

# North Ayrshire Council

## Equality & Children's Rights Impact Assessment (Full Form)

### Introduction

This form will assist in carrying out an **Equality Impact Assessment** and where appropriate, **Socio-Economic, Children's Rights, Island Communities and Consumer Duty Impacts** of new, revised and existing policies and practices. Guidance on how to complete assessments is given in the Council's **Equality and Children's Rights Impact Assessment Toolkit**.

The form is mandatory and must be published on the Council website once the policy or practice has been approved.

### Section 1 - General Details

1.1 Directorate/Service Education:  
Section: Education

1.2 Name of Policy, Practice or Proposal being assessed and determination of whether this is a new, existing or a budget proposal:

Review funding arrangements for Campus Police Officers

This is a budget proposal.

Please insert Budget Reference number (if applicable) SP/ED/25/04

1.3 List of participants in the assessment

Andrew McClelland

1.4 Manager responsible for the impact assessment

Name: Andrew McClelland

Designation: Head of Service (Education)

1.5 Timetable (should be started during the development phase of the proposal)

Date Assessment Started: 9 September 2024

Interim Review Date: Not applicable

Final sign off by Head of Service at the end of the form.

## Section 2 – Aims and Relevance

### 2.1 What is the purpose of the policy practice or proposal?

This budget saving proposal is to progress alternative funding arrangements for Campus Police Officers. It is proposed 50% of costs are met by Police Scotland with 25% funded from central education budgets and the remaining 25% contributed by secondary school head teachers through Pupil Equity Funding (PEF). This will reduce reliance on the central education budget, which currently covers 50% of the post costs. It is proposed secondary school head teachers are given autonomy to decide whether to continue with a campus police position in their school by contributing 25% cost of the post from the school's PEF allocation. This may result in some secondary schools deciding not to fund a campus police officer.

## Section 3 – Equality and Diversity

3.1 What evidence were you able to access about the relevant needs of protected groups as outlined in section 3.3 below (Please include your sources – links to equality providers and evidence can be found in both the toolkit and the [Promoting Equality](#) Page on Connects).

1) Education service leadership team and establishment leadership team knowledge of the operational and strategic delivery of the education in North Ayrshire. 2) Direct engagement with relevant protected groups and stakeholders as part of the pre-budget engagement exercise. Engagement with Police Scotland.

3.2 Are there any gaps in your evidence or areas of uncertainty?

None.

3.3 From the list of protected characteristic groups identified in the table below please identify any potential positive and negative impacts on any of these protected characteristics?

Protected Characteristic	Impact on the Protected Characteristics (yes or no)	Please Explain (Positive or Negative or Neutral)
<b>Age</b> - Older people, children and young people – please identify which categories will be affected	Yes	Potential for negative impact on children and young people as this proposal could lead to some schools choosing not to continue with their campus police officer position. This post can have a key role in delivering early intervention and preventative work that promotes more cohesive communities with a focus on preventing children and young people from engaging in criminal behaviour.
<b>Disability</b> - Physical and Learning	Yes	Potential for negative impact on children and young people with disabilities who might choose to engage in criminal behaviour as this proposal could lead to some schools choosing not to continue with their campus police officer position. A key aspect of this role is to use early intervention and

Protected Characteristic	Impact on the Protected Characteristics (yes or no)	Please Explain (Positive or Negative or Neutral)
		restorative approaches to educate young people to be responsible citizens.
<b>Gender reassignment</b> - Where a person is living as the opposite gender to their birth	Yes	Potential for negative impact on children and young people with this protected characteristic, as this proposal could lead to some schools choosing not to continue with their campus police officer position. The campus officer role may be considered by children and young people with this protected characteristic as a support and a safety net.
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No	Not applicable
<b>Race, ethnicity, colour, nationality or national origins</b> (including gypsy/ travellers, refugees and asylum seekers)	Yes	Potential for negative impact on children and young people with this protected characteristic, as this proposal could lead to some schools choosing not to continue with their campus police officer position. The campus officer role may be considered by children and young people with this protected characteristic as a support and a safety net.
<b>Religion or belief</b> (includes religious and philosophical beliefs, including no belief)	No	Not applicable
<b>Sex</b> - Women and Men	No	Not applicable

