EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT INTRODUCTION

In accordance with s149(1) of the Equality Act 2010 Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA), and Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) are required in the exercise of their functions to have due regard for the need to:

Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation.
Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic, and persons who do not share it.
Foster good relations between those who have a relevant protected characteristic and those who don't.

Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and people who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:

Remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic.

Take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of the persons who do not share it.

Encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

Consider intersectionality and overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage.

Relevant protected characteristics are age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; married/civil partnership and sexual orientation.

Note, 'Carers' and Low-Income Households and Other have also been included in the template, as although not defined as 'protected characteristics' by the Equality Act (2010), it is important to consider the effect on groups. It is important to note that the categories contain important subcategories.

As part of its compliance with this ongoing duty, TfGM undertakes an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) for any significant strategy, project, policy, process or procedure.

Using a standard screening form designed to identify any adverse impacts on members of the above "protected characteristic groups" and to record actions planned to ameliorate any adverse impacts, should any be identified.

Equality Impact Analysis

Section one: Proposal Context

a) Name of Proposal: School Travel Strategy
b) Function: Transport Strategy
c) Key contact for proposal: Sam Knight
d) New or existing proposal: New
e) Aims, objectives & purpose of the proposal summary, including desired outcomes (attach proposal as applicable): The draft School Travel Strategy sets out the vision and approach for how the Greater Manchester Combined
f) Main stakeholders: Schools, colleges, local authorities, parents, young people, transport operators, active travel (TfGM), bus (TfGM), public transport users

Authority (GMCA), Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) and the ten local authorities will enable more young people to walk, wheel, scoot, cycle or use public transport to get to school and access further education.

The strategy aims are to:

Improve safety measures around schools to encourage walking, wheeling, cycling, and the use of public transport.

Provide more young people with travel skills and better supporting schools to promote travelling to school sustainably.

Improve the reliability and accessibility of public transport for students.

Explore opportunities to integrate school services into the Bee Network to improve connectivity for students and the wider community.

Section Two: Baseline Assessment/Scoping

To assess the impacts of the proposal, you first need to understand the current inequalities in provision, access, participation, or opportunities as they are now, before the implementation of your proposal. These groups of people may be different from your target audience or main stakeholders. Please see the EqIA Guidance notes before completing this section.

Protected Characteristic - Age

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service:

TRADS 2021-23 provides modal splits for school travel:
5- to 10-year-olds, Active Travel = 63%, Public Transport = 4%, Car = 33%
11- to 16-year-olds, Active Travel = 47%, Public Transport = 27%, Car = 25%
17- to 18-year-olds, Active Travel = 13%, Public Transport = 54%, Car = 33%

Distance travelled to primary school:
Up to 2 km: 87%, 2k to 5km: 10%, 5 km or more: 3%

Distance travelled to secondary school:
Up to 2 km: 59%, 2k to 5km: 29%, 5 km or more: 13%

Distance travelled to access further education:
Up to 2 km: 15%, 2k to 5km: 51%, 5 km or more: 34%

Anyone aged 16-18 can apply for Our Pass which provides free bus travel and discounted Metrolink 1-day off-peak travelcards.

Scholar's permit provides child tickets for 16 to 19 years olds.

TfGM runs school buses to 114 of 202 secondary schools and further education colleges in GM, transporting circa 5% of the secondary school population.

Analysis undertaken in 2022 on the distance pupils travel on school buses found that over half travelled within a 3-mile walking distance (statutory distance for pupils over 8):
Within 1 mile: 44 (0.3%), Within 1-2 mile: 2181 (15.6%), Within 2-3 mile: 4806 (34.5%), Within 3-4 mile: 3447 (24.7%), Within 4-5 mile: 1352 (9.7%), Within 5-6 mile: 869 (6.2%), Within 6-10 mile: 1148 (8.2%), Beyond 10 miles: 97 (0.7%)

GM TRADS data also shows a slightly higher than average proportion of bus users amongst people aged 60 and over.

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal):

National Youth CA Young Persons Transport Survey 2022 found:
Of those who used public transport less frequently, perceived safety, reliability and cost were the key barriers preventing their use.
Not feeling safe was the key issue preventing public transport use amongst under 16's in GM who don't use public transport frequently.
Just under a sixth of less frequent users noted they didn't really know how to use the public transport network.

Amongst those who used active travel infrequently, perceived safety was the key barrier to greater use.
Lack of infrastructure (e.g. cycle lanes) was a linked issue raised by approximately a fifth of infrequent users.
Cost and not having access to a bike were also cited as reasons for avoiding active travel by around a fifth of those using active travel infrequently.
Around 1 in 10 of those who use active travel infrequently noted that they couldn't ride a bike currently.

