

# HARINGEY COUNCIL

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM



**Service:** BSF

**Directorate:** CYPS

**Title of Proposal:** BSF: Woodside Inclusive Learning Campus (ILC)

**Lead Officer (author of the proposal):** Steve Pyman

**Names of other Officers involved:** Nick Kemp (Transformation Coordinator), & wide range of other agents and contractors acting for the council, including architects, cost consultants

### Step 1 - Identify the aims of the policy, service or function

*State what effects the proposal is intended to achieve and who will benefit from it.*

#### **Project outline**

- ❖ Woodside ILC is one of 12 projects in the BSF programme
- ❖ Two sets of pupils will benefit from this project; those at the existing Woodside High School, and those at the new (as-yet unnamed) secondary special school, to be located on the Woodside campus, with a pupil body drawn from the secondary-age sections of the current Moselle and William C Harvey special schools
- ❖ Students in the mainstream school currently have to learn in under-sized rooms, with poor acoustics and design, with poor circulation space, and adjacencies which lead to time wasted commuting across the site. Social space is also of highly-variable quality
- ❖ Students in the special schools have similar issues, and, in addition, lack access to the range of specialist teaching/learning facilities that a mainstream secondary school campus can offer (large LRC, subject specialist facilities, etc)
- ❖ Following significant and sustained consultation the work will comprise:
  - Closing the existing Moselle and WC Harvey schools, and creating a new special school, to be based on the WHS campus (and a parallel primary-age school based at Broadwater Farm)
  - new, purpose-built teaching accommodation for (i) mainstream school pupils' English, mathematics, science, humanities, languages, art, music, and drama (ii) the whole curriculum, for special school pupils, including dedicated art and music/drama teaching

- rooms located adjacent to mainstream art/drama/music provision, to allow resource-sharing
- sufficient teaching spaces to allow smaller groups in core subjects
  - Improved social and dining spaces, indoor and outdoor, for mainstream and special school pupils
  - New, purpose-built accommodation for mainstream learning support
  - A purpose-built Learning Resource Centre for pupils of both schools, staff, and community users
  - Improved ICT access across the whole campus, for pupils at both schools, staff, and community users
  - A more efficient site, which centralises main teaching areas, thereby reducing time lost commuting between lessons
  - Sheltered walkways connecting special school with mainstream school blocks

### ***What effects the proposal is intended to achieve***

- ❖ The BSF works support CYPs and national goals, by improving (i) exam outcomes (ii) personal development & well-being (iii) facilities for community site users, (iv) specialist facilities
- ❖ Increased access to 14-19 programmes and specialist pathways both at the schools and at other locations providing greater choice and diversity of provision
- ❖ Improved access to ICT will reduce the 'digital divide' for families with limited ICT access at home and enhance the learning facilities for all students; a managed learning environment will enable any parent to securely access information on their child, such as attendance, homework and progress

### **Who will benefit?**

- ❖ The BSF programme has as its core aim, to break the link between disadvantage and low achievement. The resource allocation for these schools will help to redress this disadvantage, whilst ensuring the raising of attainment levels for all students
- ❖ The BSF works in this project intended to benefit the students & community site users
- ❖ The schools' students are more economically disadvantaged than the national norm (eg over 50% Free School Meals entitlement, compared to national average of 14.2%)
- ❖ Most students are from minority ethnic groups (over 80%), compared to national average of 19.5%, reflecting the nature of the local community. Community site users, whether parents/carers, or other community groups, reflect a similar profile

### **NB**

*As the new special school is not yet formally constituted, for consultation and data purposes, reference is made to the two predecessor schools (Moselle, WC Harvey)*

## Step 2 - Consideration of available data, research and information

You should gather all relevant quantitative and qualitative data that will help you assess whether at presently, there are differential outcomes for the different equalities target groups – diverse ethnic groups, women, men, older people, young people, disabled people, gay men, lesbians and transgender people and faith groups. Identify where there are gaps in data and say how you plug these gaps.