Protected Characteristic	Impact on the Protected Characteristics (yes or no)	Please Explain (Positive or Negative or Neutral)
<b>Sexual Orientation -</b> Lesbian, gay and bisexual people	Yes	Potential for negative impact on children and young people with this protected characteristic, as this proposal could lead to some schools choosing not to continue with their campus police officer position. The campus officer role may be considered by children and young people with this protected characteristic as a support and a safety net.
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership -</b> marriage between same sex couples is included	No	Not applicable
<b>Human Rights</b>	No	Not applicable
<b>Care Experienced -</b> This term refers to anyone who is currently in care or has been for any length of time regardless of their age and includes <b>Kinship Care</b> (other family members); <b>Looked After at Home</b> (with support from social work); <b>Residential Care</b> ; <b>Foster Care</b> ; <b>Secure Care</b> ; <b>Adoption</b> .	Yes	Potential for negative impact on any care experienced children and young people as this proposal could lead to some schools choosing not to continue with their campus police officer position. A key aspect of this role is to use early intervention and restorative approaches to educate young people to be responsible citizens.

Protected Characteristic	Impact on the Protected Characteristics (yes or no)	Please Explain (Positive or Negative or Neutral)
<b>Other</b> - Poverty, homelessness, ex-offenders, isolated rural communities, carers, part-time workers, or people in a marriage/civil partnership	Yes	Potential for negative impact on children and young people as this proposal could lead to some schools choosing not to continue with their campus police officer position. A key aspect of this role is to use early intervention and restorative approaches to educate young people to be responsible citizens.

#### 3.4 Describe any consultation or engagement undertaken, including details of the groups involved and the methods used.

An online prebudget engagement was undertaken by North Ayrshire Council in late 2024 that was completed by 714 respondents. This included engagement with a wide range of groups including children and young people; care experienced young people; young ambassadors; North Ayrshire Youth Executive; Joint Cabinet Café Conversation; Employee Disability Forum; ESOL learners Syrian / Afghan / Ukrainian / Russian speakers; NAFCO; Men's and she sheds; long covid group; parents and carers supported via employability services; Equal groups; New Scots groups; and North Ayrshire tenants. A summary of the key findings in relation to this proposal has been provided below: Opinion differed greatly with a range of views expressed in the survey. Many responses praised the role of campus police in ensuring safety amid issues like bullying, violence, drug use, and mental health challenges. They said that the presence of officers provides security and fosters a safer environment for students and staff. However, others questioned the effectiveness of the campus police scheme and raised concerns about diverting school funds, especially PEF (Pupil Equity Fund), from educational purposes to cover policing costs. Many people felt that people with specific characteristics may be liable to face bullying at school and therefore would be adversely affected by changes to the way the service is delivered. A number of responses highlighted the importance of campus police in ensuring safety, addressing antisocial behaviour, and supporting vulnerable groups, including those at risk of bullying and discrimination. The potential reduction or redistribution of funding is viewed by some as disproportionately impacting deprived areas, where such support is deemed most essential. Concerns were also raised about shifting funding responsibilities onto schools, particularly from PEF budgets, which are intended to address educational attainment gaps. Feedback provided by North Ayrshire's local branch of Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS) stated the budget proposal suggests that alternative funding streams should be used and gave PEF as an example. PEF is a ring-fenced grant provided by the Scottish Government specifically to help schools close the poverty-related attainment gap. They state that this proposal appears to be based on

an assumption that money from PEF can be 'skimmed' of for other purposes than it is intended. This proposal would require schools to use approximately £12k from their budgets, which could place strain on schools and divert funds away from resources. EIS members have already raised concerns over school budgets and evidence has been presented previously to LNCT.

Questions 3.5 – 3.7 refer to the 'Three Key needs (or aims) [of the Equality Duty](#)'.