National Highways and Transportation Survey found:
That only 50% of GM residents were satisfied that it was safe for children to walk to school. Lowest satisfaction was in Oldham (47%), highest was in Wigan (54%).
That only 42% of GM residents were satisfied that it was safe for children to cycle to school. Lowest satisfaction was in Oldham (39%), highest was in Rochdale and Wigan (44%).

Older People's Network 22/07/24:
Buses are overcrowded already. Avoid travelling during school time due to overcrowding and poor behaviour of young people.

Greater Manchester Youth Network 23/09/24:
Poor customer experience and issues of safety on public transport put young people off. Issues of physical and mental accessibility, it's not just being able to physically access public transport but also the mental barriers (busy and noisy).
Process for applying for passes is very inconvenient.
Young people can be dissuaded from using public transport due to safety concerns and poor experiences interacting with drivers.

Evidence source:

National Youth Combined Authority Young Persons Transport Survey 2022
National Highways and Transport Network (NHT) Survey 2022
Engagement with GM Moving, Older People's Network, Greater Manchester Youth Network

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

Young people in full time education
Schools
Further education establishments
Parents / Guardians
Elected officials
Local authorities
Public transport users

Protected Characteristic - Disability

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service?

Note: SEND transport is out of scope of the School Travel Strategy
The majority of bus vehicles operating in GM are low-floor, including those operating on TfGM supported school services.

ENCTS Disability pass provides free bus, tram and train travel for those who are:
blind or partially sighted
profoundly or severely deaf
without speech
have a disability, or has suffered an injury, which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on his or her ability to walk
does not have arms or has long-term loss of the use of both arms

Disability Plus is a local enhancement to the statutory offer that entitles people with certain disabilities to free anytime bus travel (i.e. allowing them to travel for free before 0930 in the peak, not supported by the national scheme).

Local authorities will provide free travel if a child is unable to walk to school due to their SEN, disability, or mobility problem (including temporary medical condition).

Some councils state that if a child's parents or carers have a disability which prevents them from accompanying their child and this means that the child has no safe walking route to school unaccompanied, they will consider providing travel support. Bolton, Manchester, Salford, Tameside, and Wigan have published this policy on their website.

Disabled people in GM are less likely than those without a disability or long-standing health condition to have access to a car and therefore more likely to rely on public transport, including bus. People with a communication or sensory impairment, learning disability or cognitive impairment, or mental health difficulties are more likely than those with no disability to travel by bus.

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal)

National Youth CA Young Persons Transport Survey 2022 reported that accessibility prevented some respondents, particularly those with a disability, using active travel.

Bee Network buses have two wheelchair spaces as standard and onboard audio-visual announcements. Some older buses have limited capacity for wheelchair users; lack of accessible on-bus information via visual and audio announcements

ENCTS travel pass does not let those with a disability travel before 9:30, meaning it cannot be used for travelling to school in the morning.

GMYN Engagement 23/09/24:
Overcrowded buses aren't accessible – not just physically but also mentally.
Not enough seats downstairs on the new buses.

DDRG 22/08/24:
Avoid travelling during school time due to overcrowding and poor behaviour of young people. Wheelchair spaces are often taken up with extra passengers and parents with prams taking younger siblings on the school run.
Disabled bus users are less satisfied than those without a disability. This is focussed mainly on a number of aspects: ease of getting to the stop, personal security getting to the stop and waiting at a bus stop.

Evidence source:

National Youth Combined Authority Young Persons Transport Survey 2022
TRADS 2017-2019
GM Bus Passenger Survey (2019)

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

Young people in full time education
Schools
Further education establishments
Parents / Guardians
Elected officials
Local authorities
Public transport users

Protected Characteristic - Sex

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service?

Women were more likely to use bus services than men in 2017-2019, but men were more likely to use buses in 2021. It is also recognised that woman are more likely to 'trip-chain' than men.

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal):

Bee Network Public Conversation 2021:
Women were more likely to choose safety (57%) and accessibility (33%) as Customer Charter commitments compared to men (50% and 24% respectively.
Women were amongst those who were more likely to say they avoid making journeys due to lack of safety (57%)
Reasons for avoiding journeys included darkness, poor lighting, travelling alone, secluded or poorly maintained areas/stops/services, poor CCTV and antisocial behaviour.
Respondents stated that an increase in staff presence (36.1%), better lighting (28.7%), increased CCTV/cameras (26.5%) would make them feel safer on the journeys they frequently make.

Experiences of women and girls on transport by Transport Focus on behalf of TfWM 2022:
Negative experiences when travelling had stayed with some participants for decades, but many also talked about more recent experiences. Incidents described included sexual assaults, intimidating/predatory encounters, being physically assaulted or threatened and feeling unsafe due to antisocial behaviour (which included fighting, verbal abuse and vandalism)
When asked what being 'safe' when travelling meant the most frequently mentioned factors included 'staff', 'light' and 'police'.
Two in five participants said they avoid some travel modes because they don't feel safe; walking was the most common mode to avoid.