In order to establish whether a group is experiencing disproportionate effects, you should relate the data for each group to its population size. The 2001 Haringey Census data has an equalities profile of the borough and will help you to make comparisons against population sizes.

[http://harinet.haringey.gov.uk/index/news\\_and\\_events/fact\\_file/statistics/census\\_statistics.htm](http://harinet.haringey.gov.uk/index/news_and_events/fact_file/statistics/census_statistics.htm)

**2 a) Using data from equalities monitoring, recent surveys, research, consultation etc. are there group(s) in the community who:**

- **are significantly under/over represented in the use of the service, when compared to their population size?**
- **have raised concerns about access to services or quality of services?**
- **appear to be receiving differential outcomes in comparison to other groups?**

### **Groups significantly under/over represented in use of the service, when compared to their population size**

- ❖ **Age:** the schools serve the 11-16 age group; community users are of varied ages, with high representation of adults with school-age children (as they are parents of WHS and special school students), a high representation of younger people, and relatively low representation of older people
- ❖ **Gender - students:** in common with many mixed schools, boys outnumber girls (eg 58% boys in WHS)
- ❖ **Ethnicity:** the school rolls reflect local patterns, with very high (over 80%) representation of (national) minority ethnic groups, the largest categories of which, at Woodside, are currently Black/Black British African=18.3%, Any other White Background = 36.6%; (White British=6.8%). Similar patterns are discernable amongst community users, but there is no requirement for users to complete an ethnic monitoring return
- ❖ **Religion or Belief:** over 50% of students are Muslim, and c 30% Christian
- ❖ **Disability:** WHS has well above the national average of students with SEN (over 30% vs 19.9% nationally). All students at the special school will be on the SEN register, with virtually all having a full statement of special educational needs
- ❖ **Sexual orientation:** the schools do not hold data on student sexual orientation, unless confidentially divulged by individual students; similarly, the school does not hold such records on other users

### **Groups that have raised concerns about access to service/service quality**

- ❖ The logs of parental queries show that the schools receive a level of queries in line with similar schools, reflecting their recognised success in achieving progress for their

students in line with or, frequently, better than national (as evidenced by Raiseonline see <http://www.cocentra.com/> )

- ❖ Community user groups for the two special schools are aware that their current sites are generally constrained (the new special school will be on a new site on the Woodside Campus)

### **Groups which appear to be receiving differential outcomes in comparison to other groups**

- ❖ Students in the equalities target groups make educational progress which is at least in line with national norms, and, frequently, better. At WHS, for example, where there were previously ethnic groups with attainment significantly below that group's national norm, this is, since the 2009 GCSE results, no longer the case, as a function of the rapid improvements in learning. Most groups are making better progress than national, some of which are making significantly better progress
- ❖ As attainment on entry to the current special schools, and to WHS is well below national, attainment at 16 is, predictably, below national, despite the good progress made whilst students are attending the schools in question. For WHS, continuing to close the attainment gap with national for all groups remains a priority
- ❖ *In line with national patterns, boys attainment is below girls (typically reflecting lower prior attainment at Key Stage 2), but boys' progress is now above national norms in the special schools and in WHS*
- ❖ *Religion or Belief:* no significant patterns of underachievement can be isolated
- ❖ *Disability:* students with SEN (School Action Plus/Statements) tend to have attainment below national and school norms, as would be expected, but their progress is good at the special schools, and broadly in line with national at WHS
- ❖ Lift access within the current WHS buildings is restricted, with the obvious potential impact on disabled users

