds ¹² . There is a potential impact on 36 pupils out of 6,863 pupils, who are identified as "School Action Plus".
Ethnicity (and children with English as an additional language)	The analysis indicates that there is a negative impact on pupils from ethnic minority groups but it is not possible to identify particular groups because the numbers are so low. The analysis also indicated that there is an impact on children with English as an additional language; this group represented 8.6% of the cohort (55 pupils).	The analysis indicated that there is a negative impact on 43 pupils from minority ethnic groups (white eastern European and Irish) and 30 pupils (white western European and African). The analysis also indicated that there is an impact on children with English as an additional language; this group represented 4.8% of the cohort (86 pupils).	The analysis indicated that there is a negative impact on 39 pupils from minority ethnic groups (white eastern European and Chinese). It also indicated that there is an impact on children with English as an additional language; this group represented 4.17% of the cohort (286 pupils).

Data: the results are based on 87% of current eligible pupils attending denominational secondary schools and 91% of current eligible pupils attending selective secondary schools. This is due to some pupils attending schools outside of Kent, or insufficient data for the pupil in order to determine if they would qualify for eligibility. It is considered the sample size is sufficient to provide estimates.

More generally, the impact on groups identified by analysis using the Mosaic groups is as follows:

Denominational Primary	Groups disproportionately impacted by the proposals are Mosaic groups K&M 1 and K&M 4. K&M 1 represent the most affluent citizens in Kent and K&M 4 are characterised by young, full nest families on middle incomes living in new housing. Of those pupils classified as K&M 1, 68% will no longer be entitled to discretionary transport under the proposed scheme compared with 55% for all groups. The proportion is even higher for K&M 4 with 77% of current pupils no longer entitled under the proposals.
------------------------	---

¹² Not all children with a statement of SEN get free transport on the grounds of their special needs. However, some children with statements will get free transport on other grounds.

Denominational Secondary	Approximately 42% of pupils from the most affluent families will retain their eligibility. 1,128 pupils who would be no longer eligible would be from families on middle to lower incomes
Selective	Of the 4,199 pupils who would no longer be eligible, those most affected would be families on middle and low incomes, but a small proportion are likely to be from families living on limited means.

Involvement and Engagement

Consultation responses

A total of 1,256 responses to the consultation were received. 83.4% were from parents; 5.1% were from pupils; 7.8% were from a member of school staff or school governor and 3.7% were from other groups. Information on the respondents (as individuals) in relation to the protected characteristics for disability, ethnicity and religion is provided in the table below:

Disability	Those who did not consider themselves to be disabled	81%
	Those who considered themselves to be disabled	3%
	No response	17%
Ethnicity	White British	84%
	White - other	3%
	White - Irish	1%
	Mixed - any other mixed background	1%
	Mixed - white – Asian	1%
	Mixed - white – Black African	0.1%
	Mixed - white – Black Caribbean	0.5%
	Any other Asian background	0.5%
	Bangladeshi	0.1%
	Indian	1%
	Pakistani	0.2%
	African	0.2%
	Any other black background	0.2%
	Caribbean	0.4%
Chinese	0.2%	
Religion	Buddhist	0.2%
	Christian	69%
	Hindu	0.2%
	Jewish	0.1%
	Muslim	1%
	None	14%
	Other (this included 13 Catholic, 1 holistic, 1 pagan, 1 Pantheist and 1 spiritual)	3%
	Sikh	0.3%
	No response	13%

73% of respondents provided a valid postcode and this has been used to give a Mosaic profile. While the results of this analysis are only partial they show that the groups K&M 1, K&M 4 and K&M 11 are over represented compared to the Kent population. This reflects some of the most affluent segments of the population, and for K&M 11, a number of people living in rural communities. Those segments on lower or comfortable incomes are under – represented in terms of consultation responses.