Good lighting, visible staff, dependable transport and personal space contribute to a feeling of safety on public transport.

2020 Sexual Harassment Survey by Government Equalities Office:
Of those who reported sexual harassment in the 12 months prior to completing the survey, 27% experienced it on public transport and 42% in the street.
By mode, buses were the most reported in which to experience sexual harassment (62%), followed by train or tram (49%) and the underground (36%).
Women, younger people, ethnic minorities, people who identify as LGBT and those with a highly limiting disability were more concerned about sexual harassment and more likely to change their behaviour to avoid sexual harassment.

A DfT study found 60% of women felt unsafe waiting at train stations after dark, 59% felt unsafe walking from the bus stop or station, 49% fear waiting at a bus stop and 40% fear travelling by bus. It is also known that these safety concerns are greater when travelling alone (especially at night).

Evidence source:

Bee Network Public Conversation 2021 engaged over 5000 residents via online survey, workshops and in person conversations.
Experiences of women and girls on transport by Transport Focus on behalf of TfWM 2022 - survey of 1282 women.
2020 Sexual Harassment Survey by Government Equalities Office - survey of 12,131 individuals
How to Ease Women's Fear of Transportation Environments: Case Studies and Best Practices
GM TRADS (2017-2019, 2021), Network Principles (2022), Invisible Women

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

Young people in full time education
Schools
Further education establishments
Parents / Guardians
Elected officials
Local authorities
Public transport users

Protected Characteristic: Gender Reassignment

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service?

No information given.

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal):

Transgender people are more likely to feel unsafe or experience victimisation or harassment when travelling on the bus network (particularly at certain times – night - or in certain areas).

In England and Wales, transgender identity hate crimes by 16% (to 2,540). These percentage increases are smaller than seen in recent years. In the year ending March 2022, there were 4,355 transgender hate crimes showing a sharp increase.

Evidence source:

Hate Crime, England and Wales, 2019 to 2020 – GOV.UK.
Hate Crime, England and Wales, 2021-2022 – GOV.UK.

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

No information given.

Protected Characteristic: Race/Ethnicity

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service?
People experiencing racial inequality (Black, mixed and other) are more likely to use public transport than the overall population (Travel by distance, trips, type of transport and purpose - GOV.UK Ethnicity facts and figures (ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk)).
On average people experiencing racial inequality travel further to access education and a greater proportion of their trips are to access education (Travel by distance, trips, type of transport and purpose - GOV.UK Ethnicity facts and figures (ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk)).
People from Black or Black British backgrounds in GM are also less likely than average to have access to a car.

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal):

Young people from communities experiencing racial inequality are very concerned about bullying and harassment on and around public transport (LGIU Policy Briefing (towerhamlets.gov.uk).

Evidence source:

Travel by distance, trips, type of transport and purpose - GOV.UK Ethnicity facts and figures (ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk)
LGIU Policy Briefing (towerhamlets.gov.uk)
GM TRADS (2019), Census (2011).

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

Young people in full time education
Schools
Further education establishments

Parents / Guardians
Elected officials
Local authorities
Public transport users

Protected Characteristic - Marriage/Civil Partnership (workforce only)

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service?

Not applicable

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal)

Issues have been noted for parents with prams on buses in particular: lack of space on board and time to get the pram onto the bus and settled before the bus pulls away.

Evidence source:

Network Principles (2022).

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

No information given.

Protected Characteristic - Pregnancy and Maternity

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service

Not applicable

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal):

Evidence source:

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

Protected Characteristic - Religion/Belief

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service?

38 out of the 114 schools / 16-plus colleges that have school buses are faith schools. This means of those secondary schools that receive dedicated buses, 33% are religious schools.
Attending a faith school is considered when local authorities are assessing whether a pupil classified as low income should be in receipt of free travel, but whether travel assistance should be provided to pupils who attend a faith school due to personal choice is up to the discretion of the local authority (Section 509AD of the Education Act 1996). DfE guidance says that local authorities have to have 'regard' for religion and beliefs, but don't have to arrange travel based on religious preferences.

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal)

No information given

Evidence source

No information given

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

Young people in full time education
Schools
Further education establishments
Parents / Guardians
Elected officials
Local authorities
Public transport users

Protected Characteristic - Sexual Orientation

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service?

No information given.

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal)

GMYN Engagement 23/09/24:

Experienced homophobic abuse while using public transport and no action was taken against perpetrators.
In England and Wales, sexual orientation hate crimes have increased by 19% (to 15,835). In the year ending March 2022, there were 26,152 sexual orientation hate crimes which shows an increase from 2019-2020.

Evidence source

Hate Crime, England and Wales, 2019 to 2020 – GOV.UK.
Hate Crime, England and Wales, 2021-2022 – GOV.UK.

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

No information given.

Protected Characteristic: Socio-economic

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service?

