



Northumberland County Council

Equality Impact Assessment Template

To be completed for all key changes, decisions and proposals. Cite specific data and consultation evidence wherever possible. Further guidance is available at:

<http://www.northumberland.gov.uk/About/Equality.aspx?nccredirect=1>

Duties which need to be considered:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not

PART 1 – Overview of the change, decision or proposal

1. Title of the change, decision or proposal:

The Council has consulted on proposals for Admission Arrangements for 2025/26

2. Date of equality impact assessment:

January 2024

3. Brief description of the change, decision or proposal:

- 1) The majority of the arrangements remain unchanged from the 2024/25 arrangements.
- 2) There are proposed changes to the Published Admission Numbers at Seahouses Primary and Longhoughton Primary

4. Name(s) and role(s) of officer(s) completing the assessment:

Jill Atkinson, School Admissions and Inclusion Manager
Audrey Kingham, Executive Director of Children's Service's

5. Overall, what are the outcomes of the change, decision or proposal expected to be? (E.g. will it reduce/terminate a low-priority service, maintain service outcomes at reduced cost, or change the balance of funding responsibility for a service which will remain the same?)

Annual determination of the admission arrangements by Cabinet is in accordance with the requirements of the School Admissions Code 2021.

6. If you judge that this proposal is **not** relevant to some protected characteristics, tick these below (and explain underneath how you have reached this judgement).

Disability Sex Age Race Religion Sexual orientation

People who have changed gender Women who are pregnant or have babies

Employees who are married/in civil partnerships

After considering employees and service users, the characteristics checked above are not relevant because:

There is no evidence or reason to believe that the proposals would affect more positively or negatively people with the above protected characteristics than those without the above protected characteristics.

PART 2 – Relevance to different Protected Characteristics

Answer these questions both in relation to people who use services and employees

Disability

Note: “disabled people” includes people with physical, learning and sensory disabilities, people with a long-term illness, and people with mental health problems. You should consider potential impacts on all of these groups.

Please answer these questions with reference to our employees and people who use our services

7. What do you know about usage of the services affected by this change, decision or proposal by disabled people, about disabled people’s experiences of it, and about any current barriers to access?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on any current arrangements for disabled people.

8. Could disabled people be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal?

No

9. Could the change, decision or proposal affect the ability of disabled people to participate in public life? (e.g. by affecting their ability to go to meetings, take up public appointments etc.)

No

10. Could the change, decision or proposal affect public attitudes towards disabled people? (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)

No

11. Could the change, decision or proposal make it more or less likely that disabled people will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on disabled people.

12. If there are risks that disabled people could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal, are there reasonable steps or adjustments that could be taken to reduce these risks?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on disabled people.

13. Are there opportunities to create *positive* impacts for disabled people linked to this change, decision or proposal?

See 7, above.

Sex

Please answer these questions with reference to our employees and people who use our services

14. What do you know about usage of the services affected by this change, decision or proposal by males and females, about their experiences of it, and about any current barriers to access?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on any current arrangements for males or females.

15. Could males or females be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal?

No

16. Could the change, decision or proposal affect the ability of males or females to participate in public life? (e.g. by affecting their ability to go to meetings, take up public appointments etc.)

No

17. Could the change, decision or proposal affect public attitudes towards males or females? (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)

No

18. Could the change, decision or proposal make it more or less likely that males or females will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on males or females.

19. If there are risks that males or females could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal, are there reasonable steps or adjustments that could be taken to reduce these risks?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on males or females.

20. Are there opportunities to create *positive* impacts for males or females linked to this change, decision or proposal?

See 14, above

Age

Please answer these questions with reference to our employees and people who use our services

21. What do you know about usage of the services affected by this change, decision or proposal by people of different age groups, about their experiences of it, and about any current barriers to access?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on any current arrangements for people of different age groups.

22. Could people of different age groups be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal?

No

23. Could the change, decision or proposal affect the ability of people of different age groups to participate in public life? (e.g. by affecting their ability to go to meetings, take up public appointments etc.)