- 3.5 Which aspects of the policy eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation?

Budget saving proposal will not unlawfully discriminate, cause harassment or result in victimisation to any specific group. HR policies and procedures will be followed to progress PSA reductions.

- 3.6 Which aspects of the policy advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not?

The budget saving proposal will potentially result in less equality of opportunities for children with relevant protected characteristics. As a result, this budget saving proposal is unlikely to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not.

- 3.7 Which aspects of the policy foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not? (Does it tackle prejudice and promote a better understanding of equality issues).

Budget saving proposal will not detrimentally impact good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

- 3.8 If you have identified any negative impacts of your proposal how will you mitigate these?

The potential for negative impact for protected characteristic groups will be mitigated through ensuring secondary schools, who no longer wish to continue this intervention, are able to provide a clear rationale and evidence-based alternative to meet learner needs.

- 3.9 Is the policy or practice intended to promote equality by permitting positive action or lead to positive outcomes for people based on a protected characteristic?

No.

## Section 4 – The Fairer Scotland Duty

**The Fairer Scotland Duty ('the Duty'), Part 1 of the Equality Act 2010 places a legal responsibility on the Council to actively consider ('pay due regard to') how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socio-economic disadvantage when making decisions.**

- 4.1 Does the proposal have the potential to have a significant impact on inequalities of outcome caused by socio-economic disadvantage? (consider low income; low wealth; material deprivation; area deprivation; communities of place or interest, socio-economic background).

Yes, the proposal has the potential to have a significant impact on inequalities of outcome caused by socio-economic disadvantage.

Campus police officers can have a key role in delivering early intervention and preventative work that promotes more cohesive communities through a focus on preventing children and young people from engaging in criminal behaviour. Removal of these posts could detrimentally impact children and young people living in areas of socio-economic disadvantage, where there may be greater rates of criminal activity. Consequently, a decision taken at school level to decide not to continue with a campus police officer post could disproportionately affect learners impacted by poverty with a knock-on impact on their attainment, achievement and post-school destination opportunities.

If No, please go to Section 5.

If Yes please provide more information under any of the below headings which are relevant, highlighting any evidence and sources of evidence used to inform your information.

- 4.2 Low Income/Income Poverty: Cannot afford to maintain regular payments such as bills, food and clothing

As noted above, a decision taken at school level to decide not to continue with a campus police officer could impact attainment, achievement and post-school destinations of learners affected by poverty.

- 4.3 Low/and or no wealth: Having enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to pay for any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.

As noted above, a decision taken at school level to decide not to continue with a campus police officer could impact attainment, achievement and post-school destinations of learners affected by poverty

- 4.4 Material Deprivation: Being unable to access basic goods and services, i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure/hobbies

None directly related to this budget saving proposal.

Version: 6.0

4.5 Area Deprivation: Where you live (rural areas), where you work (accessibility of transport).

Noting the potential links between area deprivation and crime, any reduction in the provision of campus police officers may reduce supports available to young people, including early intervention and prevention / diversionary strategies.

4.6 If impacts have been identified how will these be mitigated or explored in more detail? (please outline below)

The education leadership team will ensure early engagement with secondary school head teachers throughout the current academic year to provide adequate notice that enables schools to reprioritise use of PEF or establish alternative approaches to meeting learner needs in this area. Secondary head teachers, who decide not to continue to fund campus police officers, will be asked to supply a clear rationale and evidence-base to demonstrate alternative interventions and supports available in their school to mitigate potential impact on learners.

## Section 5 – Children’s Rights

When considering the Children’s Right’s Impact process, some of the key considerations include any evidence, research and consultation (specifically including any consultation or engagement with young people).

- 5.1 Are any Children’s Rights impacted by this proposal? ([The Children’s Rights Articles](#) have been matched against the GIRFEC Wellbeing Indicators – where relevant these are highlighted in 5.4 below).

Yes, Children’s Rights are impacted by this proposal.

