

Equality Analysis Report

Title of activity / Budget Proposal title and number Summer Play and Games Schemes Stop delivery of Summer Play Schemes - £64,000 / 6.2 (15)	Committee meeting (decision maker) and date Service Modernisation Revenue Budget Planning 2016/17 Considered by the Executive on 20 th January 2016
Service area Environment & Sustainable Communities – Leisure Management & Sports Development	Lead officer Craig Austin – Assistant Director (ESC)
Approved by Craig Austin <i>CSAustin</i>	Date of approval 06/01/16
Description of activity: As part of the 2016/17 budget proposals, this proposal is to stop the Summer Play and Games Schemes. The equality analysis provides a clear summary of the proposal that describes; the aim and rationale behind proposing the cut of the existing 16 day summer schemes for 5-13year olds held across 18 different geographical locations in Bedford Borough; how the cut is expected to take place and the intended outcomes as a result of stopping this service. Information will be supplied on how the Summer Play and Games Schemes are currently operating and the expected income to be saved by removing this provision from the Sports Development work programme. Background: <i>The schemes have been operating for over 35 years and welcome around 6000 attendances from over 1000 different young people annually. Participants pay £2 per session and sessions last between 1 ½ to 2 hours. Casual summer staff are employed to work across sites for 5 hours per day, Monday to Friday.</i> <i>The schemes alongside the Summer Sports Courses are the only early intervention programmes encouraging healthier lifestyles to be</i>	

run by the Sports Development Team, with all other programmes and courses targeting 14year olds+.

Play Scheme offer children & young people opportunities to socialise, be active, learn new skills, development existing skills and explore new environments within the local area. They also offer employees an opportunity to gain child work experience and invaluable training suited to the role, including first aid, safeguarding and disability awareness qualifications.

The Play Schemes aim to reduce inequalities by;

- *Offering a number of schemes in areas of deprivation.*
- *Providing rest bite for parents and carers*
- *Supplying low cost holiday activities for low income families*
- *Enabling children with and without disabilities to attend, play and support each other in one place.*
- *Offering employment in adherence to the Council's Equal Opportunities Policies.*
- *Reducing impact of school transitioning using school facilities and operating across school ages.*

Relevance Test

1. The outcomes of the activity directly and significantly impact on people, e.g. service users, employees, voluntary and community sector groups.	Yes	✓	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The activity could / does affect one or more protected equality groups.	Yes	✓	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The activity could / does affect protected equality groups differently.	Yes	✓	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. One or more protected equality groups could be disadvantaged, adversely affected or are at risk of discrimination as a result of the activity.	Yes	✓	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The activity relates to an area where there are known inequalities.	Yes	✓	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The activity sets out proposals for significant changes to services, policies etc. and / or significantly affects how services are delivered.	Yes	✓	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The activity relates to one or more of the three aims of the Council's equality duty.	Yes	✓	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The activity relates to the Council's Corporate Plan objectives, is a significant activity and / or presents a high risk to the Council's public reputation.	Yes	✓	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. An equality analysis of this activity is required.	Yes	✓	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
This activity has no relevance to Bedford Borough Council's duty to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; to advance equality of opportunity; and to foster good relations. An equality analysis is not needed.				<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanation why equality analysis is not needed				

Scope of equality analysis

Who is / will be impacted by the activity's aims and outcomes?	<p>Main Groups Affected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Service UsersParents/Carers/GuardiansEmployees <p>Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Community GroupsLocal Facilities/Schools/CentresLocal Councillors/Parish CouncillorsPolice & Community Safety TeamPublic HealthOfstedChildren's ServicesTraining Providers <p>Other beneficiaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Future EmployersLocal schools – reducing barriers to school transfers with some schemes running at local schools e.g. preparing 5 year olds to go to their local schools and to introduce year 4's to bigger schools. In 2015 schemes ran at the following schools;• Balliol Lower School• Brickhill Lower School• Marston Vale Middle School• Kings Oak Primary School.
---	---