Households on lower incomes are more likely to live closer to their closest suitable school (ACORN, 2022). Households with higher incomes are more likely to live further away from their registered schools. This means that school buses tend to serve pupils from higher socio-economic categories.
Children in receipt of free school meals or whose parents are in receipt of their maximum Working Tax Credit will be eligible for free transport if:
Under 11 = 2 miles from nearest qualifying school with places available (defined by paragraph 15 of schedule 35B to the Education Act 1996).
11-16 = live more than 2 miles but less than 6 from one of their 3 nearest qualifying schools with places available.
Pupils / young people aged 11 to 16 years attending their nearest appropriate school preferred on grounds of religion faith or belief and live between two and fifteen miles from the school.
Increasingly to use public transport you need a bank account and a contactless bank account. Not every child will have access to these.

GM Moving 22/08/2024:

Poor air quality, mental health and wellbeing outcomes, and levels of obesity are unequally distributed by place and demographics in Greater Manchester.

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal):

Postcode data of registered pupils by ACORN categories
ACORN Category:
Affluent achievers within 0-2 miles – 64.5%, 2-3 miles – 15.1%, 3-6 miles – 15.1%, 6-10 miles – 3.8%, over 10 miles 1.6%
Rising prosperity within 0-2 miles – 64.3%, 2-3 miles 15.6%, 3-6 miles 16.1%, 6-10 miles – 3.2%, over 10 miles 0.8%

Comfortable communities within 0-2 miles – 68.0%, 2-3 miles – 15.4%, 3-6 miles 13.8%, 6-10 miles – 2.0%, over 10 miles – 0.7%

Financially stretched within 0-2 miles – 73.3%, 2-3 miles – 15.0%, 3-6 miles – 10.0%, 6-10 miles – 1.3%, over 10 miles – 0.4%

Urban Adversity within 0-2 miles – 71.2%, 2-3 miles – 16.0%, 3-6 miles – 11.2%, 6-10 miles – 1.2%, over 10 miles – 0/4%

Not private household within 0-2 miles – 66.1%, 2-3 miles – 17.5%, 3-6 miles – 12.6%, 6-10 miles – 3.1%, over time miles – 0.6%

National Youth CA Young Persons Transport Survey 2022 found that young people in GM ranked public transport as more affordable than the overall NYCA response.

23% of GM 16s and under said public transport was affordable, and 66% said it was somewhat affordable. The data was not broken down by socio-economic characteristics.

Census 2021 - 44.1% of households classified as urban adversity do not have a car. This compares to only 8.2% of affluent achievers and 12.6% of comfortable communities.

School Census data from 2023/24 - Average % of pupils eligible for FSM at schools with school buses = 28%, Average % of pupils eligible for FSM at schools with no school buses = 35%, GM Average % of pupils eligible for FSM = 31%

Evidence source:

National Youth CA Young Persons Transport Survey 2022
Census 2021
Postcode data provided by Local Authorities

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

Poverty Truth Commissions (e.g. Trafford)

Protected Characteristic: Carers

How well are people within this protected characteristic served within the current service?

Individuals on a care pathway, aged 18–21 can apply for a care leavers pass and receive free anytime bus travel and discounted Metrolink 1-day off-peak travelcards
Manchester City Council provides free transport for any child aged 4 – 16 years old who is looked after by Manchester City Council or previously LAC + attending a primary school / secondary school or academy beyond 2 miles from their LAC placement.
In Salford, any child placed with a foster carer will be able to access additional support if there is a significant, evidenced additional barrier to getting to and from school that is not covered by the foster parent payments.

Are there any existing: barriers to access, or participation, or disadvantages faced by groups of people within this protected characteristic? (in relation to aim of proposal):

GMYN Engagement 23/09/24:

Young people said that drivers don't know what the carers pass is, meaning they have either refused travel or required carer to explain what it is (this can make them feel uncomfortable). This is perception, there is not actually a carers pass but the concession plus pass is often mistaken for a carers pass.

Carers are not currently entitled to reduced/free fares in GM which may present a barrier to travel.

Evidence source:

Manchester City Council's Home to School Policy
Salford City Council's Home to School Policy

Stakeholder/Community Groups relevant to proposal, e.g. representative community groups, dedicated services, schools, places of worship:

Section Three: Engagement, Consultation & Data Gathering

You may be required to involve and consult stakeholders during your assessment to understand the impact of the proposals. The extent of the consultation/engagement will depend on the nature of the policy, plan or project and whether there has been previous engagement activity with the groups who will be impacted (directly or indirectly) that is relevant to this proposal. (Don't forget to involve trade unions if staff are affected and consider socio-economic impact as well as community and third sector groups for different protected characteristics).

If consultation or engagement activity hasn't been undertaken with people who may be affected by the proposal, or is not planned, why not?

Engagement and consultation activity has been undertaken or is due to take place.

