

Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) Template 2026/27 Service Users

The Budget EIA process is a legal duty supporting good financial decision-making. It assesses how proposals may impact on specific groups differently (and whether/how negative impacts can be reduced or avoided) so that these consequences are explicitly considered. Decisions must be informed by accurate, well-informed assessment of likely impacts so that they are fair, transparent, and accountable. Budget EIAs provide a record of this assessment and consideration.

For advice and guidance on completing this assessment contact [Deborah Totney](#), EDI Manager, People & Innovation.

1. Budget Proposal

| | |
|--|---|
| Title of budget saving being assessed: | Transfer of Roundabout nursery to an alternative early years provider |
| Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA: | Vicky Jenkins Childcare Strategy Manager |
| Directorate and Service Name: | Families, Children and Wellbeing |
| Budget proposal no. | <i>EIA 2</i> |

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal: (use the wording in the budget spreadsheet and more detail if needed)

| |
|---|
| The proposal is to transfer Roundabout nursery to an alternative provider |
| Proposed saving £50,000 2026/27, £215,170 2027/28, £100,000 2028/29 |

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

| |
|--|
| <p>Roundabout is an 86-place nursery based on the same campus as Whitehawk Family Hub offering free early learning (the early years free entitlement, EYFE) and paid-for nursery provision to children aged 0 to 4.</p> <p>There is a far greater proportion of disadvantaged children attending Roundabout nursery compared with other nurseries in the city.</p> <p>In order to limit negative impacts for nursery users the proposal is to transfer to an alternative provider under a service specification to offer the same provision in terms of age range of children and hours and weeks of operation as Roundabout and with same EYFE offer so that parents can continue to access nursery provision without additional charges.</p> |
|--|

2. Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

None – at present the proposal is confidential

However, should an alternative provider be identified there will be full consultation with staff and parents

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

There is a budget EIA for Acorn, Cherry Tree and Jump Start nurseries but there are no identified impacts in this

3. Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Age | Yes |
| Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not | Yes |
| Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers) | Yes |
| Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism | Not applicable |
| Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people) | Yes |
| Gender Reassignment | Not applicable |
| Sexual Orientation | Not applicable |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership | No |
| Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum) | No |
| Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans | Not applicable |
| Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees | No |
| Carers | Not applicable |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| | |
| Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people | Yes |
| Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections) | No |
| Socio-economic Disadvantage | Yes |
| Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability | No |
| Human Rights | Not applicable |
| Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed) | Not applicable |

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- People being housebound due to disabilities or disabling circumstances
- Environmental barriers or mobility barriers impacting those with sight loss, D/deafness, sensory requirements, neurodivergence, various complex disabilities
- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

Data not available

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

The impact of the proposal will be collected in termly early years census data. It will also be monitored through the annual audit of the nursery’s EYFE offer and in the Childcare Sufficiency Assessment.

4. Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Population and population groups](#)
 - 🕒 [Census 2021 population groups Infogram: Brighton & Hove by Brighton and Hove City Council](#)
 - [Census and local intelligence data](#)
 - Service specific data
 - Community consultations
 - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
 - Lived experiences and qualitative data
 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
 - [Health Inequalities data](#)
 - Good practice research
 - National data and reports relevant to the service
 - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
 - Feedback from internal 'staff as residents' consultations
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on 'who' the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

| Assess impact for different population groups | Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact? State Yes or No | Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why. |
|---|--|--|
| Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections. | Yes | Roundabout nursery is for children aged 0 to 4. In autumn 2025 there were 91 children on roll and 84.6% of children at Roundabout came from the local area (BN2 5 postcodes). Ongoing provision in Whitehawk & Marina will be retained in the proposal which is important because there is less childcare provision in the ward compared with other areas of the city (7.2 children per early years place in Whitehawk & Marina, compared with two children per early years place city-wide). See Childcare Sufficiency Assessment 2025 |