<p>Which particular protected equality groups are likely / will be affected?</p>	<p>Protected Characteristics'</p> <p>Age: The schemes are open to children that are 5 by the September of the year they are attending and admittance is available for children up to the age of 13year olds. In 2015 650 5-8year olds and 587 9-13 year olds attended the Play and Games Schemes.</p> <p>Disability: Sports Development Play Schemes are available to children and young people with disabilities (within 1:8 staff to child ratio). The team work with Children's Services and disability groups to enable children and young people with disabilities to access the Summer Play and Games Schemes.</p> <p>In the past 6 years the Play Schemes have admitted children and young people with a range of disabilities including physical, mental, sensory, behavioural ASD and visual and hearing disabilities. <i>SEE EVIDENCE IN 'Evidence, data, information and consultation' section</i></p> <p>Continued Overleaf</p>
---	--

Race:

In 2015 The Summer Play Schemes asked parents/carers to complete an optional 'About You' equality form when registering their children at their first session. Statistics taken from these forms have been compared to the Boroughs average 2011 Census statistics in the subsequent table. These figures illustrate that the Play schemes in 2015 had a higher than average percentage of Black, Mixed and Other ethnic race participants and a lower than average population of Asian and White participants. See 'Evidence, data, information and consultation' section for details on previous year Play schemes.

	ASIAN	BLACK	MIXED	OTHER Ethnic Group	WHITE
2015 Play Scheme Average	8%	8%	10%	6%	57%
Bedford Borough Average (2011 Census)	11.40%	3.90%	3.40%	0.70%	80.50%
England Average (2011 Census)	7.7%	3.4%	2.2%	1%	85.5%

Source: ONS, 2011 Census
Table DC2101EW

Religion or belief:

2015 statistics collected from 'About You' forms provided details on the number of religion and belief groups that attended in this year. The following table tells us that the Play Schemes in 2015 admitted a higher than the Bedford Borough average number of Hindu, Muslim, Other Religion, No Religion and those families that do not wish to state their religion. On the other hand, the schemes had a lower than average percentage of Christian, Buddhist, Jewish and Sikh families. For historical Play Scheme data about religions and beliefs since the 'About You' forms were created and introduced in 2012 see evidence section.

	Christian	Buddhist	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Other Religion	No Religion	Religion Not Stated
2015 Play Scheme Average	44.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	6.00%	1.00%	4.00%	24.00%	19.00%
Bedford Borough Average (2011 Census)	59.30%	0.30%	1.50%	0.10%	5.50%	2.10%	1.00%	23.60%	6.60%
England Average (2011 Census)	59.40%	0.40%	1.50%	0.50%	5.00%	0.80%	0.40%	24.70%	7.20%

Source: ONS, 2011 Census Table DC2101EW

Other disadvantaged Groups**Socio-economic:**

Summer Play & Games Schemes operate in areas of high deprivation; In 2015 information was requested about the employment status of parents/carers to provide a broad overview of the socio-economic status of the families accessing the summer play scheme service SEE EVIDENCE IN '**Evidence, data, information and consultation**'.

The index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) combines 37 social, economic and environmental indicators to provide an overall deprivation score for each Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA)2 of the areas in which Play Schemes operate, namely; Harpur & Kingsbrook are among the most deprived 10% of LSOA's in England and 3 further wards; Goldington, Queens Park and Putnoe fall within the 10-20% of the most deprived LSOA's in England as identified in the 'Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015'.

Carers/young carers:

Through local practitioners and volunteer groups the Summer Play Schemes are promoted as an opportunity for rest bite for parents/guardians and young carers. The number of children recorded as either in care or as young carers over the past 4 years/since the introduction of the questions 'Is this child looked after (in care)' and 'Do you consider your child to be a young carer' are listed below. Information is taken from 'About you' equality forms N.B. that these forms are optional, therefore the percentages displayed refer to the percent of the total number of equality forms completed, not the total number of play scheme participants.

Year	Number of young Carers	% of Young Carers	Number of 'Looked After' Children (in care)	% of 'Looked After' Children (in care)
2012	5	1%	12	2%
2013	13	2%	23	3%
2014	0	0%	6	2%
2015	8	1%	8	1%

Evidence, data, information and consultation

What evidence have you used to analyse the effects on equality?

This equality analysis will now review particular statistics further to distinguish the possible impact on protected equality groups from the proposed cut of the Summer Play and Games Schemes based on data from the last 6 years.

Age:

The average number of 5-8 year olds attending the Play Schemes between 2010 and 2015 is 692 children. The average number of 9-13 year olds attending the Play Schemes over this same period is 451.

