

## Template for Impact Assessment Level 2: Full impact assessment

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	To assess the proposal to increase the costs of school meals provision			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Service Specific			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b> To assess the proposal to increase the price at which we will offer the provision of meals to schools.</li> <li>• <b>Statutory drivers</b> Provision of a Council school meals catering service is discretionary.</li> <li>• <b>Differences from any previous approach</b> Present pricing structure is £1.90 for Primary and £2.00 for secondary. In order to cover costs, prices are increasing to £2.05 for primary school meals and £2.15 for secondary schools. Schools are able to choose to deliver this service themselves or seek another provider. They are not mandated to take the Council service and are free to commission whoever they choose to deliver this service, indeed a number of schools have moved to an alternative provider in the last 12 months.</li> <li>• <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b> Users of these services are children.</li> <li>• <b>Intended outcomes.</b> That the service is able to continue to deliver within a cost neutral approach to the Council.</li> </ul>			
<b>Live date:</b>	April 2020			
<b>Lifespan:</b>	n/a			
<b>Date of next review:</b>	April 2020 – prices will rise by inflation in future years unless a desktop review identifies new concerns			

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
<b>Human Rights</b>						
Engagement with Convention Rights (as set out in section 1, appendix 2 of the Impact Assessment Policy).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No concerns were identified at stage one in relation to this element and no concerns have been raised in relation to human rights as a result of the consultation.
<b>Equality</b>						

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Stage one impact assessment that was completed and submitted to Executive in October, seeking approval to consult on this proposal. At that stage one, there were no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics. During the course of the consultation it became clear that there were concerns from the public that the proposal would have an adverse impact on children and their families. Acknowledging this concern, a stage 2 has now been completed to explore those concerns.</p> <p>The provision of school meals is a discretionary function for the Council. Schools are free to procure this service from other companies and they also set the charges for meals. In some cases there is already a disconnect between the fee the Council charge for a meal and the fee the school charges, with schools having increased the fee. In this case the school retains the balance. Feedback from the consultations highlighted a range of opinions in relation to the proposal from those who felt no child should have to pay for a meal to others that felt all children should pay regardless of need. These issues are for national government and are not within the scope of this proposal to consider.</p> <p>Consultation feedback from the budget consultation online consultation was that there was a slight majority against the proposal. Within the free text, a number of responders expressed concern about the impact on families and children. Within the targeted consultation there was a majority against the proposal, the vast majority of respondents identified that they were parents with children currently accessing this service.</p> <p>In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and the feedback, the Council considered whether it could avoid this perceived disproportionate impact on children. It is felt that it is not possible to continue to provide a nutritious midday meal to all children at current standards without increasing the cost of the meals that have not been increased since 2009. In line with the PSED consideration was then given to whether the impact of the proposal could be mitigated to address the concerns. Given the need to maintain a viable level of service, which schools are free to contract from elsewhere, it is not felt the Council could reduce the cost of the proposed increase. The council has worked to minimise the increases proposed already to minimise the impact on families who have to pay for school meals, particularly larger families. Those that are entitled to free school meals will continue to receive them.</p> <p>Consideration was then given to whether this proposed increase could be justified. Given the steps taken to minimise the increases, the fact that the increase is in line with the increases in living wage, and the length of time since costs were last increased, it is felt that the impact of the proposal on children and their families is justified.</p> <p>Evidence to support this assessment includes analysis of the targeted consultation undertaken with schools and parents / carers and feedback from the universal consultation undertaken as part of the budget setting process.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>No concerns were identified at stage one in relation to this element and no concerns were raised during the consultation on this proposal that require further consideration,</p> <p>Evidence to support this position includes, knowledge of the market, ability of schools to commission elsewhere and protections in place through free school meals provision for those who qualify, and feedback from the consultations detailed in the age section of this impact assessment.</p>
Gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pregnancy / maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Marriage / civil partnership**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Criminal record / offending past**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

\*\* Indicates this is not included within the single equality duty placed upon public authorities by the Equality Act. See guidance for further details.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
<b>Community cohesion</b>						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No concerns were identified at stage one in relation to these element and no concerns have been raised in relation to these as a result of the consultation.
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Further actions	Lead	Deadline
<b>Mitigating actions</b> <b>Promotion</b> <b>Monitoring and evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promotion of the price changes</li> <li>Continued work to minimise costs while maintaining standards.</li> </ul>	

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Angela Blower	<b>Head of Service:</b>	Andrew Mace
<b>Date:</b>	1 March 2020	<b>Date:</b>	1 March 2020