



## Equality Analysis Report

**Title of activity:** CSSF 3 Music Services

**Summary of activity:**

This is a discretionary service; funded through grant, parental contributions and Bedford Borough Council resources. The parental contribution is reviewed annually by members in their overall discussion of fees and charges.

The reduction in local tax payers contribution to the music service could be achieved through a range of means including: ensuring no school is subsidised twice for the service (i.e. through both national and local government), reducing administration costs by encouraging schools to work together to commission the service, reviewing staffing costs, reviewing the charging regime and seeking increased external funding for non-teaching elements of the service. All these matters are under consideration.

The reduction in local authority subsidy to the music service represents a change from the current universal provision to providing subsidy on a more targeted basis.

**Lead officer:**

Geoff Bent, Head of School Improvement

**Equality analysis team:**

Richard Hart, Head of Music Service

**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 activity proposed under CSSF3 will potentially have the most impact on the children, young people and their families who currently access the

services; for some this could mean the service is no longer available, for others, the service will be available but not to the same extent as existing provision.

**Protected equality groups:**

It is considered that the activity would have the most impact and therefore be relevant to those under the 'age' protected group and those from different socio-economic groups. 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.

**General Equality Duties:**

This activity proposed under CSSF 3 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.

This is because the activity proposes to reduce the subsidy to the music service representing a change from the current universal provision to providing subsidy on a more targeted basis.

**Evidence**

What relevant evidence is there about the activity?

For the activity proposed under CSSF 3, there is some information available on service users which may help us to analyse the impact on equality. 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.

We know that 57% of current service users are female and 43% male and 5% are in receipt of free school meals.

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 who will be affected by activity proposed under CSSF 3.

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 3, there is potentially an impact on service users 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 3 on service users.

### **Adverse affect on equality**

Age

By virtue of the fact that children and young people are the predominate service users for the Directorate – the activity proposed under CSSF 3 may 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.

Disability

There may be children and young people who access the services as proposed under CSSF 3 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.

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.

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 3 to determine this.

Race

Under CSSF 3, all children or young people who receive the services 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.

Religion or belief

Under CSSF 3, all children or young people who receive the services 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.

Sex (gender)

Under CSSF 3, all children or young people who receive the services 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.

Sexual orientation

Under CSSF 3, some young people who receive the services 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.

Marriage & civil partnership (in relation to eliminating discrimination)

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 identified groups (e.g. carers, different socio-economic, other groups experiencing barriers to access)

There may be children and young people who access the services as proposed under CSSF 3 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.

**Positive affect on equality**

**1. Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation**

The activity proposed represents a change from the current universal provision to providing subsidy on a more targeted basis and therefore could have a positive impact on pupils in lower socio-economic groups ensuring that those children and young people have access to music tuition in Bedford

Borough.
<p>2. Advance equality of opportunity</p> <p>See response under “eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation”</p>
<p>3. Foster good relations (including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding between different protected groups)</p> <p>See response under “eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation”</p>
4. Promote positive attitudes towards disabled people
5. Take account of disabled people’s disabilities

<p><b>Summary of analysis</b></p> <p>The evidence we have so far would suggest that the activity proposed under CSSF 3 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"> <li>• advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and</li> <li>• foster good relationships between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.</li> </ul> <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 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>In relation to the activity in CSSF 3 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><b>Engagement – Methodology</b></p> <p>The corporate on-line consultation received response on CSSF 3 from the</p>
---

following groups:

- Parents/Carers/Residents
- Teaching staff in schools
- Former students of the service

The consultation took place on-line between 26.9.11 and 21 November. Prior to the consultation there was a realisation that the cost base for the service was too high as a result pre consultation discussions began and continued through the period of consultation with the trade unions to get agreement to proceed with consultation on terms and conditions with their members

- Meetings with trade unions held 20.6.11, 22.7.11, 7.9.11 and 20.9.11.