Play Scheme Year	Number of 5-8 Year Olds	Number of 9-13year olds
2010	906	587
2011	871	551
2012	590	381
2013	609	398
2014	531	373
2015	650	417

Disability:

The 'number of children with a disability' figures as illustrated in the following table are an accurate representation of information taken from participants initial consent forms between 2010-2015. The figures placed in the type of disabilities columns are considered entries based on information provided on child consent forms. N.B. in some cases a child will have more than one known disability.

Play Scheme Year	Learning	Behavioural	Physical	Visual & Hearing	Mental	ASD	Other	Number of children with a disability	Total Number of Children Registered	% of total number of children registered
2010	6	7	7	2	1	10	5	38	1493	2.50%
2011	3	32	12	5	0	10	2	64	1422	4.50%
2012	10	14	5	2	0	13	10	54	971	5.60%
2013	4	10	6	8	6	8	2	44	1001	4.40%
2014	4	3	6	8	6	8	4	39	904	4.30%
2015	18	13	9	10	0	1	1	52	1067	4.90%

The average percentage of children attending the play schemes over the past 6 years who have a known or disclosed disability is 4.37%. The most common form of disability recorded is Behaviour disabilities and the least common are Mental disabilities.

Race:

Between 2012 and 2015, the race/ethnicity most highly represented on the summer play and games schemes is White British with on average 65.6% of those attending. This is 14.9% less than the Bedford Borough average. The least represented race on the Summer Play and Games Schemes from 2012-2015 is 'OTHER Ethnic Group' with on average 3.3%, 2.6% higher than the Bedford average recorded in the 2011 Census.

	ASIAN/	BLACK	MIXED	OTHER Ethnic Group	WHITE	Prefer not to say/nothing stated
2012 Play Scheme Average	8.30%	3.80%	9.00%	1.60%	73.20%	4.10%
2013 Play Scheme Average	12.40%	7%	8.50%	2.60%	65.30%	4.20%
2014 Play Scheme Average	11.20%	2.60%	6%	3%	67%	10.20%
2015 Play Scheme Average	8%	8%	10%	6%	57%	11.00%

Bedford Borough Average (2011 Census)	11.40%	3.90%	3.40%	0.70%	80.50%
England Average (2011 Census)	7.70%	3.40%	2.20%	1%	85.50%

Religion or belief:

The following table illustrates the percentage of each classified religion/faith groups that attended the Summer Play and Games Schemes between 2012-2015. Often (on average 11.7%) this question on the About You Equality Forms given to parents/carers in their child consent forms was left blank. Based on the details provided on average the majority of Play scheme attendees were Christian (50.2%) which is below the Bedford Borough Average of 59.30%. The least represented religions were identified as Buddhist and Jewish, both of which were on average 0.05% of all Play scheme attendees, both lower than the Borough average.

	Christian	Buddhist	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Other Religion	No Religion	Religion Not Stated
2012 Play Scheme Average	58.0%	0.1%	1.0%	0.2%	6.0%	2.0%	3.0%	30.0%	0.0%
2013 Play Scheme Average	55.8%	0.1%	2.8%	0.0%	6.0%	1.3%	5.1%	18.6%	10.1%
2014 Play Scheme Average	43.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	6.0%	1.0%	3.0%	27.0%	18.0%
2015 Play Scheme Average	44.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	6.0%	1.0%	4.0%	24.0%	19.0%
Bedford Borough Average (2011 Census)	59.30%	0.30%	1.50%	0.10%	5.50%	2.10%	1.00%	23.60%	6.60%
England Average (2011 Census)	59.40%	0.40%	1.50%	0.50%	5.00%	0.80%	0.40%	24.70%	7.20%

Other disadvantaged Groups:

The following table compares the average percentage of job seekers claimants in August 2015 which is the month the Play schemes were in operation, to the percentage of unemployed family service users. Of all 18 schemes, only Wootton had less unemployed families attending the Play Scheme than the average job seekers in the area.

