



## Equality Assessment Impact of Redesign on Service Users

<b>Service area:</b>	School Improvement and Curriculum Support
<b>Name of service being reorganised:</b>	Alternative Education
<b>Officer leading on assessment:</b>	Carol Buchanan, Head of Education Inclusion
<b>Other staff involved:</b>	Alex Bardsley, Business Relationship Manager; Henry Kilpin, Planning and Partnerships Officer; Sue Keep, HR Business Partner; and Marilyn Hodges, Consultant

### 1. Summarise details of proposed redesign

*Provide details of the proposed redesign. Include information about the previous structure and the new proposed structure.*

The Alternative Provision (AP) service offers targeted support for pupils who are at risk of exclusion, have been permanently excluded or are not attending school, for example for medical reasons.

Although the functions of the service in both Richmond and Kingston are similar, the way they currently operate is not comparable.

#### **Current Richmond arrangements**

Alternative provision for young people out of education in Richmond is managed through the Individual Pupil Programme (IPP); exclusions service; tuitions service; and the multi-agency team for vulnerable pupils. Richmond also has an unregistered unit (Newhouse Centre) working predominantly with pupils who have special educational needs (SEN) and emotional and/or behavioural difficulties (EBD). The Newhouse Centre is not included in the scope of this redesign. Richmond does not currently have a pupil referral unit (PRU).

#### **Current Kingston arrangements**

Alternative provision in Kingston includes programmes delivered by Pupil Support Services (PSS) through the PRU; work placements; school link college courses; and specific individual projects. Services provide both interim packages to support pupils' in transitions back to mainstream school and or longer-term placements. Individually tailored provision for year 11 pupils is also delivered through Anstee Bridge, including creative subjects and activities.

#### **Proposed re-design**

The proposed redesign seeks to establish an aligned and integrated system with joint management across Richmond and Kingston to deliver education for any pupil not able to access full time mainstream provision. This will include: behaviour support; time out; special provision due to medical needs; and support for vulnerable young people. There will be three main strands of work:

1. Pupil Referral Units (PRUs), including registering provision in Richmond as a PRU and aligning provision in Kingston onto a single site. A joint Headteacher will be established across both sites, with deputies in both Richmond and Kingston.
2. Pupil Support Services (PSS), including harnessing best practice from both Boroughs to create a consistent and innovative offer, under joint management.

### 3. Establishing an exclusions and re-integration joint service.

## 2. Reasons for redesign

*Set out the rationale for the redesign.*

In December 2012 the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames and the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Councils agreed to jointly deliver children's services under the banner of Achieving for Children (AfC).

AfC aims to provide value for money for all customers, high quality services and truly customer focused work. We aim to maximise the benefits of sharing expertise and resources across the two boroughs, and reduce management and overhead costs where possible.

The move towards shared services between Kingston and Richmond offers a good opportunity to consider the function and delivery of services, test their effectiveness and identify potential for service development.

## 3. What data collection and consultation have you undertaken?

*What data and information have you used to complete this equality assessment? What consultation have you carried out with service users to gather their views? How has this fed into the equality assessment?*

<b>Information source</b>	<b>Description and outline of the information source</b>
<u>Richmond</u> Service databases and the School Census	The data shows that a wide range of pupils across the boroughs' demographic, and across all the schools, accessed the service.
<u>Richmond</u> Quarterly and annual data from fixed term and permanent exclusions	The data provides information on the numbers of pupils placed on a medical or EBD individual learning programme, including: age of pupil; SEN; gender; duration of individual learning programme. It also enables comparisons with previous years; with current targets and across different settings.
<u>Richmond</u> Examination results and performance data from individual learning programmes, including pupils with medical tuition and EBD.	The data provides information on the numbers of pupils placed on a medical or EBD individual learning programme, including: age of pupil; SEN; gender; duration of individual learning programme. It also enables comparisons with previous years; with current targets and across different settings.
Equality monitoring data gathered by local authority.	This data provides information on the ethnicity; age; disability; gender; educational support (school action, school action plus and statutory assessment); and geographic location (localities) of service users.
<u>Kingston</u> School information systems and service databases.	Information relating to the protected groups is obtained from school information systems and service databases. The data is verified using the Local Authority pupil database when necessary.

A period of consultation was also held with staff who were invited to staff briefing events in both Kingston and Richmond and were encouraged to reply to the consultation proposals. As a result of the responses received, no changes were made to the proposed structure of the new service but amendments were made to job profiles, job titles and pay gradings.

## 4. Assess the impact of the redesign on service users with regard to each of the protected characteristic groups:

*Summarise the main issues identified with the redesign in relation to service users and the evidence for this under the protected characteristic that is affected e.g. age, disability, etc. For example, re-locating a service could*

lead to accessibility issues.