In addition to the on-line consultation questionnaire meetings and discussions with service stakeholders took place as follows:

- Letter sent to stakeholders informing them of the proposal
- Meeting/Discussion with the chairman of Friends of Bedfordshire Youth Music (FBYM) 1.11.11
- Consultation at CVS 4.11.11 to discuss all policy proposals in detail, particularly the impact on the Voluntary and Community sector
- Discussion with Head teachers and Heads of Music as part of the ongoing day to day maintenance activities of the service
- Bedford Borough Learning Exchange 17.11.11
- Meeting with the Friends of Bedfordshire Youth Music (FBYM) 17.11.11

## **Age**

Through the consultation activity we have been able to identify the following age ranges:

Age range	No of respondents
Under18	1
18-24	0
25-34	3
35-44	14
45-54	26
55-64	3
65+	4
Unknown	3

## **Disability**

Respondents to the public consultation declared that 1 had a physical disability, 1 had a sensory disability and 1 had a mental health condition.

There is no data on disabilities of service users – this is not a factor in the decision whether a child or young person accesses the service or not.

**Gender reassignment**

I respondent identified that their current gender was not their gender at birth.

**Pregnancy and maternity**

There were no respondents that identified themselves as pregnant.

**Race**

The breakdown of respondents to the public consultation was:

Ethnic Group	Number
White British	48
White other	1
Asian Indian	1
Chinese	2
Unknown	2

From considering the data from service users we know that:

85% are white, 4% Asian, 0.3% Black, 0.04% Chinese and 6% Mixed Race – the remaining 4.66% is unknown.

**Religion or belief**

The breakdown of respondents was

Religion	Number
Buddhist	2
Christian	25
Hindu	1
Jewish	1
None	14
Other	3
Unknown	4

There is no data on the religion or belief of the service users – however, this is not a factor in the decision whether a child or young person accesses the service or not.

**Sex (gender)** The breakdown of respondents was

Male 20  
 Female 33  
 Unknown 4

There are 2191 service users (young people 5-19 year old)  
 Male 903  
 Female 1288

**Sexual orientation**

The breakdown of respondents was

Orientation	Number
Bisexual	1
Gay male	1
Heterosexual	43
Unknown	5

**Marriage & civil partnership (in relation to eliminating discrimination)**

Not specified

Other identified groups (e.g. carers, different socio-economic, other groups experiencing barriers to access)

No specified group

**Engagement findings****Age**

None of the identified respondents were children or young people. However, we know from the nature of the service that the impact of removing or changing the service will be on those aged between 5 and 19. There is no

The impact on Children aged 5 -19 could be significant if the cost of opportunities rises and/or fewer opportunities to participate in musical opportunities are available.

A common theme in the in the response to the consultation focused upon the importance of music to children and young people's overall educational attainment and personal development.

**Disability**

The removal of this service will not impact disabled children or young people more than those peers who are not disabled.

**Gender reassignment**

As the service users are children and young people aged 5 – 19, it is not appropriate to ask for this response and we know from the responses that only one person had identified themselves as having undertaken gender reassignment.

**Pregnancy and maternity**

As the service users are children and young people aged 5 – 19, it is not appropriate to ask for this response and we know from the responses. No respondents identified themselves as pregnant

**Race**

<p>There were no specific issues raised regarding race in the process other than there could be a reduction in activities and opportunities available</p>
<p><b>Religion or belief</b></p> <p>We do not hold information on young people's religion and from the respondents there are no groups that are disadvantaged</p>
<p><b>Sex (gender)</b></p> <p>We know that more females than males will be potentially impacted by the proposals, however access to music is open to all and therefore this is not relevant</p>
<p><b>Sexual orientation</b></p> <p>As the service users are children and young people aged 5 – 19, it is not appropriate to ask for this response and we know from the responses. The vast majority of respondents were heterosexual. The engagement raised no specific issues.</p>
<p><b>Marriage &amp; civil partnership (in relation to eliminating discrimination)</b></p> <p>As the service users are children and young people aged 5 – 19, it is not appropriate to ask for this response and we know from the responses. The engagement raised no specific issues. This is not a criteria for access to the music service</p>
<p><b>Other identified groups (e.g. carers, different socio-economic, other groups experiencing barriers to access)</b></p> <p>A common theme in all responses to the consultation raised concern that rising charges for music lessons would be a barrier to accessing the activities and opportunities provided by the service. However the proposal is designed to protect the more disadvantaged socio-economic as the remaining funding will continue to be used to enable this group to access music and subsidise fees and charges.</p> <p>From the data we have on service users, 5% of current service users are in receipt of free school meals.</p>

<p><b>Analysis of engagement</b></p> <p><b>What further adverse impact on each protected equality group was identified?</b></p> <p>The proposal will not impact differentially on those from protected groups other than to positively impact on those from a disadvantaged socio-economic group.</p>
---

**If the activity is likely to have a negative impact, what are the reasons?**

Those from less disadvantaged socio-economic groups will not receive the subsidy for activities that have previously been given. They will also face the possibility of raised fees and charges.