- 5.2 Please indicate, if possible, how many children and young people (nearest estimate) are likely to be affected by the policy or measure?

17,400 children and young people (i.e. those attending state schools in the area)

- 5.3 Are some children and young people more likely to be affected than others?

Yes, some children and young people are more likely to be affected than others.

If, Yes what groups? (consider protected characteristics – for example, disabled young people, LGBT etc)

Children with additional support needs, care experienced learners and pupils impacted by poverty may potentially be more affected

5.4 The following [Children's Rights](#) and Wellbeing Indicators are likely to be affected by the policy/proposal:-

Wellbeing indicator (for example, safe, healthy etc)	Children's Right (for example, 22 – refugee children)
<p><b>Safe, Healthy, Achieving, Nurtured, Responsible, Included</b></p>	<p>19: protection from violence, abuse and neglect 'Children and Young People have the right to' be kept safe from harm and protected against violence. They must be given proper care by those looking after them. 3 – best interests of the child 'Children and Young People have the right to' have their interests considered if a decision is being made by any person about them. What is best for them is what matters. 29 - goals of education 'Children and Young People have the right to' learn and develop their skills and personality fully, teach them about their own and other people's rights and prepare them for adult life. 20 - children deprived of a family 'Children and Young People have the right to' special care if they can't live with their parents. They may be looked after by other members of their family or by a different family. 12 - respect for the views of the child 'Children and Young People have the right to' speak up and have their opinions listened to and be taken seriously by adults on things that affect them. 23 - children with disabilities' Children and Young People have the right to' if they have any kind of disability, have special help to make sure they can join in with things.</p>

5.5 What likely impact will the policy/proposal have on Children's Rights and Wellbeing? Either Positive, Negative or Neutral.

**Children Rights -**

	<b>Positive (Explain)</b>	<b>Negative (Explain)</b>
<b>Wellbeing Indicators/ Children’s Rights -</b>	Not applicable	A potential reduction in campus police officer posts may be detrimental to current approaches to meeting Children’s Rights that have been mapped to wellbeing indicators.
	<b>Positive (Explain)</b>	<b>Negative (Explain)</b>
<b>Other Protected Characteristics</b>	Not applicable	A potential reduction in campus police officer posts could result in a decrease in support for children with additional support needs, care experienced learners, and learners impacted by poverty.

**Other Protected Characteristics**

None.

5.6 What consultation or engagement has taken place with young people?

Not applicable as no direct or indirect impact on younger people.

5.7 If Negative impacts are identified how will these be mitigated, or the effect reduced?

The potential for negative impact for protected characteristic groups will be mitigated through ensuring secondary schools, who no longer wish to continue this intervention, are able to provide a clear rationale and evidence-based alternative to meet learner needs in their establishment.

## Section 6 – Island Communities Impact (or Island Proofing)

Island Proofing is about considering the particular needs and circumstances of island communities when public sector organisations exercise their functions and make decisions. This has been added to the process of assessing the Council Plan and includes a range of issues such as access to services, digital connectivity, employment and access to education, transport and access to goods and services.

6.1 Do the intended outcomes of the proposal potentially differ or have a different impact for our Island Communities?

No, the intended outcomes of the proposal do not potentially differ or have a different impact for our Island Communities.

## Section 7 – The Consumer Duty

The Consumer Duty is about the impact of Council proposals on consumers in Scotland. A Consumer is an individual or a small business that purchases, uses or receives goods or services in Scotland, that are supplied either by a business or a public body – please see [What is the Consumer Duty](#).

### 7.1 Will your proposal impact on consumers?

Yes the proposal will impact on consumers.

If no, please complete the 'Assessment not required' template by emailing [northayrshireperforms@north-ayrshire.gov.uk](mailto:northayrshireperforms@north-ayrshire.gov.uk)

### 7.2 What are the impacts, if any, on consumers in general? Is it likely that consumers will experience harm because of this proposal?

