

3.6. CULTURE AND COMMUNITIES EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

Department: Culture and Communities Title of Service: Adult and Community Learning

Lead Officer: Gwen Harris

Date: 17/06/2008

STEP 1 - What type of policy, service or function is this?

Existing New/ proposed Changing/ updated

1. What is the aim and purpose of the policy, service or function?

'To encourage a learning culture in Blackpool through the offer and promotion of innovative and inclusive learning opportunities, enabling adults to develop their individual potential at home, with their families, in the community and at work.'

2. Who are the main stakeholders/ customers/ communities of interest?

Learners aged over 19 in the general public, third sector, families in schools and children's centres. Blackpool and the Fylde College, Montgomery High School

3. Does the proposal have existing aims relating to equality, social inclusion or community cohesion?

Yes, see above. Within the Service we have a strategy and actions that address these issues

4. How will the resulting service or function be delivered/ administered?

The provision of learning opportunities in the community

STEP 2 - Summarise data/ research and performance management information

Enter research or comparative information available

Performance is managed through use of TERMS software
Research-use of corporate strategies, Basic Skills Agency survey 2003, information from Lancashire Neighbourhood statistics, DCLG Indices of Deprivation 2007 and LSC

5. What are the impacts or effects for communities?

| | |
|--|---|
| Race or ethnicity | - see below |
| Gender and transgender | see below-no data collected on transgender therefore no impact identified |
| Age | see below |
| Disability | see below |
| Religion or belief/ faith communities | - no data collected on this therefore no impact identified- we do some work with faith groups |
| Lesbian, gay, bisexual people | - no data collected on this therefore no impact identified |
| Other socially excluded communities or groups | -work in this area highlighted as a strength by inspectors 2006 and 2007 |
| Relationships between or within communities | - no evidence collected on this therefore no impact identified |

STEP 3 - ASSESSING THE IMPACT

1. Is there any evidence of higher or lower take-up by any group or community? How is this explained?

| |
|---|
| <p>Analysis of learner profile 2006-7 (academic year) for direct and sub-contracted provision (sub-contractors = Montgomery, College)</p> <p>Gender By provider Previously analysis of participation was conducted according to enrolments. The average for 2006-7 across all provision in 2006-7 was female 74% and male 26%. BACL was slightly below the average for male (25%); Montgomery was well above for male (35.5%) and the college below for male (23%) The average for 2005-6 across all provision in 2005-6 was female 68% and male 32%. Of this BACL attracted a higher percentage of men (36%), Montgomery slightly more than the average (33%) and the College less (26%). The trend therefore has been to recruit fewer men and this is noticeable with the drop in BACL. This is due to the high number of family workshops that ran attracting a preponderance of females. However considerable thought and effort has gone into attracting men and currently funding is being sought to address this area. The Montgomery curriculum has proved attractive to men.</p> <p>Ethnicity The local ethnic minority population constitutes 0.8% In 2006-7 BACL attracted 3.4%, Montgomery 0.04% and the College 2.76%. This represented an increase by BACL on 2005-6 (2.75%) a slight decrease by Montgomery (0.06%) and an increase by the College (1.46%). <i>Figures in brackets refer to last year totals.</i> The figures are of declared ethnicity and actual may vary (more likely to be underrepresented)</p> <p>Disability Of declared disability, there was a slight decrease in BACL figures in 2006-7(total 13.35%), a slight decrease by Montgomery (total 4.65%) and a significant decrease by the College (total 12.6% down from 30.3%). The College decrease was occasioned by a restructuring of the curriculum due to factors including the 2006 ALI inspection and external changes to College funding when all provision for learners with learning disabilities ceased to be offered in their Adult and Community Learning.</p> <p>Learning Disability In 2006-7 there were 394 people with learning disabilities known to the Council. Of those 34 accessed discrete ACL. In 2005-6 55 accessed ACL. The drop has been caused by a shortage of trained tutors to work in this area and the need to ensure that the curriculum is appropriate to the needs of the learner.</p> |
|---|

Age

In Personal and Community Development Learning (PCDL) of learners aged over 50, BACL had 42%, Montgomery 60% and College 39% with an average across all of 43%. Over 65, BACL had 22%, Montgomery 21% and College 21% with the average across all PCDL of 21%. This demonstrates that PCDL has a bigger uptake than the percentage elderly in the population (Blackpool has 20% over 60). Overall participation dropped by 14 percentage points for the over 50s and 6 percentage points for the over 60s from the previous year. This was judged to link to an increase in fees occasioned by a significant drop in LSC funding. Consultation was held with older people to address this issue.

Of total learners across all provision aged over 55, BACL had 28%, Montgomery 42.5% and College 44%.

In 2005-6 BACL attracted 38.5%, Montgomery 41.2%, and the College 53%

Overall therefore there was a younger profile in 2006-7. For BACL this was largely caused by a significant rise in the number of parents (generally in the 20-40 yr old cohort) participating in Family learning and Family Language, Literacy and Numeracy. Overall, the reduction in older people mirrored to some degree an overall drop in learner numbers in fee-paying provision.

Fee remitted

FLNN and First Steps are fee remitted. Wider Family Learning attracts fees at Montgomery and only one person paid fees in 2006-7. In PCDL of fees remitted the Council had 51%, Montgomery 25.5% and college 75%. The latter rose by 6 percentage points from the previous year. There was significant uptake by learners on benefits.

New learners

Across all provision, there is an established pattern of attracting new learners with the college attracting 81% in 2006-7, Montgomery 68% and the Council 94%. College taster courses attracted many to their provision.

Participation by Population and Wards

The percentage of learners as a total of the population was 2% (of 142700) in 2006-7.