**What does your activity currently do to address the issues highlighted by engagement?**

We currently provide subsidies to a wider service user group.

**What practical changes will help reduce any adverse impact on the relevant protected equality groups?**

- We are investigating the introduction of a commissioning model which will make schools the purchasers of the service rather than parents. This has the potential to reduce costs and add another provider (schools) of subsidy perhaps through the pupil premium
- We are continuing to discuss the staff terms and conditions to reduce the cost base of lessons. This will reduce the need to raise fees
- Finally the proposal is to introduce the reduction in funding over 2 years in order to lessen the impact

**What are the resource / budget implications of these actions?**

We will make the level of savings identified but it may not need an increase in income generated by higher fees and charges.

**What will be done to improve access to, and take-up of, services and understanding your activity by relevant protected equality groups?**

We will ensure we collect data on relevant protected equality groups and monitor the impact of the proposals on each group.

**What impact will the activity have on helping different groups of people to get on well together and foster good relations?**

The continued provision of a music service will ensure young people regardless of their background can continue to discover the pleasure that learning a music instrument can bring as well as working together in music ensembles.

**What can you do to advance equality and eliminate discrimination when you procure goods and services?**

Ensure procurement regulations are followed and specific attention is paid to prioritising services for disadvantaged and protected groups in future tendering processes

**How will the activity meet the different needs of relevant protected**

**equality groups?**

We will engage with service users and their parents in the development and commissioning of any model

**What risk to equality / adverse impact would there be if your activity was not implemented?**

We would have to consider the viability of offering a universal music service

## Analysis Findings

**Analysis findings**

1. No major change required.

Bedford Borough will continue to work with the music service staff, schools, children and parents to deliver a service that meets the needs of all users. By

- Investigating the introduction of a commissioning model which will make schools the purchasers of the service rather than parents. This has the potential to reduce costs and add another provider ( schools) of subsidy perhaps through the pupil premium
- Continuing to discuss the staff terms and conditions to reduce the cost base of lessons. This will reduce the need to raise fees
- implementing the reduction in funding over 2 years

We are working to mitigate the impact of the reduction in funding.

However, the reduction in local authority subsidy to the music service represents a change from the current universal provision to providing subsidy on a more targeted basis.

**Monitoring and review**

The work to review and re-focus delivery model of the Music Service will be overseen by the Chief Education Officer and Heads of School Improvement. Schools/Academies and other key stakeholders will be also be involved in this process as required. The Head of service will be responsible for collecting data on all protected groups and monitoring the impact on each of the proposal.

## Action plan

Issues	Actions	Target date	Lead	Resources required
Adverse impact	To develop a re-focused model(s) The Music Service that prioritises support for disadvantaged & protected groups	By September 2012	Heads of School Improvement and Music Service	None above existing
Opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations	Ensure focus on disadvantaged and protected groups through the development of revised delivery models	Ongoing but concluded by Dec 2012	Heads of School Improvement and Music Service	None above existing
Engagement and involvement	Involve schools/academies and users in the planning process	Ongoing but concluded by Dec 2012	Heads of School Improvement and Music Service	None above existing
Dissemination of analysis	Keep all partners & stakeholders service users and parents up to date through strategic groups	Ongoing but concluded by Dec 2012	Heads of School Improvement and Music Service	None above existing
Equality information, data and evidence	Keep accurate records of ongoing engagement	Ongoing but concluded by Dec 2012	Heads of School Improvement and Music Service	None above existing



**Sign off**

**Name of Executive or Assistant Director: Brian Glover**

**Date: 24 November 2011**

**Review date: September 2012**