Consumers in general would include all children and young people who are currently served by Campus Police Officers. The proposal may have a negative impact on children and young people as it could lead to some schools choosing not to continue with their campus police officer position. This post can have a key role in delivering early intervention and preventative work that promotes more cohesive communities with a focus on preventing children and young people from engaging in criminal behaviour.

### 7.3 What are the impacts if any, on consumers in vulnerable circumstances? Is it likely that consumers in vulnerable circumstances will experience harm because of this proposal? (please include any relevant evidence or engagement with consumers)

\*Vulnerable circumstances may be temporary in nature and may or may not arise as a result of a consumer's protected characteristics. For more information, please see [page 31 of Consumer Scotland's draft guidance on the consumer duty](#).

The proposal may have a negative impact on vulnerable consumers. Children and young people with disabilities, children with the gender reassignment protected characteristic, children with the race, ethnicity, colour, nationality or national origins protected characteristic, children with the sexual orientation protected characteristic, care experienced children and children living in poverty may all be more likely to be impacted by the proposal. This role provides a support and safety net for many of the above groups that may present a unique impact on vulnerable consumers that typical consumers would not experience. Additionally, the proposal may be more likely to have a negative impact on children who are in temporary vulnerable circumstances.

### 7.4 What consultation and engagement has taken place with consumers around your proposal?

As detailed above at Point 3.4.

### 7.5 What alternative proposals are there that could improve outcomes for consumers and/or reduce harm to consumers? How do these compare to the original proposal?

Version: 6.0

The potential for negative impact for protected characteristic groups will be mitigated through ensuring secondary schools, who no longer wish to continue this intervention, are able to provide a clear rationale and evidence-based alternative to meet learner needs.

## Section 8 – Crosscutting Impacts

- 8.1 Have any cross-cutting impacts been identified from other Council Services or Partner Agencies (multiple discrimination or accumulated effects of multiple proposals on a protected characteristic group)?

No other cross-cutting impacts have been identified

## Section 9 – Outcome of the Assessment

There are four potential outcomes for this assessment which are:

- No major alterations to the policy assessed
- Adjust the policy as potential problems or missed opportunities identified.
- Continue the policy - justification required as potential for adverse impact has been identified.
- Stop and remove the policy or proposal, as potential for discrimination or other harmful impact.

### 9.1 Please detail the outcome of the assessment:

Continue the policy: the Impact Assessment identifies the potential for adverse impact or missed opportunities to promote equality.

### 9.2 Please outline the justifications for continuing the policy/procedure.

North Ayrshire Council's budget pressures in both the short- and long-term necessitate the need for action now to achieve a balanced budget within 2025/26 as well as an ongoing focus on achieving financial sustainability. Consequently, whilst this saving is anticipated to have a low negative impact on learners, including those with protected characteristics, it is recommended for implementation to support the Council to reach a balanced budget position for 2025/26 financial year. As outlined above, mitigating action will be undertaken to ensure secondary schools who no longer wish to continue this post are able to provide a clear rationale and evidence-based alternative to meet learner needs.

### 9.3 Please state the key issues, recommendations and future actions arising from the Integrated Impact Assessment.

Please refer to section 5.7 and 9.2 above

## Section 10 – Monitoring

10.1 Describe how you will monitor the impact of this policy for example, performance indicators used, other monitoring arrangements, who will monitor progress, criteria used to measure if outcomes are achieved, timescales including any future reviews of the impact of the proposal?

Impact will be monitored throughout the implementation of this proposal. This will include a range of measures managed by the service. The Education Service's annual service plan, which is published in the Autumn following each academic session, provides an overview of service performance against ambitions within our Service Improvement Plan.

## Section 11 – Sign Off

11.1 Head of Service who has approved the impact assessment.

Name: Andrew McClelland

Title: Head of Service (Education)

Date: 29 January 2025

## Section 12 – Publication

12.1 Following approval by Head of Service, completed Impact Assessments need to be published on the Council's External Website.

Please email: [northayrshireperforms@north-ayrshire.gov.uk](mailto:northayrshireperforms@north-ayrshire.gov.uk)