Planned Activity: Meetings with local authorities
Stakeholders/communities involved: Transport Strategy Group members and officers from local authorities transport and education departments
Estimated timeframes: Ongoing
Methods: Meetings and written feedback on draft strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: Ongoing engagement

Planned Activity: Big Active Conversation
Stakeholders/communities involved: Officers, community groups parents
Estimated timeframes: 05/06/2023
Methods: Ran two one-hour workshops on school travel
How will you publicise the engagement activity: Workshop was publicised alongside promotional activities for Big Active Conversation

Planned Activity: GMCA Education Summit
Stakeholders/communities involved: Schools, headteachers, education leads in local authorities, officers in local authorities' education departments
Estimated timeframes: 14/06/2023
Methods: On behalf of the GMCA facilitated discussion on assigned table
How will you publicise the engagement activity: GMCA publicised event through their education networks

Planned Activity: Older People's Network
Stakeholders/communities involved: Older people
Estimated timeframes: 22/07/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: GM Directors of Education
Stakeholders/communities involved: Directors of Education in Local Authorities
Estimated timeframes: 26/07/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contact organiser

Planned Activity: Foundation 92
Stakeholders/communities involved: Teachers and safety groups
Estimated timeframes: 30/07/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy

How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: DDRG
Stakeholders/communities involved: People with a disability or additional needs
Estimated timeframes: 22/08/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: GM Moving
Stakeholders/communities involved: Active travel group
Estimated timeframes: 22/08/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: Greater Manchester Travel Training Forum
Stakeholders/communities involved: Travel training delivery partners
Estimated timeframes: 12/09/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: WACCAG
Stakeholders/communities involved: Active travel groups
Estimated timeframes: 13/09/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: GM Faith and Belief Network
Stakeholders/communities involved: Faith and belief
Estimated timeframes: 17/09/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: Stockport Headteachers Forum
Stakeholders/communities involved: Headteachers of secondary schools
Estimated timeframes: 18/09/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: Greater Manchester Youth Network
Stakeholders/communities involved: Young People
Estimated timeframes: 23/09/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: Metrolink
Stakeholders/communities involved: Metrolink
Estimated timeframes: 29/09/2024
Methods: Shared Powerpoint and response sent via email
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PIPA contacted organiser

Planned Activity: Greater Manchester Learning Partnership
Stakeholders/communities involved: Greater Manchester Education leads, Dioceses, Trust CEOs, National Leaders of Education, Teaching School Hubs, Legacy Teaching Schools and Chairs of Headteachers Conferences
Estimated timeframes: 17/10/2024
Methods: Presentation on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: Bee Network Committee
Stakeholders/communities involved: Elected representatives
Estimated timeframes: 24/10.2024
Methods: Not applicable
How will you publicise the engagement activity: Not applicable

Planned Activity: Greater Manchester Combined Authority
Stakeholders/communities involved: Elected representatives
Estimated timeframes: 25/10/2024
Methods: Not applicable
How will you publicise the engagement activity: Not applicable

Planned Activity: Rochdale Children and Young People Partnership Plan Working Group
Stakeholders/communities involved: Rochdale Council, GMP, Young People
Estimated timeframes: 25/10/2024
Methods: Discussion on Rochdale Children and Young People Partnership Plan
How will you publicise the engagement activity: Organiser contacted TfGM

Planned Activity: Stockport Primary Headteacher Forum
Stakeholders/communities involved: Headteachers of primary schools
Estimated timeframes: 07/11/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PIPA contacted organiser

Planned Activity: Greater Manchester Youth Combined Authority
Stakeholders/communities involved: Young people
Estimated timeframes: 07/11/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: Women and Girls Panel
Stakeholders/communities involved:
Estimated timeframes: 07/11/2024
Methods: Presentation and discussion on proposals in draft school travel strategy
How will you publicise the engagement activity: PEI contacted organiser

Planned Activity: Public Consultation
Stakeholders/communities involved: Greater Manchester residents and stakeholders with a particular emphasis on those living, studying, or working within its boundaries
Estimated timeframes: 18/11/2024-26/01/2025
Methods: Survey hosted on GM Consult with other formats available on request
How will you publicise the engagement activity: Social media, posters

You have a duty under the Public Sector Equality Duty to consider what measures can be taken to design and deliver engagement activity that is accessible to different groups of people and implement the measures wherever this is feasible to do. This particularly necessary where you have identified barriers in accessing the relevant scheme, service or provision, or in participating in engagement activities for particular groups of people who have an interest in, or are likely to be impacted by the change. This includes considering how you communicate or publicise the engagement activity. You should consider all potential adjustments and consider the feasibility. If you are unsure what measures are required to make the engagement activity more accessible, you should ask representatives of the relevant communities or groups. You can also contact the TfGM engagement team engagement@tfgm.com

Using the information identified in section 2, complete the table below to identify what actions need to be considered and actions

Demographic Group

Examples - please note: The information provided are examples only to demonstrate the type of information to include
(example – people who do not speak or write in English as their first or main language)

Barrier to participation
(example – may be unable to take part in consultation)

Actions which could remove barriers
(example – translation of written materials and/or video translation of information in consultation)

Feasibility/ expected impact of action
(examples – for individuals who do not write in their main language, translation of written materials will not remove the barrier. Not feasible to provide video transport for all languages that are spoken in the borough. Urdu, Bangla, Punjabi and Mirpuri are the main language after English spoken in Rochdale. Will also need provide a way for individuals to respond to the consultation.)