### ***2 b) What factors (barriers) might account for this under/over representation?***

- ❖ Age: relatively low representation of older people as site users is a function of current demand; the schools continue to welcome proposals for adult education/community activities,
- ❖ Over-representation of boys is a function of parental choice (Haringey has a girls school but no boys school – hence gender is skewed in many schools); given low prior attainment, boys are more at risk of inappropriate behaviour, thence exclusion, than the national norm
- ❖ As indicated above, no ethnic group is now significantly underachieving at WHS or the special schools.
- ❖ All schools concerned, however, track both individual learners' progress, and the patterns across different groups (age, ethnic, gender, etc) to identify and act on any emerging patterns of underachievement.
- ❖ The lower attainment of particular groups on entry to the school has multiple causation, (including: high levels of disadvantage; EAL; factors associated with prior schooling

and low prior attainment; factors associated with refugee/asylum-seeker status), but this is not something within these schools' control.

- ❖ *Religion or Belief*: no particular issues
- ❖ *Disability*: the special schools are specifically established to cater for learners with identified special educational needs, hence the high proportion of SEN. Students on the SEN register at WHS make progress broadly in line with national, (see above), but the school is determined to accelerate their progress to be significantly better than national. The reasons for this not being so at present are complex, and the subject of a study being undertaken by external consultants, at the school's request

### Step 3 - Assessment of Impact

Using the information you have gathered and analysed in step 2, you should assess whether and how the proposal you are putting forward will affect existing barriers and what actions you will take to address any potential negative effects.

**3 a) How will your proposal affect existing barriers? (Please tick below as appropriate)**

<del>Increase barriers?</del>	Reduce barriers	<del>No change?</del>
-------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------

#### Comment

As indicated above, whilst progress is at least as good as national, low prior attainment for the mainstream school means the school needs support, through BSF, in closing the attainment gap with national. For learners at the special schools, widening ECM outcomes is essential. This proposal supports both goals

**3 b) What specific actions are you proposing in order to respond to the existing barriers and imbalances you have identified in Step 2?**

- ❖ Boys attainment, will benefit from: improvements in teaching and learning provision (particularly additional rooming to support small maths, English & science groups); improved independent study facilities (particularly improved facilities for booster sessions in new learning resource centre); improvements to circulation space & SEN provision will benefit boys in terms of reducing opportunities for poor behaviour, which can otherwise detract from focus on learning, & lead to exclusion. Specific provision has been made for students with short or medium behavioural difficulties to have a more personalised curriculum that gets them back on track and avoid exclusions.
- ❖ *Ethnicity*: progress, thence attainment, for all minority ethnic groups will benefit from measures described in Gender section, above
- ❖ *Disability*. The new works for the mainstream school are fully compliant with DDA, statutory legislation and DCFS Building Bulletins. Learner achievement, personal development & well being will benefit from: improvements to circulation space, and social space; larger, more purpose-fit , environmentally-controlled classrooms; purpose-built educational inclusion suite; installation of lifts providing access to higher floors in the new blocks, including the new LRC
- ❖ The special school block (z block) is a complete new build, providing a wide range of learning enhancement facilities for the range of disability needs catered for in the new special school. All rooms (teaching, therapeutic, ect) are purpose-built. The special school will also have its own dedicated art, music and drama spaces adjacent to the mainstream school arts provision
- ❖ Community users (particularly the elderly or less mobile) will benefit from: disabled toilets; more environmentally-controlled rooms; new lifts serving inaccessible areas

**3 c) If there are barriers that cannot be removed, what groups will be most affected and what Positive Actions are you proposing in order to reduce the adverse impact on those groups?**

- ❖ Some of the special school students have severe needs (eg autism-related) which may preclude their take-up of use of all aspects of the mainstream school site. Addressing these severe and complex needs is not within the remit of the BSF project
- ❖ The BSF project cannot in itself widen provision for community users, such as the under-represented older citizens. Revenue funding (which BSF cannot provide) to sustain this provision is the key challenge. This is being addressed through the newly extended services team and some measures within the schools' specialist community plans
- ❖ Low attainment by identified ethnic groups, and WHS students at SEN School Action Plus (above) will be addressed by measures including: booster sessions in key subjects; additional training for staff on effective Assessment for Learning; closer working partnerships with parents/carers, in particular specific target groups; use of MEAP and BPAP programmes lead by teachers with specific responsibilities; use of progress tracking data, on a case-by-case basis, working with students, teachers, parents/carers on individualised strategies to accelerate progress