No

24. Could the change, decision or proposal affect public attitudes towards people of different age groups? (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)

No

25. Could the change, decision or proposal make it more or less likely that people of different age groups will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on different age groups

26. If there are risks that people of different age groups could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal, are there reasonable steps or adjustments that could be taken to reduce these risks?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on different age groups

27. Are there opportunities to create *positive* impacts for people of different age groups linked to this change, decision or proposal?

See 21, above

Race

Note: For the purposes of the Act 'race' includes colour, nationality and ethnic or national origins.

Please answer these questions with reference to our employees and people who use our services

28. What do you know about usage of the services affected by this change, decision or proposal by people of different racial groups, about their experiences of it, and about any current barriers to access?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on any current arrangements for people of different racial groups.

29. Could people of different racial groups be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal?

No

30. Could the change, decision or proposal affect the ability of people of different racial groups to participate in public life? (e.g. by affecting their ability to go to meetings, take up public appointments etc.)

No

31. Could the change, decision or proposal affect public attitudes towards people of different racial groups? (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)

No

32. Could the change, decision or proposal make it more or less likely that people of different racial groups will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on different racial groups

33. If there are risks that people of different racial groups could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal, are there reasonable steps or adjustments that could be taken to reduce these risks?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on different racial groups

34. Are there opportunities to create *positive* impacts for people of different racial groups linked to this change, decision or proposal?

See 28, above

Religion or belief

Note: *In the Equality Act, religion includes any religion. It also includes a lack of religion. Belief means any religious or philosophical belief or a lack of such belief.*

Please answer these questions with reference to our employees and people who use our services

35. What do you know about usage of the services affected by this change, decision or proposal by people with different religions or beliefs, about their experiences of it, and about any current barriers to access?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on any current arrangements for people with different religions or beliefs.

36. Could people with different religions or beliefs be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal?

No

37. Could the change, decision or proposal affect the ability of people with different religions or beliefs to participate in public life? (e.g. by affecting their ability to go to meetings, take up public appointments etc.)

No

38. Could the change, decision or proposal affect public attitudes towards people with different religions or beliefs? (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)

No

39. Could the change, decision or proposal make it more or less likely that people with different religions or beliefs will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on people with different religions or beliefs

40. If there are risks that people with different religions or beliefs could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal, are there reasonable steps or adjustments that could be taken to reduce these risks?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on people with different religions or beliefs

41. Are there opportunities to create *positive* impacts for people with different religions or beliefs linked to this change, decision or proposal?

See 35, above

Sexual Orientation

Note: The Act protects bisexual, gay, heterosexual and lesbian people.

Please answer these questions with reference to our employees and people who use our services

42. What do you know about usage of the services affected by this change, decision or proposal by people with different sexual orientations, about their experiences of it, and about any current barriers to access?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on any current arrangements for people with different sexual orientations.

43. Could people with different sexual orientations be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal?

No

44. Could the change, decision or proposal affect the ability of people with different sexual orientations to participate in public life? (e.g. by affecting their ability to go to meetings, take up public appointments etc.)

No

45. Could the change, decision or proposal affect public attitudes towards people with different sexual orientations? (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)

No

46. Could the change, decision or proposal make it more or less likely that people with different sexual orientations will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on people with different sexual orientations

47. If there are risks that people with different sexual orientations could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal, are there reasonable steps or adjustments that could be taken to reduce these risks?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on people with different sexual orientations

48. Are there opportunities to create *positive* impacts for people with different sexual orientations linked to this change, decision or proposal?

See 42, above

Gender Reassignment

Note: The Act provides protection for transgender people. A transgender person is someone who proposes to, starts or has completed a process to change his or her gender.

Please answer these questions with reference to our employees and people who use our services

49. What do you know about usage of the services affected by this change, decision or proposal by transgender people, about their experiences of it, and about any current barriers to access?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on any current arrangements for transgender people

50. Could transgender people be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal?

No

51. Could the change, decision or proposal affect the ability of transgender people to participate in public life? (e.g. by affecting their ability to go to meetings, take up public appointments etc.)