Agreed Action
(Example - Arrange for the 4 main languages identified, which can translate the materials and responses.)

Demographic Group: People who do not speak or write English as their first main language
Barrier to participation: May be unable to take part in consultation
Actions which could remove barriers: No information given
Feasibility/ expected impact of action: Will be unable to provide a translation of every language spoken in GM due to cost of doing so
Agreed Action: Non-English speakers can access translations of the consultation through the use of LanguageLine accessed via the Bee Network contact centre. The survey will have text directing people to Language Line translated into the top 5 most spoken languages in Greater Manchester; Arabic, Urdu, Polish, Chinese and Bengali.

Demographic Group: People who do not have digital access will be unable to take part in online consultation
Barrier to Participation: May be unable to take part in the Consultation
Actions which could remove barriers: Briefing of elected officials, so if a resident does wish to feedback Councillor/MP know where to direct response
Feasibility/ expected impact of action: Expect a high number of resources meaning using an online response is the most efficient way to manage workload

Agreed Action: Will provide paper copies of the strategy and consultation at key locations. Will brief elected officials and have a process that allows them to escalate any responses they receive. Colleagues will be available in person at 3 locations across GM at advertised times to answer questions and support those who need it in submitting their response.

Demographic Group: Young people, particularly those at primary school, will be affected but may not fully understand the implications.

Barrier to participation: May be unable to take part in the consultation

Actions which could remove barriers: Parents will be able to feedback on behalf of their children. Provide easy read version of strategy

Feasibility/ expected impact of action: Engagement has been undertaken specifically with young people's groups

Agreed Action: Will provide an easy read version of the strategy

Section Four: Equality Impact Assessment - Please use the EqIA Guidance document for reference

For the following question describe any potential positive or negative impacts of the proposal for different groups of people.

To explore the impacts of your proposal, you should use your baseline as a comparison with how the proposal could impact these inequalities (either positively by reducing the inequality or negatively by worsening it). Think about how this might differ from the baseline for people with each protected characteristic. You should consider the impact of inaction based on your findings from section 1.

Include any sources of data you have used to inform this view (including desktop research and engagement activity).

Equality Group – Age:

Children (under 13 years)
Young people (13-18 years)
Older adults (55+ years)

Impact Description:
Proposal to improve road safety around schools will positively impact young people by reducing road danger – Positive Impact.
Auditing of barriers to travelling actively to school will inform future plans and funding proposals. This will help reduce road danger around schools and provide health benefits (cleaner air and physical activity) – Positive Impact.
We will work with councils to widen access to cycles. This will include looking at the possibility of providing discounted bikes, connecting bike libraries with schools and looking at how we can provide more cycle storage at schools and in the community – Positive Impact.
We will work with schools to deliver behaviour change programmes and training so that young people have the confidence and skills to travel sustainably - Positive Impact.
Through network reviews we will adjust the public transport network and gradually integrate school services to better serve schools and colleges. This will provide all day connectivity benefiting young people as they can attend breakfast clubs, after school clubs and still get to school, if they miss the bus. May however mean that some young people will no longer have a direct service to school, instead they may have to change services. Potential risk of young people being stuck halfway along their journey if connecting bus fails to arrive – Positive/Negative Impact.
Ongoing work of the TravelSafe Partnership is helping to make the transport network safer for young people. More young people on the general network could however lead to poor and anti-social behaviour – Positive/Negative Impact.
Likely to see more pupils travelling on public transport at peak time. This could lead to overcrowding, meaning there is less space and available seats. May negatively affect older people – Negative Impact.
Through prioritising our resources on improving the general network we can focus on providing capacity on the general network and improving services that run all day, benefitting older people through improved transport connectivity – Positive Impact.

Evidence Source:

Childhood Health and Wellbeing: An Overview | Greater Manchester Moving (gmmoving.co.uk)
National Child Measurement Programme, England 2020/21 School Year - NDRS (digital.nhs.uk)
National Youth CA Young Persons Transport Survey 2022
HT briefing layout v FINALvii.pdf (publishing.service.gov.uk)

Investigation of the associations between physical activity, self-regulation and educational outcomes in childhood | PLOS ONE

Being Active Helps Students in School - Association for Physical Education - Association For Physical Education | P.E. (afpe.org.uk)

ALR_Brief_ActiveEducation_Jan2015.pdf (activelivingresearch.org)

Engagement with DDRG, GM Moving, Foundation 92, Older People's Network, GM Directors of Education, Bee Network Committee, Greater Manchester Travel Training Forum, WACCAG, Metrolink, Greater Manchester Youth Network, Headteacher Forums.