## Step 4 - Consult on the proposal

Consultation is an essential part of impact assessment. If there has been recent consultation which has highlighted the issues you have identified in Steps 2 and 3, use it to inform your assessment. If there has been no consultation relating to the issues, then you may have to carry out consultation to assist your assessment.

Make sure you reach all those who are likely to be affected by the proposal, ensuring that you cover all the equalities strands. Do not forget to give feedback to the people you have consulted, stating how you have responded to the issues and concerns they have raised.

### 4 a) Who have you consulted on your proposal and what were the main issues and concerns from the consultation?

- ❖ The whole BSF project for these schools has been driven by the major consultation point at the **beginning** of the project (2<sup>nd</sup> row of table, below), where governors (including representatives of community & parents) produced School Vision documents, detailing what they wished the project to comprise
- ❖ These documents have driven the project, with governors & Partnership for Schools carefully monitoring the emerging design, to ensure the users' aspirations were met
- ❖ Any design proposal from architects or ICT consultants that was not in line with the vision documents was challenged by the schools &/or BSF team, unless it was an affordable **enhancement** to what consultees prioritised in their vision statement
- ❖ As the governors' vision drove the project, there were relatively few concerns raised by subsequent consultations, & those that were tended to be of a technical nature

Group /Body consulted	Focus of consultation	Frequency & timing of consultation	Concerns/Issues raised by consultees	Overall message from consultees
WHS, Moselle and WC Harvey governing bodies (including parent, community representatives )	School's vision for improvements in provision funded by BSF	Governors & Head submitted detailed written proposals		Governors made clear that their main goal was to raise achievement for all sections of school community
	Design Quality Indicator workshop attended by governors, staff, parents and students	Reviewing priorities, & match of priorities to emerging design	Views fed into design process	
	Initial design proposals (Stage B)	Briefing prior to Stage B signoff, then formal signoff of proposals	Various concerns over design detail. (eg layout of z block rooms)	Governors agreed proposals, once room layout issue resolved)
	Stage C design	As above	Need for	Signed off



	proposals		walkways between buildings	proposals, to include walkways
	Stage D design proposals	As above	As above	Signed off proposals
	Final detailed proposals for works – “Employers Requirements”	Detailed information on all aspects of proposals provided	None	Proposals agreed
	Seeking confirmation that governing body was satisfied with the consultation process, and that the design is in line with the governors views expressed in their vision document (see above)	Prior to Final Business Case	None	Formal confirmation agreed from governing bodies, that they are satisfied with process and outcome
Headteachers	Headteachers involved at all stages in governing body consultation process – see above			
	Detailed consultation throughout all stages described in governing body section	Weekly meetings with project officers, architects, ICT consultants, FF&E consultants, plus regular telephone & email discussion	Wide range of issues covered during duration of project, all resolved, including: reconfiguration of types of special school classrooms	Issues resolved, Heads happy with process and outcome
Staff	Consultation on detail of: room adjacencies; room layouts; ICT specifications; FF&E	Programme of workshops & group/individual meetings’ participation in DQI workshop	Wide range of issues covered; concerns all resolved	
Students	Consultation on range of aspects of project including Joined Up Design project run by the Sorrell Foundation	Input into governors’ vision document; in-house discussion throughout process; DQI workshops; drop-in surgeries	Wide range of issues covered, & student views fed into design process	

		with architects		
Parents	As above	Involvement through: input into governors' vision document via parent governors; parent governor representation throughout process; drop-in sessions with architects	Wide range of issues covered. All significant concerns addressed, but parents aware that not all aspirations were deliverable, given limited budget	
Community Users & general public	As above	User involvement: consultation on input into vision document; discussions with WAES, & user groups, talking to school business manager, & fed into design process; drop-in sessions with architects. Planning consultation process via standard procedures	As above & logistical concerns regarding the impact of the actual works on the local community – ongoing consultation to address this	

