

## Equality Impact Assessment for Budget process

<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Children Young People and Families</b>
<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Safeguarding</b>
<b>Policy/Service being affected</b>	
<b>Is this an investment or proposed saving?</b>	<b>Proposed savings.</b>
<b>Is this proposed saving or investment directly linked to another i.e that an investment in a new or existing service relates to a saving in another area? If so please name the linked proposal.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Who is undertaking this assessment?</b>	<b>Phil Sawbridge, Shearon Williams</b>
<b>Date of this assessment</b>	<b>26/10/10</b>
<b>Signature of completing officer (to be signed after the EIA has been completed)</b>	
<b>Name and signature of Head of Service (to be signed after the EIA has been completed)</b>	
<b>Signature of DMT Equalities Champion (to be signed after the EIA is completed and signed by the completing officer)</b>	

**A copy of the Equality Impact Assessment Report including relevant data and information to be forwarded to the Directorate Equalities Champion and the Corporate Equalities & Diversity Team**

## Form A1

### INITIAL SCREENING FOR BUDGET DECISIONS – DO THEY HAVE ANY RELEVANCE OR POSE ANY RISK TO ANY OF THE EQUALITIES GROUPS?



High relevance/priority



Medium relevance/priority



Low or no relevance/ priority

**Note:**

1. Tick coloured boxes appropriately, and depending on degree of relevance to each of the equality strands
2. Summaries of the legislation/guidance should be used to assist this screening process

DEPARTMENT:	Relevance/Risk to Equalities																				
State the service or proposal being assessed:	Gender			Race			Disability			Sexual Orientation			Religion/Belief			Age			Priority status For EIA		
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		✓		✓			✓					✓	✓			✓			✓		

For saving proposals complete form A2a below

For investment proposals complete form A2b below

**Form A2a – proposed savings**

**Equality Impact Assessment**

Please Explain

<b><u>Stage 1 – Scoping and Defining</u></b>	
(1) What are the aims and objectives of service where savings are to be made?	<b>To contribute to the overall Council’s savings requirement.</b> <b>Proposed savings:</b> <b>1. Educational Safeguarding – now a fully funded service, proposal to make this either a service paid for through DSG or a traded service.</b> <b>2. End placement support youth worker post and housing support post.</b> <b>3, Cease funding of the Leaving Care Association.</b> <b>4. Cease funding of Family Link service for disabled children.</b> <b>5. Reduce discretionary expenditure on Looked after children</b> <b>6. Reduce the use of sessional workers.</b> <b>7. Reduce taxi hire</b>
(2) How does the service fit with the council’s wider objectives?	<b>To provide a safeguarding service to children young people and families.</b>
(3) What would the expected outcomes of the service have been?  Who would have benefited from the service and in what way?	The areas where savings have been identified contribute towards the provision of an enhanced service to some of our our most vulnerable and disadvantaged children.  All young people who are subject to child protection, fostering or adoption benefit from receiving a tailored service directly to meet their needs.

<p>(4) Does this proposed saving have the potential to directly or indirectly discriminate against any particular group?</p> <p>Please identify all groups that are affected</p>	<p><b>RACE</b></p> <p>2. End Placement support posts - This will have a disproportionate adverse affect on our Asylum seeking population compared with the general child population.</p> <p>3. End Leaving Care Association – This will have disproportionate adverse affect on our Asylum seeking population.</p>	<p><b>AGE</b></p> <p>All of these measures will disadvantage the total Looked After population with reference to the quality of service they will now receive.</p>	<p><b>GENDER</b></p> <p>In respect of employment women will be disadvantaged as the majority of the posts that are affected are now occupied by women, however it is not disproportionate as the overall staff figures show a higher percentage of women employed.</p>
	<p><b>RELIGION/BELIEF</b></p> <p>The religion/belief of some Asylum seekers may be adversely impacted upon</p> <p>Other – please specify</p>	<p><b>DISABILITY</b></p> <p>4. Ending funding of the Family Link service will disadvantage LAC who also have a disability.</p>	<p><b>SEXUAL ORIENTATION</b></p> <p>At present there is limited data on this group and it is therefore difficult to identify the impact any reduction in the quality of service will have on this group</p>
<p><b><u>Stage 2 - Information Gathering</u></b></p>			

(1) What type and range of evidence or information have you used to help you make a judgement about the cut to this particular service?

1. Educational safeguarding – This is based upon a prioritisation of safeguarding services. This service is an enhancement rather than a core statutory service
2. End Placement support posts - These are non core services and whilst we would like to continue to fund them funding constraints have required us to review all non core activity
3. Leaving Care Association - We have both a Leaving Care Association and a Child in Care Council- we can no longer justify funding 2 posts to support this activity
4. Stop Family link service for disabled children - This decision anticipates the de-regulation of short term breaks for children with a disability
5. Cut funding for childcare costs for LAC –There is a universal offer for pre-school education which means that spot purchasing of childcare costs should only occur in the most exceptionalof circumstances
6. Reduce the use of sessional workers – This judgement is based upon the need for us to minimise discretionary spend in line with the financial challenges facing the local authority.
7. Reduce taxi hire - This judgement is based upon the need for us to minimise discretionary spend in line with the financial challenges facing the local authority.

(2) Have you been able to use any consultation data to help make this decision, if so what?