No

52. Could the change, decision or proposal affect public attitudes towards transgender people? (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)

No

53. Could the change, decision or proposal make it more or less likely that transgender people will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on transgender people

54. If there are risks that transgender people could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal, are there reasonable steps or adjustments that could be taken to reduce these risks?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on transgender people

55. Are there opportunities to create *positive* impacts for transgender people linked to this change, decision or proposal?

See 49, above

Pregnancy and Maternity

Note: the law covers pregnant women or those who have given birth within the last 26 weeks, and those who are breast feeding.

Please answer these questions with reference to our employees and people who use our services

56. What do you know about usage of the services affected by this change, decision or proposal by pregnant women and those who have children under 26 weeks, about their experiences of it, and about any current barriers to access?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on pregnant women and those who have children under 26 weeks

57. Could pregnant women and those with children under 26 weeks be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal?

No

58. Could the change, decision or proposal affect the ability of pregnant women or those with children under 26 weeks participate in public life? (e.g. by affecting their ability to go to meetings, take up public appointments etc.)

No

59. Could the change, decision or proposal affect public attitudes towards pregnant women or those with children under 26 weeks? (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)

No

60. Could the change, decision or proposal make it more or less likely that pregnancy women or those with children under 26 weeks will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on pregnant women and those who have children under 26 weeks

61. If there are risks that pregnant women or those with children under 26 weeks could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal, are there reasonable steps or adjustments that could be taken to reduce these risks?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on pregnant women and those who have children under 26 weeks

62. Are there opportunities to create *positive* impacts for pregnant women or those with children under 26 weeks linked to this change, decision or proposal?

See 56, above

Marriage and Civil Partnership

*Note: This applies to changes, decisions or proposals impacting on **employees only**. The Act protects employees who are married or in a civil partnership.*

63. What do you know about the Marriage and Civil Partnership profile of staff employed in the services affected by this change, decision or proposal, and about their experiences of working within it?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on employees who are married or in a civil partnership

64. Could employees who are married or in a civil partnership be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal?

No

65. If there are risks that employees who are married or in a civil partnership could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the change, decision or proposal, are there reasonable steps or adjustments that could be taken to reduce these risks?

The introduction of the proposals would have no impact on employees who are married or in a civil partnership

Human Rights

66. Could the change, decision or proposal impact on human rights? (e.g. the right to respect for private and family life, the right to a fair hearing and the right to education)

The proposals support the right to education

PART 3 - Course of Action

67. Based on a consideration of all the potential impacts, tick one of the following as an overall summary of the outcome of this assessment:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The equality analysis has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The equality analysis has identified risks or opportunities to promote better equality; the change, decision or proposal will be adjusted to avoid risks and ensure that opportunities are taken.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The equality analysis has identified risks to equality which will not be eliminated, and/or opportunities to promote better equality which will not be taken. Acceptance of these is reasonable and proportionate, given the objectives of the change, decision or proposal, and its overall financial and policy context.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The equality analysis shows that the change, decision or proposal would lead to actual or potential unlawful discrimination, or would conflict with the Council's positive duties to an extent which is disproportionate to its objectives. It should not be adopted in its current form.

68. Explain how you have reached the judgement ticked above, and summarise any steps which will be taken to reduce negative or enhance positive impacts on equality.

There is no evidence to suggest that any person with any of the protected characteristics would be disproportionately disadvantaged or advantaged by the proposals. Should a decision be made by the Council's Cabinet to implement the proposals, any evidence arising from the implementation that suggests that there could be possible negative impacts, those risks would be analysed to establish whether or not there were certain risks to any or all of those with a protected characteristic. Steps to reduce negative impacts or enhance positive impacts would then be defined.

PART 4 - Ongoing Monitoring

69. What are your plans to monitor the actual impact of the implementation of the change, decision or proposal on equality of opportunity? (include action points and timescales)

This EIA has been drafted in the light of the consultation carried out on the proposed Admission Arrangements for 2025/26. Should the proposals be approved and implemented, the EIA would be monitored during that period. If adverse implications were identified in the light of the implementation, ameliorating actions would be identified.

PART 5 - Authorisation

70. Name of Head of Service: Sue Aviston and Date Approved:

Once completed, please send to: Keith.Thompson@northumbria.nhs.uk