***4 b) How, in your proposal have you responded to the issues and concerns from consultation?***

- ❖ There has been an intensive consultation process, over several years, with detailed records kept of all changes to design, all of which have been subject to scrutiny by Partnerships for Schools, the BSF board (with elected members represented), and the governing body
- ❖ At all design stages and major decision-making points up to and including determining Employers Requirements, there has been formal consultation
- ❖ It is impractical to summarise the vast numbers of ongoing modifications to the design over the past 3 years, but the key issues raised & resolved are as below. During the consultation process the following issues have arisen:
  - Special school students' travelling across the site: sheltered walkways were seen as the preferred solution. Various routes were evaluated, with the final design meeting consultees wishes.

- Layout of special school building (z block): much time at different design stages has been spent refining the type of rooms, and the priority adjacencies. This has been resolved to the schools' satisfaction
  - Provision for arts, LRC, and learning support: the schools had reluctantly had to accept that, on cost grounds, it was not possible to replace the existing C block with a new build, which meant weaknesses in both adjacencies and designs in the existing block would not be fully addressed by refurbishment and remodelling. It has subsequently been possible to move towards replacement of C block, to more fully address the schools' concerns
  - environmental conditions were a key concern of the schools. Throughout the design stages these have been discussed and resolved. Although these were included within the original brief the project team has had to spend additional time looking at the health and well being of the user groups to improve ventilation and acoustics
- ❖ Responses to community user needs: The LRC has access for disabled users and includes Disabled WC's nearby. Zoning of the school renders supervision of community activities more cost-effective

***4 c) How have you informed the public and the people you consulted about the results of the consultation and what actions you are proposing in order to address the concerns raised?***

- ❖ Feedback provided to major constituencies through: Project Manager written & oral feedback to Headteacher; written & oral reports to governors by Head &/or Project Manager; school newsletter feedback to parents, students, community users; drop-in sessions; additional feedback to students via school assemblies, Transformation Manager has given updates to staff, parents and students at Parent's Evenings, PSA meetings, Academic Review days and assemblies

## **Step 5 - Addressing Training**

The issues you have identified during the assessment and consultation may be new to you or your staff, which means you will need to raise awareness of them among your staff, which may even training. You should identify those issues and plan how and when you will raise them with your staff.

***Do you envisage the need to train staff or raise awareness of the issues arising from any aspects of your proposal and as a result of the impact assessment, and if so, what plans have you made?***

- ❖ Moselle and WC Harvey are judged 'Outstanding' by the national regulating body (OfSTED); Woodside High, one of the capital's most improved schools, is judged Satisfactory with Good Features

- ❖ All these schools have good self-review systems, & are actively training staff to improve quality & equality. The issues identified in this impact assessment draw heavily from the school's self-review, & there is clear evidence (verified by the School Improvement Partners) that the issues identified in this EIA are on the school's training agendas. These include training on: assessment for learning focused through arts methodologies; curricular target-setting & progress tracking of student performance; effective use of ICT, provision for students without access to home facilities; teaching bilingual learners; strategies to raise achievement of target groups; individual performance management plans, containing customised CPD/training plans for over 150 staff

## Step 6 - Monitoring Arrangements

If the proposal is adopted there is a legal duty to monitor and publish its actual effects on people. Monitoring should cover all the six equality strands. The purpose of equalities monitoring is to see how the policy is working in practice and to identify if and where it is producing disproportionate adverse effects and to take steps to address the effects. You should use the Council's equal opportunities monitoring form which can be downloaded from Harinet. Generally, equalities monitoring data should be gathered, analysed and report quarterly, in the first instance to your DMT and then to the Equalities Team.