1. Educational safeguarding - Full consultation on this proposal will take place, once we can release this sensitive proposal which at the time of doing this impact assessment remains confidential.
2. End Placement support posts - These posts are part of our corporate parenting strategy and our intention to end this aspect of provision has been well known for some time
3. Leaving Care Association – Full consultation on this proposal will take place, once we can release this sensitive proposal which at the time of doing this impact assessment remains confidential.
4. Stop Family link service for disabled children – Full consultation on this proposal will take place, once we can release this sensitive proposal which at the time of doing this impact assessment remains confidential.
5. Cut funding for childcare costs for LAC – No consultation has been undertaken as the proposal is to find an alternative way of delivering this service.
6. Reduce the use of sessional workers – We have not undertaken any specific consultation as yet but don't see any direct impact on the service delivery as the proposal is to deliver within our normal resources. Staff implications are that these posts are sessionally commissioned part time workers.
7. Reduce taxi hire – We have not consulted on the reduction. This will not affect the delivery of statutory services but may well cause inconvenience for service users

**Stage 3 – Making a Judgement**

(1) From the evidence above is there any adverse or negative impact identified for any particular group?

1. Educational safeguarding- becoming a traded service could have an adverse impact if schools do not buy into the service leading to the service folding. This could also lead to less responsive schools regarding referrals to the Child protection service. If the service were to fold, this would lead to an impact on staff although in terms of equality this is not disproportionate.
2. End placement support posts - This is an enhanced service provided to care leavers as we are proposing that we no longer provide this service all care leavers will see a reduced service but in particular our Asylum seeking cohort will be disproportionately disadvantaged because of the numbers of Asylum seekers who now benefit from this service. There are staff implications although in terms of equality this is not disproportionate.
3. Leaving Care Association –This is an enhanced service and so care leavers may see a reduced service. It also may disproportionately disadvantage Asylum seekers, as they are over-represented in this service provision [100% of unaccompanied asylum seekers are looked after].
4. Stop Family link service for disabled children – The removal of this service will have an adverse impact on LAC who have a disability.
5. Cut funding for childcare costs for LAC- the impact will be on all the LAC population accessing this service but at present it is thought that this will not disproportionately disadvantage any particular group. Additionally the proposal involves accessing these services in accordance with the universal offer..
6. Reduce the use of sessional workers – This will invariably reduce the range of services available to looked after children.. Further work is required to identify if staffing issues adversely impact any particular group. This will be undertaken once the proposals are public.
7. Reduce taxi hire – This will not affect the delivery of statutory services but may well cause inconvenience for service users

(2) If there is an adverse impact, can this be justified?

1. Educational safeguarding – This proposal is justified as we are not, at this stage, proposing to dissolve the service but to offer it as a traded service or as a service funded from the schools budget..
2. End Placement support posts - The justification is based on the fact that this is an enhanced service which does not prevent us from fulfilling our statutory duties.
3. Leaving Care Association – The justification is based on the fact that this is an enhanced service and by making a saving here allow us to continue meeting our statutory responsibilities in other areas..
4. Stop Family link service for disabled children – This proposal appears to accord with national policy direction
5. Cut funding for childcare costs for LAC – there is a universal offer and by making a saving here allow us to continue meeting our statutory responsibilities in other areas..
6. Reduce the use of sessional workers – sessional workers support the delivery of child care plans but much of the work that they do is at the discretion of the local authority- by making a saving here we can continue to meet our statutory responsibilities in other areas..
7. Reduce taxi hire – this is a savings measure in the area of our discretionary spending that will help us to continue to deliver our statutory requirements.

<p>(3) What actions could be taken or have been taken to reduce or eliminate negative or adverse impact?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Educational Safeguarding – minimise or negate the impact by offering as a traded service or one funded from the Direct Schools Grant.</li> <li>2. End Placement support posts - There is no way to reduce or eliminate this proposal as we are proposing that the service ends. We will continue, however, to support care leavers through our core services.</li> <li>3. Leaving Care Association - The proposal is that this service will be conflated with another provision so the full service will not be lost.</li> <li>4. Stop Family link service for disabled children – We are anticipating legislative change that will negate the purpose of this provision. Current responsibilities will be absorbed within our general fostering service</li> <li>5. Cut funding for childcare costs for LAC - intention is for services to be provided from a universal service in accordance with the core offer.</li> <li>6. Reduce the use of sessional workers – the proposals is to reduce discretionary spend and use sessional work much more sparingly</li> <li>7. Reduce taxi hire - No actions have been taken the proposals is to reduce discretionary spend and use taxi's much more sparingly</li> </ol>
<p>(4) Is there any positive impact?</p> <p>Does it promote equality of opportunity between different groups and actively address discrimination?</p>	
<p><b><u>Stage 4 – Action Planning, Review &amp; Monitoring</u></b></p>	

If No Further Action is required then go to – Review & Monitoring

(1) Action Planning – Specify any action which could be taken to mitigate or eradicate negative or adverse impact on specific groups, including resource implications.

EIA Action Plan

Action	Lead Officer	Date for completion	Resource requirements	Comments
Although some of these services are enhanced services we will where applicable consult on the proposal to cut or reduce the service.				
We will investigate the use of these services by particular groups to identify any adverse impact on any particular group.				

(2) Review and Monitoring

State how and when you will monitor the impact of this proposed saving

Once the proposals have been made public we intend to conduct further reviews on how it will affect diverse groups in its implementation within our annual service planning cycle.

