



Equality and Diversity  
Initial Impact Assessment Toolkit

2010

## APPENDIX C

PCD11103

Title of policy/Service	School catchment area revision. Shawbost and Breascleite.
Department/Section	Department of Education & Children's Services
Lead Officer	Bernard Chisholm
Date of Initial Assessment	18/03/2014

Is this a new or existing policy? (please tick as appropriate)	<input type="checkbox"/> New	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing	√
What is the purpose of the proposed policy (or changes to be made to the policy)?	The purpose of the proposed policy is to change the catchment areas of the stated schools.			
Who is affected by the policy or who is intended to benefit from the proposed policy and how?	Pupils and parents living in the two current school catchment areas may be affected by the change to the school catchment boundary. The policy is intended to benefit parents and pupils who live closer to a school which happens to be out with their assigned catchment area. The policy aims to remove anomalies which have arisen in current catchment areas following the school rationalisation programme over recent years. The proposal will, potentially, rationalise transport provision reducing costs for parents who are currently 'out of catchment'.			
How have you, or will you, put the policy into practice, and who is or will be responsible for delivering it?	The policy will be implemented on the basis of community engagement, community conversation and statutory consultation processes.			
What consultation has been carried out?	Community conversation and statutory consultation processes have all been undertaken and a wide range of stakeholder engagement facilitated. All stakeholder concerns have been evaluated and the Education and Children's Services Department is confident that its statutory duty to provide education is not compromised by this proposal.			

**Identified Impacts**

<b>Age</b> – Could the policy have a differential impact due to age?	The policy would not have a differential impact due to age.
What evidence do you have for that decision?	The proposal has been subject to comprehensive evaluation and consultation.
<b>Disability</b> - Could the policy have a differential impact due to disability?	No.
What evidence do you have for that decision?	Both schools are DDA compliant in terms of key statutory requirements.
<b>Gender</b> - Could the policy have a differential impact due to gender?	No.
What evidence do you have for that decision?	The provision is gender-blind.
<b>Race</b> - Could the policy have a differential impact due to race?	No.
What evidence do you have for that decision?	The provision is race-blind.
<b>Religion or belief</b> - Could the policy have a differential impact due to religion of belief?	No.
What evidence do you have for that decision?	The provision is religion/belief-blind.
<b>Sexual orientation</b> - Could the policy have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	No.
What evidence do you have for that decision?	The provision is sexual orientation-blind.
Are there any other groups whom the policy may have a differential impact on? (e.g. employees, poverty, pregnant women, persons with caring responsibilities, gypsy/travellers)	No.
What evidence do you have for that decision?	

## APPENDIX C

PCD11103

What gaps are there in our knowledge?		None known.				
What plans are in place to monitor and review for any potential future impacts?		Quality Improvement and Assurance Policy and Procedures systems will apply in all schools.				
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Based upon your initial screening:</b></p> <p>Is there potential for:</p> <p>1. Unlawful discrimination?</p> <p>2. People to be treated differently/unfairly?</p> <p>3. Certain groups to be disadvantaged?</p> <p>4. Community relations to be damaged?</p> <p>And to what extent? (e.g. numbers of people affected/extent of negative impact)</p>	No	Yes	To some extent	On what grounds?		
	√	X				Age
	√					Disability
	√					Gender
						Race/Ethnicity
						Religion/Belief
						Sexuality
	√			Other:	Perception that the proposed boundary could divide the community of Carloway.	
<p>Where the anticipated adverse effect is minor, can you identify any means to minimise the impact? (If yes and measures can be put in place to minimise impact, a full EQIA may not be required).</p> <p>Please specify how:</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By appropriately addressing and putting in place resources to address all issues of concern raised by stakeholders</li> <li>• By complying with our statutory obligations</li> <li>• By providing educational benefits with little or no impact on community</li> <li>• By securing best value and enhancing educational investment.</li> </ul>				

*If no further Impact Assessment is required, please sign below.*

This policy/function will have no impact on people from any of the equality groups and an EQIA is not required.	<b>Signed:</b> <b>Position: Head of Service</b> <b>Date: 10/03/14</b>
Authorisation by Head of Service or Director.	<b>Signed:</b> <b>Position: Director of Education and Children's Services</b> <b>Date: 10/03/14</b>
Date of next review:	Review to take place within one year.

### Appendices

None

### Background Papers

Background Paper 1.1	Future Strategy for Provision of Education in the Western Isles - Community Information Document
Background Paper 1.2	Proposal Document
Background Paper 1.3	Consultation Report
Background Paper 1.4	'Getting it Right for Children and Young People in the Western Isles' policy
Background Paper 1.5	Meeting Needs, Supporting Learners – A Handbook for Professionals
Background Paper 1.6	Inclusion Policy
Background Paper 1.7	Quality Improvement Policy and Procedures