Consider whether any differences are justified (e.g. are there legislative or other constraints)? If they are, explain in what way.

If there is no evidence or feedback received for a particular strand, note this and move on.

In addition to identifying any problems or issues with the redesign, try to identify ways in which the changes will lead to positive impacts for protected characteristic groups.

The redesign will ensure a robust and quality assured service to pupils as well as continuing to work within strong, collaborative partnerships with schools and other support service providers. It will strive to provide an inclusive and well regarded programme of mainly short term support for those with additional needs and vulnerable pupils at risk of exclusion or for those with medical needs. Front-line services will be protected, ensuring that statutory duties relating to alternative provision are met and current performance is sustained.

Protected Group	Findings			
Age (Number of pupils)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Kingston PRU 2012 - 2013</b></p> <p>Yr 8 = 5</p> <p>Yr 9 = 12</p> <p>Yr 10 = 22</p> <p>Yr 11 = 26</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Kingston PSS 2012-13</b></p> <p>Yr 8 = 8</p> <p>Yr 9 = 8</p> <p>Yr 10 = 21</p> <p>Yr 11 = 26</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Richmond 2012-13 (Medical)</b></p> <p>Yr 4 = 2</p> <p>Yr 5 = 1</p> <p>Yr 6 = 2</p> <p>Yr 7 = 1</p> <p>Yr 8 = 2</p> <p>Yr 9 = 4</p> <p>Yr 10 = 6</p> <p>Yr 11 = 4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Richmond 2012-13 (EBD/ ILP's including SEN)</b></p> <p>Yr 7 = 1</p> <p>Yr 8 = 2</p> <p>Yr 9 = 7</p> <p>Yr 10 = 9</p> <p>Yr 11 = 10</p>
Disability	<p><b>Kingston PRU 2012 - 2013:</b> 1 student is DDA registered = 1.5%</p> <p><b>Kingston PSS 2012-13:</b> 1 student is DDA registered = 1.5%</p> <p><b>Richmond 2012-13</b> 2 students are DDA registered = 3.9%</p> <p>Although the proportion of service users who are DDA registered is small, the impact of service re-design could be considerable for the small group. Particular consideration should be given to the accessibility of any proposed changes in accommodation and transport options.</p>			
Gender (sex)	<p><b>Kingston PRU 2012 - 2013:</b> Male = 55% Female = 45%</p>			

	<p><b>Kingston PSS 2012-13:</b> Male = 68% Female = 32%</p> <p><b>Richmond 2012-13</b> Male = 39 % Female = 61%</p> <p>More males access the service in Kingston, whereas more females access the service in Richmond. More information is needed to help explain this, in particularly in Richmond where the female access is higher than anticipated.</p>																																																																					
<i>Gender reassignment</i>	We do not currently report on this.																																																																					
<i>Marriage and civil partnership</i>	We do not currently collect this information and do not target any services in relation to this.																																																																					
<i>Pregnancy and maternity</i>	<p><b>Kingston PRU 2012 - 2013:</b> 1 student = 1.5%</p> <p><b>Kingston PSS 2012-13:</b> 1 student = 1.5%</p> <p><b>Richmond 2012-13</b> 0 students</p>																																																																					
<i>Race/ ethnicity</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race/Ethnicity</th> <th>PRU</th> <th>PSS</th> <th>Richmond (Medical)</th> <th>Richmond BESD ILP's</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White British</td> <td>86%</td> <td>74.6%</td> <td>86%</td> <td>83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Irish</td> <td>0%</td> <td>4.76%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White European</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1.59%</td> <td>4.5%</td> <td>6.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mixed White/Black Caribbean</td> <td>6%</td> <td>1.59%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mixed White/Black African</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1.59%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mixed White Asian</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>4.5%</td> <td>3.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Mixed</td> <td>1.5%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>4.5%</td> <td>3.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black African</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1.59%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black Caribbean</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mixed / Black Other</td> <td>3%</td> <td>6.35%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian / British Indian</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian / British</td> <td>0%</td> <td>3.17%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Race/Ethnicity	PRU	PSS	Richmond (Medical)	Richmond BESD ILP's	White British	86%	74.6%	86%	83%	White Irish	0%	4.76%	0%	0%	White European	0%	1.59%	4.5%	6.8%	Mixed White/Black Caribbean	6%	1.59%	0%	0%	Mixed White/Black African	0%	1.59%	0%	0%	Mixed White Asian	0%	0%	4.5%	3.4%	Other Mixed	1.5%	0%	4.5%	3.4%	Black African	0%	1.59%	0%	0%	Black Caribbean	0%	0%	0%	0%	Mixed / Black Other	3%	6.35%	0%	0%	Asian / British Indian	0%	0%	0%	0%	Asian / British	0%	3.17%	0%	0%				
Race/Ethnicity	PRU	PSS	Richmond (Medical)	Richmond BESD ILP's																																																																		
White British	86%	74.6%	86%	83%																																																																		
White Irish	0%	4.76%	0%	0%																																																																		
White European	0%	1.59%	4.5%	6.8%																																																																		
Mixed White/Black Caribbean	6%	1.59%	0%	0%																																																																		
Mixed White/Black African	0%	1.59%	0%	0%																																																																		
Mixed White Asian	0%	0%	4.5%	3.4%																																																																		
Other Mixed	1.5%	0%	4.5%	3.4%																																																																		
Black African	0%	1.59%	0%	0%																																																																		
Black Caribbean	0%	0%	0%	0%																																																																		
Mixed / Black Other	3%	6.35%	0%	0%																																																																		
Asian / British Indian	0%	0%	0%	0%																																																																		
Asian / British	0%	3.17%	0%	0%																																																																		