All twenty-one Blackpool wards produced enrolments.

The Council provision provided most in Haweside (Family Literacy and Numeracy) with weighting towards the most disadvantaged wards (e.g. Claremont, Clifton), with Montgomery drawing from the more affluent areas. The College drew highest from Highfield, a relatively disadvantaged area and Park, which is highly disadvantaged.

From the table below it can be seen that about 30% of learners attend from out of the Borough. This is because Blackpool is within the travel to learn areas of neighbouring Lancashire wards. What is currently unknown is the number of learners from Blackpool wards attending classes in Lancashire venues.

The most disadvantaged wards are: Park, Claremont, Brunswick, Bloomfield and Talbot though other wards are also relatively disadvantaged compared to regional and national profiles.

2006-2007 All providers

| Ward | Numbers |
|----------------|---------|
| Out of borough | 909 |
| Highfield | 200 |
| Ingthorpe | 188 |
| Hawes Side | 182 |
| Waterloo | 172 |
| Clifton | 157 |
| Bispham | 144 |
| Park | 136 |
| Claremont | 135 |
| Greenlands | 134 |
| Tyldesley | 131 |
| Norbreck | 130 |
| Layton | 126 |

| | |
|--------------|-----|
| Brunswick | 124 |
| Marton | 124 |
| Bloomfield | 123 |
| Victoria | 120 |
| Warbreck | 117 |
| Anchorsholme | 110 |
| Stanley | 106 |
| Squires Gate | 100 |
| Talbot | 100 |

The following strengths were identified for the academic year 2006-7

- The ACL department continues recruit high numbers of non-traditional learners
- There is good evidence of learning opportunities being provided for those harder to reach learners through the range and strength of partnerships. Examples include financial literacy Money Matters programmes focussing on specific target groups as part of a Fair debt strategy. The College's Picking up the Pieces is a well-established programme with referrals coming from a wide variety of agencies. Partnerships with the voluntary, community and faith sectors leading to provision of ICT and other courses. Moves have been made with Positive Steps provision to address the learning needs of those on long term Incapacity Benefit with the beginnings of success in terms of increasing numbers of referrals and actions to engage people in learning.
- There is evidence of significant impact on individuals and groups and of encouraging the hard to reach to reengage in learning
- Where there has been a necessity to increase fees, courses have been shortened to enable them to still be affordable in advertised provision. This was informed by consultation (Senior Voice Forum). The College also provided short tasters.
- There are high levels of fee remission in College and BACL provision evidencing good uptake and access by individuals who are socially and economically disadvantaged

2. Does the geography or demography of service users reveal anything? Yes No
3. Do any rules or requirements prevent access or use of the service? Yes No
4. Does the service or policy; create additional barriers for disability groups? Yes No
5. Does the service delivered, or policy; create additional barriers for other groups or communities: e.g. income, time, availability, gender or cultural reasons. Yes No
6. Do any of the above limitations amount to unlawful discrimination? Yes No
- Yes: Explain (referring to relevant legislation)
No: Do they amount to a differential impact, which should be addressed?

The impact of the Service is monitored annually through the Equality and Diversity section produced in the Self-assessment report and is subject to inspection by OFSTED .
OFSTED report 2006 was very positive about impact of service in E and D

7. If the impact or effects are adverse for any community or group, can they be defended in order to provide equality for another community under legislation or policy? Yes No

Where this happened previously (fees and older people) there was consultation and the impact minimised

8. Do you have enough information to make a judgement? Yes No
If no, what information do you require, about which communities?

Not applicable

- 9 Is it possible to get the information quickly and easily or is it recommended that the collection of such data be included as an action for the action plan that will be developed? Please detail below.

Service collects comprehensive data for internal and funding body use on age, race, gender, ethnicity, previous educational levels, postcode and so is able to analyse learner cohort and impact of policies and strategies. Development plan outlines future intentions and these reflect government priorities.

STEP 4 - DEALING WITH ADVERSE OR UNLAWFUL IMPACT

1. What can be done to improve proposals in order to reduce or remove any adverse impact or effects

A rationale for proposals is made based on the needs of Blackpool. Proposals are subject to agreement by LSC (funding body) and to scrutiny by OFSTED

2. What would be needed to be able to do this? Are the resources likely to be available?

We undertake this as part of our quality standards procedures. We would consult with the Faith, Equality and Diversity team if we thought there might be an impact and could not resolve it or if in doubt about legal responsibilities.

3. What other support or changes would be necessary to carry out these actions?

STEP 5 - CONSULTING THOSE AFFECTED FOR THEIR VIEWS

1. Outline the steps taken to test out your findings and possible courses of action below.

None current

2. What feedback or responses have you received to the findings and possible courses of action? Please give details below.

None current

3. If you have not been able to carry out any consultation, please indicate below how you intend to test out your findings and recommended actions.

None current

4. If you are impact assessing some proposals, what steps have been taken to ensure that stakeholders have been able to voice their opinions on the proposals or the need for change?

None current

STEP 6 – MAKING A DECISION BASED ON FINDINGS

- 1. Decide whether or not to go ahead with your policy, procedures, proposals, or changes to services;

STEP 7 - ACTION PLANNING

| Issues/ adverse impact identified | Proposed action/ objectives to deal with adverse impact | Targets/Measure | Timeframe | Responsibility | Indicate whether agreed |
|--|--|-----------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

STEP 8 - ARRANGEMENTS FOR MONITORING AND REVIEW

| Agreed action | Monitoring arrangements | Timeframe | Responsibility | Added to Service Plan etc. |
|---------------|----------------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

STEP 9

Date completed: 17/06/008 Published

Signed:

Name: Gwen Harris

Position: Head of Adult and Community Learning