	Full Time Employed	In Education or training	Part Time Employed	Unemployed	None Ticked	Other	Average Job Seekers Claimants in Aug 2015 per ward	Average Number of Unemployed families attending Play schemes
Biddenham	9	0	19	1	3	0	0.70%	3.1%
Brickhill	20	2	47	8	3	0	1.60%	10.0%
Clapham	21	1	27	4	4	6	1.50%	6.3%
Goldington	32	6	33	30	4	0	3.00%	28.6%
Great Barford	1	0	8	6	0	0	1.4%	40.0%
Harpur	6	0	9	13	0	0	3.60%	46.4%
Kempston	27	2	42	16	0	2	2.2% (Kempston West)	18.0%
Kingsbrook	27	0	30	24	4	0	3%	28.2%
Oakley	8	2	17	2	1	3	0.60%	6.1%
Putnoe	29	3	67	30	5	0	1.30%	22.4%
Queens Park	18	6	15	23	6	1	3.30%	33.3%
Riseley	21	2	32	9	5	2	0.50%	12.7%
Roxton	10	2	11	4	5	0	1.4% (Great Barford)	12.5%
Shortstown	27	3	23	8	1	2	2% (Eastcotts)	12.5%
Stewartby	14	0	16	10	4	0	1.00%	22.7%
Wixams	23	1	30	8	7	2	0.80%	11.3%
Wootton	12	0	6	0	2	0	1.40%	0.0%
Wymington	1	0	8	1	2	0	0.90%	8.3%
Bedford Borough Average Unemployment Rate (Job Seekers Claimants) in August 2015			2.00%		LSOA's identified as within 20% of the most deprived in England (Sept 2015)			
Rural Bedford Average Unemployment Rate (Job Seekers Claimants) in August 2015			1.00%					

Based on previous financial cuts, when the schemes were reduced by 4 days and increased from £1 to £2 per child, attendances reduced by 41%. This table illustrates the changes in attendance between 2008 and 2015.

Total Number of Attendances at Play scheme Sites. A Year-by-Year Comparison - taking into account the change in service post 2011/12 consultation changes

	Based on a 20 Day Scheme (£1 per session)				Based on a 16 Day Scheme (£2 per session)			
Site	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Biddenham	125	129	120	87	90	72	63	103
Brickhill	478	325	352	340	387	398	300	317
Clapham	315	322	433	428	238	246	283	223
Goldington	87	270	209	552	327	268	316	637
Great Barford	59	42	41	40	15	29	47	40
Harpur	242	215	302	336	196	167	194	187
Kempston	1181	1632	1840	1636	832	664	613	629
Kingsbrook	777	1368	1139	1013	466	577	613	639
Oakley	59	42	97	73	48	32	15	52
Putnoe	1358	1461	1404	1446	1085	862	756	1031
Queens Park	1466	1537	1273	1103	477	600	584	553
Riseley	291	207	248	400	232	252	308	291
Roxton	194	316	281	269	200	205	149	128
Shortstown	381	627	614	694	220	210	308	344
Stewartby	547	591	342	356	246	258	262	262
Wilstead/ Wixams	395	374	480	509	227	253	164	271
Wootton	99	57	55	107	25	79	26	44
Wymington	55	92	62	121	49	53	27	27
Total Attendances	8109	9607	9292	9510	5360	5225	5028	5778

The number of children registered when the schemes were affected by cost increases and a service reduction reduced by 31%. Site by site figures are illustrated in the following table.

Total Number of Children Registered at Play scheme Sites. A Year-by-Year Comparison - taking into account the changes in service post 2011/12 consultation for cost reductions

	Based on a 20 Day Scheme (£1 per session)				Based on a 16 Day Scheme (£2 per session)			
Site	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Biddenham	48	56	46	40	32	29	22	36
Brickhill	117	76	57	67	84	96	82	83
Clapham	51	53	84	68	62	53	62	64
Kempston	183	197	225	180	123	112	82	89
Goldington	20	22	42	82	46	51	44	105
Great Barford	27	25	27	13	9	15	24	17
Kingsbrook	171	160	142	120	63	79	75	87
Oakley	60	47	54	31	23	15	20	33
Putnoe	128	192	204	171	158	149	120	133
Riseley	46	67	57	66	56	47	68	72
Roxton	41	62	40	32	35	37	26	32
Shortstown	76	83	93	94	33	41	58	64
Stewartby	98	89	65	58	52	41	50	44
Harpur	14	35	62	60	30	33	35	32
Queens Park	141	140	140	151	69	72	67	73
Wilstead/Wixams	67	74	118	102	60	69	34	71
Wootton	46	24	21	50	17	37	16	20
Wymington	14	28	16	37	19	25	19	12
Total Registered	1348	1430	1493	1422	971	1001	904	1067