Action proposed to mitigate any negative impact:

By using the network review process to consider how school services can be integrated into the wider network we are better able to consider the network wide impacts. Means we can take mitigating actions, such as increasing capacity or frequency on other services.

The introduction of a hopper fare in March 2025 also means there will no longer be a cost implication to having to change between bus services.

The draft strategy identifies safety as a key activity, focusing on encouraging good behaviour and taking enforcement action against poor behaviour.

All bus stations and interchanges have staff who can help young people changing between buses. Can deploy TSEOs any areas with high number of young people to support them and prevent ASB.

Live bus tracking means young people can see where their bus is and using journey planner can plan out any connections they need to make. TfGM is taking steps to improve the reliability of the buses through timetable changes, additional vehicles and bus priority infrastructure.

Equality Group – Disability:

Mobility
Visual
Hearing
Learning/Understanding/Concentrating
Mental Health

Impact Description:

SEND travel is out of scope so there will be no impact on their provision of transport – Neutral impact.

To widen access to cycles we will work with bike libraries to provide adapted bikes and ensure schools have secure storage – Positive impact.

New zero emission buses have better facilities than school buses (two wheelchair bays, real time information, enhanced CCTV, and audio announcements) – Positive impact.

Likely to see more pupils travelling on public transport at peak time. This could lead to overcrowding, meaning there is less space for disabled people and it could be more distressing. This could be due to lots of people being in close proximity and the possibility of young people being noisy - Negative impact.

Evidence Source:

Greater Manchester's first Bee Network buses handed over ahead of September launch (tfgm.com)

Partnerships, Engagement and Inclusion - EqIA Form- Network review September 22.pdf - All Documents (sharepoint.com)

Engagement with DDRG, Greater Manchester Travel Training Forum, Older People's Network, Greater Manchester Youth Network.

Action proposed to mitigate any negative impact:

Through prioritising our resources on improving the general network we can focus on providing capacity on the general network.

By using the network review process to consider how school services can be integrated into the wider network we are better able to consider the network wide impacts. Means we can take mitigating actions, such as increasing capacity or frequency on other services if there are issues with overcrowding.

The draft strategy identifies safety as a key activity, focusing on encouraging good behaviour and taking enforcement action against poor behaviour.

Equality Group – Gender:

Impact Description:

One of our activities is focused on safety on public transport through enforcement, education and raising awareness of how to report incidents. As women are more likely to report feeling unsafe on public transport this should help improve safety and perceptions of safety – Positive impact.

Evidence Source:

Bee Network Public Conversation 2021
Experiences of women and girls on transport, by Transport Focus on behalf of TfWM 2022
2020 Sexual Harassment Survey by Government Equalities Office
How to Ease Women's Fear of Transportation Environments: Case Studies and Best Practices
Engagement with Foundation 92, Greater Manchester Youth Network, Bee Network Committee.

Equality Group – Gender Reassignment:

Male (inc Trans Male)
Female (inc Trans Female)
Transgender
Gender Fluid
Gender neutral

Impact Description:

One of our activities is focused on safety on public transport through enforcement, education and raising awareness of how to report incidents. As trans people are more likely to report feeling unsafe on public transport this should help improve safety and perceptions of safety – Positive Impact.

Evidence Source:

Press release: Trans Lives Survey 2021 — TransActual.
National LGBT Survey: Summary report - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)
Engagement with Foundation 92, Greater Manchester Youth Network, Bee Network Committee.

Equality Group – Race/Ethnicity:

Pakistani
Indians
Bangladesh
Chinese
Caribbean
African
Mixed /Multiple Ethnic Groups
Scottish & Welsh
Gypsy
Irish Travellers
Irish
Polish
Spanish
Romanians
Arabs
Jewish
Other

Impact Description:

Due to the correlation between certain ethnic groups being more likely to be religious, and faith schools currently being the main beneficiaries of school buses, if changes are made to school services they are more likely to be impacted than the general population – Negative Impact.
All groups will benefit from improved active travel infrastructure and safer roads – Positive Impact.
All groups will benefit from improved public transport and by integrating services into the general network have access to services all day – Positive Impact.

Evidence Source:

Census Data 2021

Action proposed to mitigate any negative impact:

Through focusing on improving the general network will provide enhanced connectivity to more people and provide a better level of service (able to access other opportunities – e.g. after school clubs). When considering a school's need we will have due regard for religion, as set in the Department for Education's guidance.