	Pakistani				
	Asian / British Bangladeshi	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Asian / British Other	0%	1.59%	0%	0%
	Other Korean	0%	1.59%	0%	0%
	Other Ethnic group / Info not obtained	3%	1.59%	0%	3.4%
	<p>Although pupils from a white British background form a considerable majority across all alternative provision services, the services are accessed by students from many different ethnic backgrounds, including white Irish; mixed white/black Caribbean; mixed white/black African. Some groups are more specific to only one of the two boroughs, including in Richmond white European and mixed white Asian; and in Kingston black African, black other; and Korean. Joining up services will need to ensure the service can be responsive to the needs and identities of the different ethnic groups in different areas.</p>				
<i>Religion and belief including non-belief</i>	We do not currently report on this				
<i>Sexual Orientation</i>	We do not currently report on this				

### 5. What issues have you identified that require action?

*Summarise the issues identified in the equality assessment and the actions that will be taken to address these in the table below, for example, making reasonable adjustments to improve accessibility.*

*The action plan should be drawn up in conjunction with the Directorate Lead Manager for the redesign. Once the equality assessment has been signed off then the actions should be transferred into the relevant Service Plans to ensure that they are followed through and progress monitored.*

<i>Issue identified</i>	<i>Planned action</i>	<i>Lead officer</i>	<i>Completion Date</i>
69% of service users are in Years 10 and 11. Any re-design could have a more significant impact on them than other service users, so this will need to be carefully considered. Students this age are also more likely to travel to the centres themselves so any change of location could have a large knock-on effect.	Model travel options to potential PRU locations as part of scoping for new accommodation and potential re-location. Consult current service users on the viability of the travel options.	Carol Buchanan	September 2014
The service has users who are DDA registered; therefore all decisions made will need to consider any effects a re-design might have.	Consideration should be given to the accessibility of any proposed changes in accommodation and transport options. Service users should be consulted on potential sites and transport options to inform decisions and adaptations.	Carol Buchanan	September 2014

More males access the service in Kingston, whereas more females access the service in Richmond. More information is needed to help explain this, in particularly in Richmond where the female access is higher than anticipated.	Investigate higher than expected numbers of females accessing the service in Richmond. Consider potential diversionary/ preventive work with colleagues in other teams	Carol Buchanan	September 2014
The service is accessed by students from many different ethnic backgrounds. Any re-design will have to take this in to consideration, ensuring no decision discriminates against anyone. There are differences between the two boroughs in the ethnic backgrounds of service users so the joint service will need to be responsive to different needs in different identities.	Ensure joint provision is able to respond to and protect the needs and identities of pupils from different ethnic backgrounds, work with borough based PRU deputies to achieve this.	Carol Buchanan	September 2014
There are gaps in data for religion and belief, including non-belief; marriage and civil partnership and gender re-assignment.	Work with colleagues to understand reasons for gaps in data and to improve data collection on service users characteristics. This could include developing materials to inform service users, or to support discussion with service users, on why information is collected and what it is used for.	Carol Buchanan	September 2014
Information for the service is recorded differently across both Boroughs, making it difficult to accurately analyse any data.	Work with colleagues to standardise data collection and recording across both boroughs following the integration of the service.	Carol Buchanan	September 2014

**6. When completed, the equality assessment should be approved by a member of AfC Management Team**

**Approved by** AfC Equalities Working Group

**Date of approval:** April 2014

**Date of publication:** May 2014