	<p>Parent responses to the following question in the 'Summer Play Scheme 2011 Survey, Parent/Carer and Children's Feedback Form' (pre cost increase from £1 to £2): Would you be prepared to pay £2 to £3 for a session? – Options given 'yes' 'no' & 'If no how much money do you suggest to charge per person?'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 78 gave 'No' responses (48.75%) • 82 gave 'Yes' responses (51.25%) <p>Comments provided that are associated with families economic status included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £1 a session makes the scheme affordable • £1 less for children on free school meals • £1 per child as it gets costly over the summer • £1 per session is just about right, especially with more than one child • £4 or £5 BUT this must include lunchtime cover so the scheme runs from 10am-4pm • £1 for 2 hours was fantastic, especially for us single mums that don't work full time or many hours • At an increased rate (max £2) my children would only be able to attend on session per day. • Cost was a huge factor in my child attending • Disappointed that the sessions are no longer free. • I have 2 children so £1 was enough each totally £4 a day • It helps parents with low incomes to be able to send children to clubs • Keep the price the same, if the price goes up people won't attend • Normally would pay up to £2 but not with current employment issues • Would be prepared to pay more, but with two children we would not be able to use the scheme as often as I did this year <p>Parent responses to the following question in the 'Summer Play Scheme 2015 Survey, Parent/Carer and Children's Feedback Form: 'If the Council were able to, would you be interested in sending your children to a full day Play scheme in your local area?' – Options given 'yes' 'no' & 'If Yes how much would you pay for a full day scheme? £0-£5, £10-£15, £15-£20 or £20 +'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 gave 'No' responses (33.33%) • 14 gave 'Yes' responses (66.66%)
--	--

	<p>For those that provided a 'Yes' response, 3 (21%) said they would pay £0-£5, 6 (43%) said they would pay £5-£10, 4 (29%) said £10-£15 and 1 (7%) said £15-£20. No one answered £20+.</p> <p>Carers/young carers: Based on evidence in the 'Which particular protected groups are likely / will be affected?' section of this report, of those that answered the About You Equality Forms over the past 4 years on average 1% of attendees have been young carers and 2% have been 'looked after children (in care)'.</p>												
<p>What consultation did you carry out with protected equality groups to identify your activity's effect on equality?</p>	<p>Public Consultation December 2015 – Service Modernisation Revenue Budget Planning 2016/17</p> <p>Consultation Outcomes:</p> <p>The proposal to cut Sports Development Services including Play Schemes, Older People Activities and Events was subject to public consultation from 19 October to 14 December 2015. In summary 114 response forms were received which rated the proposal as follows:</p> <table><tr><td>Strongly agree</td><td>Agree</td><td>Neither agree nor disagree</td><td>Disagree</td><td>Strongly disagree</td><td>Don't know / no opinion</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>4</td><td>7</td><td>11</td><td>83</td><td>0</td></tr></table> <p>The above included responses from: The Federation of Small Businesses, Great Barford Parish Council and University of Bedfordshire.</p> <p>Additional responses submitted in varying formats to Bedford Borough Council's Consultation Team when asked the question: 'To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?' are broken down as follows.</p>	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know / no opinion	8	4	7	11	83	0
Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know / no opinion								
8	4	7	11	83	0								

Number of responses	9
Agreeing to cuts	0
Disagreeing to cuts	9
Individuals	6
Companies	3

Sport Bedford
Bedfordshire Police
University of Bedfordshire

A number of responses referred to implications or support of the cuts that would have a direct impact on protected equality groups. Those specifically linked to the Play Schemes are highlighted in the **'What does this evidence tell you about the different protected groups?'** section.

Other consultation that has taken place in relation to the Summer Play and Games Schemes include:

- Review of user feedback/complaints
- Review of Parent/carers feedback/complaints/compliments
- Staff Surveys
- Service user data
- Supported Parent/carers data
- Equality survey data
- Sustainable Communities Strategy
- Healthy Bedford Strategy
- Sports Development Strategy
- IMD 2015
- Census 2011
- Sport England Active People Survey
- NEW Sporting Future Strategy.
- Change4Life Evidence Review