Consultation responses to the proposals

88% of respondents did not agree with the proposal to remove discretionary home to school transport. 11% agreed with the proposal, and 2% did not provide an answer¹³.

80% of respondents agreed that pupils already receiving discretionary home to school transport should continue to be provided with free transport. 16% disagreed with this proposal, and 4% did not provide an answer.

Analysis of comments from respondents

In relation to the scope of this assessment, 14% of respondents made particular reference to the unfairness of the proposals for families of religious faith. The most commonly mentioned groups were Christian denominations, Catholic and Church of England.

Responses were received from the Archdiocese of Southwark, Canterbury Diocese, Rochester Diocesan Board of Education and a Catholic Priest. The following extracts give an indication of the responses from the Dioceses:

Southwark: “We fundamentally disagree with the proposals outlined in this consultation because they will have serious consequences for Catholic schools in Kent and cause great risk to education in the Catholic sector, also affecting non Catholic families who choose to send their children to Catholic schools. It will inevitably lead to a decline in numbers in Catholic schools and consequently reduce the learning opportunities for young people in Kent.”

Canterbury: “The fact that other Local Authorities have removed funding for home to school transport beyond their statutory duties should not be a reason for Kent to do so as well. Kent is a much more complicated county than most: The selective nature of Kent means that parents are actively encouraged and expected to choose a school that is not their nearest school because it has been deemed to be 'the most appropriate'. This context is further complicated by the inclusion of comprehensive denominational schools.”

Rochester: “I write to you, representing the Diocesan department with responsibility for supporting our eighty eight Church of England schools, to make strong representations against the proposals by Kent County Council, to remove subsidised funding in respect of the above. We have two Church of England Secondary schools that will be adversely affected by these proposals, Bennett Memorial Diocesan

¹³ Figures do not add up due to rounding.

School in Tunbridge Wells and St George's School in Gravesend. Both have a distinctive Christian ethos and provide an inclusive, caring and supportive environment where pupils learn and flourish in a setting shaped by Christian values and lie at the very heart of the communities they serve.”

Both Southwark and Canterbury Diocese made particular reference to the partnership arrangements to work collaboratively, and support the LA to provide school places in Kent. The comments from the Dioceses also reflect concerns that parental preference may be compromised, the impact on particular groups and that there may be increased traffic congestion.

Vulnerable groups

About half of the respondents made a comment about groups they considered should be given special consideration and in relation to the scope of this assessment:

- 4% considered that children with disabilities, including children with SEN should be given special consideration.
- 4% considered that children attending faith schools should be given special consideration.

Canterbury Diocese named the following as groups for special consideration:

- Those living in rural communities where there is no access to suitable public transport.
- Those dependent on Trains.
- Families with 3 or more children at school.
- Families who are not entitled to FSM but who have low incomes.

Judgement

1. The response from the public consultation indicated that a substantial majority (80%) did not support the proposed removal of the discretionary elements for home to school transport. However, it should be noted that Mosaic analysis shows that the majority of respondents were from the most affluent segments of the Kent population.

2. The response from the public consultation supported the proposal that if the discretionary provisions were removed then the existing cohorts of children should continue to receive those benefits until they reach statutory school leaving age.

3. All our Diocesan partners strongly opposed the removal of the discretionary provisions and this opposition was based on the view that it would restrict the choice of families for a school based on their religion and belief. Canterbury Diocese expressed particular concern for

- Those living in rural communities where there is no access to suitable public transport.
- Those dependent on Trains.
- Families with 3 or more children at school.

- Families who are not entitled to FSM but who have low incomes¹⁴.

4. Analysis of pupil level data based on the protected characteristics showed that:

Denominational Primary

The small cohort (640) means that the proposed changes would affect a relatively small proportion of the overall population. No negative impacts were identified across the groups with protected characteristics and it was noted that the Mosaic analysis indicated that a significant majority of those currently eligible were in Mosaic Groups KM1 and KM4.