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| <p>Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>12.1% of children at Roundabout had SEND compared with 1.5% of children at private, voluntary and independent (PVI) provision (autumn 2025).</p> <p>Parents of children with SEND have more difficulty finding childcare than those without SEND and are less satisfied with childcare provision see Childcare Sufficiency Assessment 2025.</p> <p>The proposal retains childcare provision on the same basis to reduce negative impacts</p> |
| <p>Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>38.3% of three- and four-year-old children at Roundabout were BME, compared with 23.7% of children at PVI provision (summer 2025)</p> <p>The proposal retains childcare provision on the same basis in order to reduce negative impacts</p> |
| <p>Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief</p> | <p>No</p> | |
| <p>Gender and Sex including non-binary and intersex people</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>Impact on both male and female parents and carers who use nurseries so that they can work. Women are significantly more impacted to changes in early years provision than men because they usually arrange early years care for their children, and the cost of nursery frequently comes from the woman's salary in a two-parent heterosexual household</p> <p>97% of permanent employees at Roundabout nursery are female.</p> <p>Staff transferring to a new provider would have rights under TUPE</p> |
| <p>Gender Reassignment</p> | <p>No</p> | |
| <p>Sexual Orientation</p> | <p>No</p> | |
| <p>Marriage and Civil Partnership</p> | <p>No</p> | |
| <p>Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)</p> | <p>Yes</p> | <p>Childcare availability is of greater importance to pregnant women, those on maternity and adoption leave than the general population, particularly now that EYFE is available to the children of working parents from the age of nine months</p> |

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| | | The proposal retains childcare provision on the same basis in order to reduce negative impacts |
| Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans | No | |
| Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | <p>Children from these groups may find it harder to access childcare because they are less likely to be able to travel to alternative provision away from their community; they are also less likely to be eligible for EYFE from the age of nine months and therefore may face greater challenges finding suitable provision</p> <p>The proposal retains childcare provision on the same basis to reduce negative impacts</p> |
| Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections | Yes | <p>Non-parents and guardians may assume responsibility for younger children and so there is reliance on these in the wider family/support network</p> <p>The proposal retains childcare provision on the same basis to reduce negative impacts</p> |
| Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections | No | |
| Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors | No | |
| Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections | Yes | <p>Children attending Roundabout nursery are significantly more disadvantaged than children attending PVI nurseries in the city. 42.9% of children at Roundabout received Early Years Pupil Premium (EYPP), compared with 10% of children in PVI provision (autumn 2025).</p> <p>The proposal retains childcare provision on the same basis to reduce negative impacts</p> |
| Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections | No | |
| Human Rights | No | |

| | | |
|---|----|--|
| Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed) | No | |
|---|----|--|

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

5. Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

There is a budget EIA for Acorn, Cherry Tree and Jump Start nurseries but there are no identified impacts in this

6. Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

1. SMART action 1: Ensure that service specifications for alternative providers taking over Roundabout require the current offer of provision to remain in place so that EYFE continues to be available to local parents and children on the same basis as at present
2. SMART action 2: Ensure that service specifications for alternative providers taking over Roundabout requires provision which meets the needs of disadvantaged communities and those with protected characteristics as they are met at present.
3. SMART action 3: The same terms and conditions for staff will remain in place through TUPE.
4. SMART action 4: All families to be supported by Family Hubs to access places in other nurseries should they so wish.

7. Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Proposal's impact score: | 3 |
|--------------------------|---|

8. Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

| |
|---|
| The proposal is confidential at present. Staff potentially impacted have not yet been consulted |
|---|

9. Directorate and Service Approval

| Signatory: | Name and Job Title: | Date: DD-MMM-YY |
|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Responsible Lead Officer: | Vicky Jenkins Childcare Strategy Manager | 12 th January 2026 |
| Accountable Manager: | Georgina Clarke-Green | 12 th January 2026 |

Notes, relevant information, and requests (if any) from Responsible Lead Officer and Accountable Manager submitting this assessment:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

EDI Review and Approval:

Equality Impact Assessment sign-off

| Signatory: | Name: | Date: DD-MMM-YY |
|--------------|----------------|-----------------|
| EDI Manager: | Lindsey Pearce | 17-January-26 |

Notes and recommendations (if any) from Head of CETS Service reviewing this assessment:

