



Equality Analysis Report

Title of activity:

CSSF 10 Review of Early Years Sustainability

Summary of activity:

The Early Intervention Grant (EIG) is a substantial funding stream for early intervention and preventative services for Children, Young People & Families. The grant is not ring-fenced, bringing a significant extension of local flexibility and greater freedom at local level, to respond to local needs and drive reform to target disadvantage and achieve better results.

The early year's sustainability budget has predominantly been used to provide targeted support to local private, voluntary and independent childcare settings. The purpose of the grant is to help financially sustain childcare provision where there are identified difficulties. Some of the funding has been used to enhance capital expenditure to enhance provision for the private, voluntary and independent childcare sector. This process is informed by a childcare sufficiency plan which highlights where the need for childcare is across the Borough, what the demands are and any gaps in provision.

In addition, the EIG has been used to fund the Home-Start service that provides early intervention for families with children aged 0-19 through volunteers.

Lead officer:

Anne Cheveralls, Head of Early Engagement & Development

Equality analysis team:

Sharon Simpson, Head of Commissioning & Resource Allocation
James Dove – Children Centre Development Manager

Relevance

An equality analysis of this activity is required.

This activity has no relevance to Bedford Borough Council's duty to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; advance equality of opportunity; and foster good relations. An equality analysis is not needed.

Explanation why equality analysis is not needed:

Level 1 Equality Analysis

Scope of equality analysis

Impacted by activity:

The proposal is that the funding to ensure sustainability of the early years providers in Bedford Borough is reduced over a 3 year period (£285,000 in total) whilst developing alternate models for future service delivery. This could include the development of a business health check model will advise businesses on financial planning, marketing, staff recruitment, identifying alternative sources of funding and sustainability.

In addition, the contract to support early intervention services provided through Home-Start will cease

In terms of sustainability, the activity proposed under CSSF 10 will potentially have the most impact on providers in the early years and childcare sector, rather than service users. However, there could be an impact on those who rely on the early years and childcare provision, if providers are unable to remain viable.

With regard to family support, the activity proposed under CSSF 10 will have the most impact on the children and their families who access the services through the contract with Home-Start

This analysis represents equality analysis for Policy Options proposed to take affect from April 2012. Please note that whilst some initial analysis has been undertaken for those options that take affect in later years, further work will be required to assess the impact taking into account circumstances at that time.

Protected equality groups:

It is considered that the activity would have the most impact and therefore by relevant to those under the 'age' protected group. Others from different protected equality groups may also be impacted – but until further work is done on engagement, consulting and analysis – this will not be known.

As the activity proposed is in relation to services provided to children and young people – it considered that those protected equality groups for gender reassignment, sexual orientation or marriage and civil partnership would not be applicable to service users. Though this could be explored further through consultation.

General Equality Duties:

This activity proposed under CSSF 10 relates to the Bedford Borough Council's equality duties to:

- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and
- foster good relationships between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Evidence

What relevant evidence is there about the activity?

For the activity proposed under CSSF 10, there is some information available on providers of early years services and service users which may help us in analyse the impact on equality. For example:

- Early Years settings;

Type of Setting	Total number of providers	Total number of places
Day Nurseries	30	1644
Pre-Schools/Play groups	41	1112
Childminders	149	682

- Home start – 114 families and 227 Children were supported in 2010/11

However, there is more evidence needed from the service users and stakeholders through engagement and analysis work to ensure that the impact of each activity proposed is considered in more detail in respect of the protected equality groups.

What does this evidence tell you about the different protected groups?

At this stage, the evidence we have does not tell us a great deal about the different protected equality groups in relation to service users, stakeholders or staff who will be affected by activity proposed under CSSF 10.

We know that the proposed activities could potentially have an impact on one or more different protected equality groups and Bedford Borough Council's equality duties to:

- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and
- Foster good relationships between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not

What further research or data do you need to fill any gaps in your understanding of the potential or known effects of the activity?

As a result of the activities proposed under CSSF 10, there is potentially an impact on service users and other stakeholders – who may be from one or more of the different protected equality groups. Through engagement and the collation of more information and evidence, the extent of any impact can be considered further.

Have you thought about commissioning new data or research?

Through the engagement and consultation which is being undertaken, specific information and evidence will be collated to allow us to better understand the impact of the proposed activity under CSSF 10 for service users and other stakeholders.

Adverse affect on equality

Age

By virtue of the fact that children and families are the predominate service users for the Directorate – the activity proposed under CSSF 10 will have an impact on those in the protected equality group with the characteristic of age. However, from the evidence we have so far, the extent of this impact is not known; and this would be further explored through the consultation work.

Although, other stakeholders could be from a particular age group it is envisaged that the activity proposed would not have an impact a particular age group for these.

Disability

There may be children and young people who access the services as proposed under CSSF 10 who would be included in this protected equality group; however, from the evidence we have so far – the impact of the proposals on this protected group is not known, and therefore more work is needed to understand this.

Although stakeholders may be from this protected equality group, it is envisaged that the activity proposed would not impact on any particular group in the community.

Gender reassignment

For the children and young people who access the services, is it not appropriate to consider the impact of this protected equality group. However, other stakeholders and staff may be included under this protected equality group as a result of the activity proposed under CSSF 10.

Pregnancy and maternity

There may be some young people who are protected by this equality group, but from the evidence we have so far the extent of any impact is not known. Therefore there needs to be consideration of the activity proposed under CSSF 10 to determine this.

Race

<p>Under CSSF 10, all children or young people who receive the services and other stakeholders could be affected by the proposed activity and could be considered in this protected equality group. It is not known at this stage what the impact would be of the proposed activity and whether this would have a particular impact on one or more of the groups with this characteristic.</p>
<p>Religion or belief</p> <p>Under CSSF 10, all children or young people who receive the services and other stakeholders could be affected by the proposed activity and could be considered in this protected equality group. It is not known at this stage what the impact would be of the proposed activity and whether this would have a particular impact on one or more of the groups with this characteristic.</p>
<p>Sex (gender)</p> <p>Under CSSF 10, all children or young people who receive the services and other stakeholders could be affected by the proposed activity and could be considered in this protected equality group. It is not known at this stage what the impact would be of the proposed activity and whether this would have a particular impact on one or more of the groups with this characteristic.</p>
<p>Sexual orientation</p> <p>For the children and young people who access the services, is it not applicable or viable to consider the impact of this protected equality group.</p>
<p>Marriage & civil partnership (in relation to eliminating discrimination)</p> <p>For the children and young people who access the services, is it not appropriate to consider the impact of this protected equality group; but we could consider the impact on families who access the services. Other stakeholders may be included under this protected equality group as a result of the activity proposed under CSSF 10; therefore more work is needed to determine the extent of any impact.</p>
<p>Other identified groups (e.g. carers, different socio-economic, other groups experiencing barriers to access)</p> <p>There may be children and young people who access the services as proposed under CSSF 10 who would be included in this protected equality group; however, from the evidence we have so far – the impact of the proposals on this protected group is not known, and therefore more work is needed to understand this.</p>

<p>Positive affect on equality</p>

<p>1. Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation It is not anticipated this proposal will have a positive effect on equality</p>
<p>2. Advance equality of opportunity As above</p>
<p>3. Foster good relations (including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding between different protected groups) As above</p>
<p>4. Promote positive attitudes towards disabled people As above</p>
<p>5. Take account of disabled people's disabilities As above</p>

<p>Summary of analysis</p> <p>The evidence we have so far would suggest that the activity proposed under CSSF 10 will have an impact on the different protected equality groups and Bedford Borough Council's equality duties to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and • Foster good relationships between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. <p>What is not known is the extent of any impact as a result of the activity, adverse and positive, and specifically on which protected equality groups. Work needs to be done on each of the service areas under the activity proposed in order to address this in more detail. Therefore, the most appropriate course of action would be to carry onto a level 2 analysis.</p> <p>For most of the activity in CSSF 10 there are gaps in the relevant equality information preventing an evidence led analysis of the effects on equality. By completing the level 2 analysis, and through the proportionate engagement with service users, staff and other stakeholders, we can determine the impact of each, whether this is positive or adverse and any mitigating actions.</p>

Level 2 Equality Analysis

<p>Engagement A consultation has taken place and included individuals from the following groups;</p>

- Parents of children aged under 5
- Women
- Those who are pregnant and on maternity leave
- Parents and/or carers who have a disability
- Young pregnant women & young parents
- Parents and/or carers from BME communities
- Parents and/or carers who practice a religion or have a belief

The consultation took place with the following dates;

Group	Date
Play Together – Wilstead	1 st Nov
Busy Bluebells – Bromham	4 th Nov
Stay & Play – Cauldwell	7 th Nov
Explore Together – Pinecones (Harpur)	8 th Nov
Baby Group – Bedford Central	8 th Nov
Play Together – Gt Barford	10 th Nov
Activity Tots – Sharnbrook	10 th Nov
Stay & Play – Pear Tree (Kempston)	14 th Nov
Daisy Hill (individual response)	15 th Nov

In addition, the consultation questionnaire was made available to partners & stakeholders from 26th September onwards. Paper copies were distributed at the Early Years Reference group on 3rd November. All partners & stakeholders were encouraged to make the questionnaire available to parents & carers.

An offer was made to all partners & stakeholders to meet with any groups to discuss the issues in more depth

The deadline for feedback was 21st November. Where requested, stakeholders were informed that proposals will go forward to the Executive on 7th December for further consideration.

Age

Given that Children aged 0-5 were potentially adversely affected by the activity proposed in CSSF 10, all the consultations carried out by the Early Engagement & Development team focused on capturing the views of parents who have children under the age of 5. There were 65 parents who completed the response

Disability

The opportunity for parents who have children with a disability to be part of the consultation was made available through the work that targeted parents with children aged 0-5. In addition, questionnaires were delivered to the Child Development Centre. There were 3 parents out of the 65 respondents who reported having a disability.

<p>Gender reassignment</p> <p>No specific consultation was aimed at this protected group but where it was noted as issue during the consultation; this was explored in more depth and will be considered in the findings.</p>
<p>Pregnancy and maternity</p> <p>The opportunity for women who are pregnant or on maternity leave to be part of the consultation was made available through the work that targeted parents with children aged 0-5. In addition, questionnaires were also delivered to Charis House which provides supported accommodation for young parents. There was 1 respondent who was pregnant and 8 individuals who had very young children</p>
<p>Race</p> <p>The opportunity for those from BME communities to be part of the consultation was made available through the work that targeted parents with children aged 0-5. There were 10 parents out of the 65 respondents from BME communities</p>
<p>Religion or belief</p> <p>The opportunity for those with a religion or belief to be part of the consultation was made available through the work that targeted parents with children aged 0-5. There were 39 parents out of the 65 who responded who recorded having a belief or religion</p>
<p>Sex (gender)</p> <p>Given that Women were potentially adversely affected by the activity proposed in CSSF 10, the consultations carried out by the Children Centre team focused on capturing the views of women. There were 57 women and 8 men who responded to the consultation</p>
<p>Sexual orientation</p> <p>No specific consultation was aimed at this protected group but where it was noted as issue during the consultation; this was explored in more depth and will be considered in the findings.</p>
<p>Marriage & civil partnership (in relation to eliminating discrimination)</p> <p>No specific consultation was aimed at this protected group but where it was noted as issue during the consultation; this was explored in more depth and will be considered in the findings.</p>
<p>Other identified groups (e.g. carers, different socio-economic, other groups experiencing barriers to access)</p> <p>In planning the consultation, consideration was given to including those who</p>

may be experiencing socio-economic disadvantage in areas of the higher deprivation and attendance at groups in those areas was targeted. Of the groups consulted, 7 were held in wards with areas that fall into the 30% most disadvantaged wards in England

Engagement findings

Age

The reduction in resources would mean the quality of Childcare and Family Support for children aged 0 – 19 would be affected. With regard to Childcare, this may impact on the sustainability of some Early Years settings and lead to insufficient childcare provision in parts of the Borough. At present, we have the following provision of services;

Type of Setting	Total number of providers	Total number of places
Day Nurseries	30	1644
Pre-Schools/Play groups	41	1112
Childminders	149	682

Disability

There were no specific issues relating to disability other than that a reduction in the resources to support early years & family support is likely to impact on the availability and quality of services available for all Children

Gender reassignment

There were no issues that arose for this particular protected group

Pregnancy and maternity

There were no specific issues relating to pregnancy & maternity other than that a reduction in the resources to support early years & family support is likely to impact on the availability and quality of services available for all Children

Race

There were no specific issues relating to race other than that a reduction in the resources to support early years & family support is likely to impact on the availability and quality of services available for all Children

Religion or belief

There were no specific issues relating to religion or belief other than that a reduction in the resources to support early years & family support is likely to impact on the availability and quality of services available for all Children

Sex (gender)

There were no specific issues relating to gender other than that a reduction in the resources to support early years & family support is likely to impact on the availability and quality of services available for all Children

Sexual orientation

There were no issues that arose for this particular protected group

Marriage & civil partnership (in relation to eliminating discrimination) There were no issues that arose for this particular protected group
Other identified groups (e.g. carers, different socio-economic, other groups experiencing barriers to access) It was highlighted that the reduction in Home-Start services will have a significant impact on many disadvantaged families who may no longer be able to access the service.

Analysis of engagement
<p>What further adverse impact on each protected equality group was identified?</p> <p>Given the universal nature of the service, the reduction in services could impact on a number of protected groups where providers are unable to access sustainability funding. This will particularly be an issue for children who use early years settings. In addition, the removal of funding for Home-Start would specifically impact on disadvantaged families.</p>
<p>If the activity is likely to have a negative impact, what are the reasons?</p> <p>A reduction in the resources available for family support & sustainability will affect on the quality of early intervention & early years provision in the Borough</p>
<p>What does your activity currently do to address the issues highlighted by engagement?</p> <p>The early year's sustainability budget has predominantly been used to provide targeted support local private, voluntary and independent childcare settings. The purpose of the grant is to help financially sustain childcare provision where there are identified difficulties. Some of the funding has been used to enhance capital expenditure to enhance provision for the private, voluntary and independent childcare sector. This process is informed by a childcare sufficiency plan which highlights where the need for childcare is across the Borough, what the demands are and any gaps in provision.</p> <p>In addition, the EIG has been used to fund the Home-Start service that provides early intervention for families with children aged 0-19 through volunteers.</p>
<p>What practical changes will help reduce any adverse impact on the relevant protected equality groups?</p> <p>To work with all parents, partners & stakeholders on developing a revised models for early years sustainability over the funding period. In terms of Home-Start, to continue providing a level of resources (albeit reduced by 20%) for the service until 13./14 so opportunities to explore the future delivery models for the service can be made</p>

<p>What are the resource / budget implications of these actions?</p> <p>None other than staff time and those already outlined in the budget options process</p>
<p>What will be done to improve access to, and take-up of, services and understanding your activity by relevant protected equality groups?</p> <p>To work with all parents, partners & stakeholders on developing a revised models for early years sustainability and the delivery of Home-Start type services over the funding period</p>
<p>What impact will the activity have on helping different groups of people to get on well together and foster good relations?</p> <p>It will have limited or no impact</p>
<p>What can you do to advance equality and eliminate discrimination when you procure goods and services?</p> <p>Ensure procurement regulations are followed and where appropriate, specific attention is paid to prioritising services for disadvantaged and protected groups in future tendering processes</p>
<p>How will the activity meet the different needs of relevant protected equality groups?</p> <p>To work with all parents, partners & stakeholders on developing a revised models for early years sustainability and the delivery of Home-Start services over the funding period</p>
<p>What risk to equality / adverse impact would there be if your activity was not implemented?</p> <p>There is a risk that some early years settings will no longer be viable and any closures would affect our ability to meet statutory requirements. In addition, the removal of a service that provided Home-Start type support would leave a significant gap in resources available to support disadvantaged families in future years</p>

Analysis Findings

Analysis findings

Adjustments required.

We are changing the original proposal from a saving of £58,000 for Home-Start in 2012/13 to a saving of £12,000 in 2012 and then £46,000 in 2013/14. The reason for this is that following consultation it is believed this will give time to the service and providers to enable a service delivery model to be created to remove help mitigate the impact of the full budget savings in 2012/13.

In addition Bedford Borough will continue to work with members of the Early Years sector to develop a service that meets the needs of all children by developing a revised model for supporting Childcare Sustainability.

Monitoring and review

The work to develop a revised model for Childcare Sustainability and Family Support will be overseen by the Early Engagement & Development service and developed in partnership with the Early Years reference group

Action plan

Issues	Actions	Target date	Lead	Resources required
Adverse impact (Early Years)	To develop a revised model for supporting Childcare Sustainability	Ongoing	Head of Service 5	None above existing
Adverse impact (Early Intervention)	To develop a revised model for the provision of family support services currently provided by Home-Start for a lower cost.	August 2012	Head of Service 5	None above existing
Opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations	N/A			
Engagement and involvement	Listen & Involve parents, partners & stakeholders in the development of services	Ongoing	Head of Service 5	None above existing
Dissemination of analysis	Keep all partners & stakeholders up to date through strategic groups	Ongoing	Head of Service 5	None above existing
Equality information, data and evidence	Keep accurate records of ongoing engagement	Ongoing	Head of Service 5	None above existing



Sign off

Name of Executive or Assistant Director: Brian Glover

Date: 24 November 2011

Review date: December 2012