Denominational Secondary

Gender - no impact identified

Special Educational Needs - no impact identified

Minority Ethnic Groups - some negative impact on a relatively small cohort.

Pupil level data on faith background is not a statutory requirement and is not collected as part of the school census.

Although it was not possible to analyse pupil level data on faith background it is recognised that for children in receipt of discretionary transport to denominational schools there is a potential negative impact for future cohorts of children. However, 37% of pupils would still be entitled to transport on statutory grounds, mainly because they live more than 3 miles from the nearest school. Approximately 42% of pupils (within the current cohort) from the most affluent families will retain their eligibility. 1,128 pupils who would be no longer eligible would be from families on middle to lower incomes and there is a potential negative impact on this group

Selective

Gender - no impact identified

Special Educational Needs - no impact identified

Minority Ethnic Groups some negative impact on a relatively small cohort.

Pupil level data on faith background is not a statutory requirement and is not collected as part of the school census.

Of the 4,199 pupils who would no longer be eligible, those most affected would be families on middle and low incomes, but a small proportion are likely to be from families living on limited means. 39% (2,664) of pupils would still be entitled to transport on statutory grounds, nearly all because they live more than 3 miles from the nearest school. 61% (4,199) of pupils would no longer be entitled to free transport as there would be a nearer appropriate school less than 3 miles away.

In summary, within the scope of this assessment there is a potential negative impact for future cohorts of children with a Christian denominational background where these families are on a low income.

¹⁴ Families on low incomes were underrepresented in terms of responses to our consultation.

Action Plan

This is set out on page 18 & 19.

Monitoring and Review

The Head of Admissions and Transport will review the implementation of the changes to provision and the action plan. This will be undertaken in spring 2013.

Sign Off

I have noted the content of the equality impact assessment and agree the actions to mitigate the adverse impact(s) that have been identified.

Senior Officer

Signed:

Date: 7 June 2011

Name: Andy Roberts

Job Title: Interim Corporate Director for Education, Learning & Skills

Directorate Equality Lead

Signed:

Date: 7 June 2011

Name: Emkay Magba-Kamara

Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Protected Characteristic	Issues identified	Action to be taken	Expected outcomes	Owner	Timescale	Cost implications
Religion or belief	Families on low income who would no longer be eligible for free transport on denominational grounds.	To apply existing eligibility criteria for low income families, i.e. free transport to any one of their three most appropriate schools between 2 – 15 miles of their home.	Families on Free School Meals who met the entry criteria for a denominational school are aware and receive their due entitlement.	Scott Bagshaw, Head of Admissions & Transport	Ongoing from September 2012 (the date when the changes to the provision are applied)	None (continuation of existing arrangements)
Disability; Gender; Race; and, Religion or belief	No direct impact to these groups, however, it was identified through Mosaic analysis that a small proportion of children from low income families attending selective schools may be impacted upon.	Children from low income families assessed suitable for grammar school will receive free transport to any one of their three most appropriate schools between 2 – 15 miles of their home.	Families on Free School Meals whose children are assessed as suitable for grammar school are aware and receive their due entitlement	Scott Bagshaw, Head of Admissions & Transport	Ongoing from September 2012 (the date when the changes to the provision are applied)	There will be a small reduction to the predicted savings as a result of this change.

Protected Characteristic	Issues identified	Action to be taken	Expected outcomes	Owner	Timescale	Cost implications
Disability; Gender; Race; and, Religion or belief	No direct impact to these groups, however, it was identified through Mosaic analysis that a small proportion of children from low income families attending selective or denominational schools may be impacted upon.	Parents will be given the opportunity to make their case to panels if they are refused transport under the new policy. Those panels will be empowered to take account of personal circumstances and override decisions taken in line with the policy where they consider the personal circumstances warrants this.	Families are aware of their right of appeal.	Scott Bagshaw	Ongoing from implementation of September 2012 (the date when the new policy is applied)	The full extent is unknown.