Equality Group – Religion/Belief:

Buddhism
Christianity
Hinduism
Judaism
Islam
Sikhism
No religion
Other

Impact Description:

Currently faith schools are more likely to have school buses so if changes are made to school services they are more likely to be impacted than the general population – Negative Impact.
The percentage of households reporting themselves as religious has fallen. Non-religious has grown in popularity meaning there are likely to be less households choosing their school based on faith. Young people of no faith will therefore benefit from a more equitable distribution of resources – Positive Impact.
All groups will benefit from improved active travel infrastructure and safer roads – Positive Impact.
All groups will benefit from improved public transport and by integrating services into the general network have access to services all day – Positive Impact.

Evidence Source:

Travel to school for children of compulsory school age (publishing.service.gov.uk)
Census Data 2021
List of current school bus provision

Action proposed to mitigate any negative impact:

Guidance will be provided to assist officers in having 'regard to religion or belief' when assessing if a school bus should be provided.

Equality Group – Sexual Orientation:

Gay man
Lesbian
Bi-sexual
Other

Impact description:

One of our activities is focused on safety on public transport through enforcement, education and raising awareness of how to report incidents. As people who identify as LGBTQ+ are more likely to report feeling unsafe on public transport this should help improve safety and perceptions of safety – Positive Impact.

Evidence source:

National LGBT Survey: Summary report - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)
Engagement with Foundation 92, Greater Manchester Youth Network, Bee Network Committee.

Equality Group – Marriage/Civil Partnership:

Not Applicable

Equality Group – Pregnancy/Maternity:

All

Impact description:

By encouraging more young people to use public transport buses are likely to become more crowded at peak times, this could mean limited seats for pregnant people – Negative Impact.

Enabling young people to travel independently means parents no longer have to drive them, saving them time and enabling them to travel to work or carry out other duties – Positive Impact.

Evidence source:

Invisible Women by Caroline Criado Perez
What-women-want-report-1.pdf (gm4women2028.org)
Engagement with GM Moving.

Action proposed to mitigate any negative impact:

As part of the school bus criteria, it will be considered if there is sufficient capacity on existing services.
By focusing our investment on the general network the creation of new services will provide additional options. The new services are likely to be more cross boundary than into the city centre, so are better suited to trip chaining journeys.

Equality Group – Carers:

No information given.

Equality Group – Socio-economic:

Low-income household

Impact description:

ACORN data and school census data 2023/24 suggests that it's higher income households that are more likely to attend a school that has school buses. Through improving the general network to better serve schools and

communities, there will be improved connectivity. As lower income households are more likely to use public transport, they will be one of the main beneficiaries – Positive Impact.

As school bus fares are cheaper than anybus tickets / single bus fare, lower income families are having to pay a higher price to travel to school. Creating a fairer and more simplified ticketing system could help address this discrepancy – Positive Impact.

Evidence source:

School Census data from 2023/24
Avg % of pupils eligible for FSM at schools with school buses = 28%
Avg % of pupils eligible for FSM at schools with no school buses = 35%
GM Avg % of pupils eligible for FSM = 31%
Fares and passes for young people | Transport for Greater Manchester (tfgm.com)

Equality Group – Other Groups:

Rural areas

Impact description:

Rural areas are more likely to face transport issues. If a bus fails to turn up in urban areas pupils may have other options, but in rural areas pupils are more likely to have fewer if any alternative options. Issues of reliability effect all services (general and school), but requiring connections in rural areas could lead to higher risk of young people being stuck halfway along their journey – Neutral Impact.

Focusing on providing services that run all day may mean some rural areas have a better level of service – Positive Impact.

Evidence source:

Transport in rural areas: local authority toolkit - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Action proposed to mitigate any negative impact:

Through the network review process the suitability of requiring onward connections will be taken into consideration when considering any adjustments to the network.

Live bus tracking means young people can see where their bus is and using journey planner can plan out any connections they need to make. TfGM is taking steps to improve the reliability of the buses through timetable changes, additional vehicles and bus priority infrastructure.

Section Five: Evidence Gaps

Are there gaps in information that make it difficult or impossible to form an opinion on how your proposals might affect different groups of people, please explain what evidence gaps have been identified. Are there groups for who you don't have data or insight in regard to how the proposal might impact a protected group.

Protected Characteristic – All

Evidence Gap:

Evidence used has come mainly from research into the adult population, limited research available that focuses specifically on young people with protected characteristics. Have had to assume that inequalities faced by the adult population are the same ones that young people face.

Your completed EqIA should be sent to the TfGM Equalities Lead for approval.

Process signed off by: Nick Fairclough, Senior Policy Manager
Date completed: 29/10/2024
Equality validator's comments: EqIA to be updated further once consultation feedback received
Validated by (Equality Team): Strategic Lead, Consultation and Inclusion
Date valudated: 29th October 2024
Next review date: February 2025