***What arrangements do you have or will put in place to monitor, report, publish and disseminate information on how your proposal is working and whether or not it is producing the intended equalities outcomes?***

- ***Who will be responsible for monitoring?***
- ***What indicators and targets will be used to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the policy/service/function and its equalities impact?***
- ***Are there monitoring procedures already in place which will generate this information?***
- ***Where will this information be reported and how often?***

The following monitoring arrangements are in place in respect of equalities issues in respect of provision & outcomes for all EIA target groups, & provision for user groups :

- ❖ Annual:
  - school outcomes & provision reviewed by schools, logged in school Self-Evaluation framework (SEF), then scrutinised by School Improvement Partner (SIP); outcomes reported to governing body & LA SIP coordinator, feeding into CYPS review
  - review of outcomes by Haringey School Improvement officers, & intervention if significant negative trends identified
- ❖ Every 2-3 years: OfSTED inspection reviews & judges quality of all aspects of school, including equalities issues; outcomes published nationally
- ❖ Annual review of Specialist Schools Plan targets with particular reference to community outcomes
- ❖ One year after BSF works completion: review of impact by independent DQI assessor; outcome fed to BSF Board, which has elected member representation
- ❖ The implementation of the School's Equality Scheme (SES) will allow the school to monitor issues in relation to race, gender, age, disability, religion and sexual orientation. The SES will also identify the key Equality Impact Assessments that the school proposes to undertake and will link in with the key issues raised in the BSF programme.

## Step 7 - Summarise impacts identified

In the table below, summarise for each diversity strand the impacts you have identified in your assessment

Age	Disability	Ethnicity	Gender	Religion or Belief	Sexual Orientation
Reduced barriers for community use	Improved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching facilities</li> <li>- Social facilities</li> <li>- ICT access</li> <li>- Curriculum breadth</li> </ul>	Improved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching facilities</li> <li>- Social facilities</li> <li>- ICT access</li> <li>- Curriculum breadth</li> </ul>	Improved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching facilities</li> <li>- Social facilities</li> <li>- ICT access</li> <li>- Curriculum breadth</li> </ul>	Improved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching facilities</li> <li>- Social facilities</li> <li>- ICT access</li> <li>- Curriculum breadth</li> </ul>	Improved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching facilities</li> <li>- Social facilities</li> <li>- ICT access</li> <li>- Curriculum breadth</li> <li>-</li> </ul>

## Step 8 - Summarise the actions to be implemented

Please list below any recommendations for action that you plan to take as a result of this impact assessment.

Issue	Action required	Lead person	Timescale	Resource implications
Ensure project continues to meet requirements	Monitor project	Project Manager	TO 2011	-
Develop special school provision	Implement transition plans	Head Designate of Special School	To 2011	-
Develop community provision using new resources	Planning & implementation	Head of Woodside; Head of Special School	From 2010	To be determined
Monitor project benefits	Monitor changes in provision, leadership & management, and outcomes	Head of CYPS	Ongoing	

## Step 9 - Publication and sign off

*There is a legal duty to publish the results of impact assessments. The reason is not simply to comply with the law but also to make the whole process and its outcome transparent and have a wider community ownership. You should summarise the results of the assessment and intended actions and publish them. You should consider in what formats you will publish in order to ensure that you reach all sections of the community.*

*When and where do you intend to publish the results of your assessment, and in what formats?*

Haringey Website (BSF section)

### **Assessed by (Author of the proposal):**

**Name: Steve Pyman**

**Designation: Project Manager**

**Signature:**

**Date: April 20 2010**

### **Quality checked by (Equality Team):**

**Name:**

**Designation:**

**Signature:**

**Date:**

### **Sign off by Directorate Management Team:**

**Name:**

**Designation:**

**Signature:**

**Date:**