<p>What does this evidence tell you about the different protected groups?</p>	<p><u>Public Consultation December 2015 – Service Modernisation Revenue Budget Planning 2016/17</u></p> <p>A small selection of public responses which directly relate to particular protected groups have been supplied within this section. All other responses can be read by request and many of which relate to the negative effects of stopping the Summer Play Schemes.</p> <p>Public Consultation Results – Comment left relating to Race:</p> <p>I have three children and when I lived in Queens Park the children attended the Play-scheme. I found it excellent as they could go and play in the morning, back for dinner and go again in the afternoon. They have fond memories of those days. In Queens Park the children are segregated depending on which school they go to; the catholic/non faith schools. This scheme gave them the opportunity to mix together through sport/ activities. At the time I was very grateful that it ran and arranged family holidays outside of the times you delivered it. As with all these things, the positive benefits are not just the days spent at the scheme but the positives that come from it, like meeting other children in the local area which helps to build a community.</p> <p>Public Consultation Results – Comment left relating to Carers:</p> <p>Each of the sporting events and Play Schemes provide everybody with a chance to do something different. They attract large numbers of people each year and they are something that people enjoy. The Play Schemes that ran in the summer of 2015 attracted the largest number of children in years. Taking this away would mean that young children may not have as many opportunities to play and be creative as this is what the scheme provides them with. It also provides parents with a form of respite which again is something they may not be able to find easily. Although the schemes only run for 2 hours at a time, this is still enough to give parents a break and for children to have some fun and so things they may not have access to at home. Each of the other events encourages young people to participate in sports where they might otherwise not feel comfortable doing. It allows participants to lead a healthy and active lifestyle whilst having fun at the same time. An alternative proposal could be to reduce staffing in these events and posing a limit on the amount of people who can attend rather than getting rid of the schemes and events altogether.</p> <p>Public Consultation Results – Comment left relating to low Socio Economic families:</p> <p>This is a service which is accessed by so many local families who have very little money but the amount the children get out of it is priceless and it would have a huge impact on the quality of the summer holidays many children would have. Without play schemes many children will be unsafe playing on the streets or inside stuck with no social skills playing games consoles. They love the play schemes and have such a wonderful time and</p>
--	---

make so many new friends and it is so accessible to parents who have very little money. To save money they could have fewer sites and focus on the areas of Bedford where annual income within families is lower and the need to access provisions such as play scheme is higher. What happened to the Olympic legacy... There are becoming fewer opportunities for children to access sports...this will only get worse!

Public Consultation Results – Comment left relating to all groups:

This is a unique scheme that I find very useful from many perspectives. 1. Health - The ability to participate in a sports activity increasing the wellbeing of the person and thus having a less negative impact on other services by the council. 2. Social - The chance to meet up with different groups of people from varying demographics allows a much closer interaction and bonding that is lacking in today's individualistic society. The council also fulfils an obligation to promote social wellbeing and cultural integrity 3. Economic (value for money) - The sessions are run in a very professional manner and is certainly value for money. The variety of programs also mean that one has the chance to try something out for the first . It reduces the inhibition that would normally hinder one from taking those first steps to trying out something new. The value that is created for the individual as a result of attending these programs is very clear. As such, it would not be beneficial for the council to stop these activities. "No activities" makes Jack a dull boy, which in turn means the council will have to start spending money in other areas.. In order to counter balance the effects of people not being able to attend these programs any more. This scheme certainly benefits many, as can also be seen by the statistics and the sheer number of people that attend these events. It would be difficult to find alternate programs that would benefit so many in the structured and systematic way in which the program is currently run.

Review of Parent/carer feedback/complaints/compliments

After every scheme, all parents are contacted for feedback and whilst attending they are asked to leave compliments/complaints on site. This was introduced in 2014 and ALL comments left in site books over the past 2 summers have been compliments. A small selection are listed below;

2015 – Biddenham Parent:

My child has thoroughly enjoyed her time at this Play scheme. She has asked to come back every Mon & Weds. However I was highly impressed with the following conversation between play worker & Parent. Parent – I am very impressed with the play workers knowledge of Asperger's. Play worker- That's because we had fantastic training'.

2015 – Putnoe Parents:

'My children have had the best summer holidays this year and this is mainly down to the fantastic time they've had at this Play Scheme. The leaders are the best! ☺'

'MT and RT have had the best time coming to play scheme. They have enjoyed it so much! We will definitely be back next year! Well done to all the leaders.'

2015 Kempston Parent:

'Great work guys! My kids love it, really breaks up the day for them, keeping them active. Filling their days with so much fun. Thanks.'

2014 Putnoe Parent:

He loved this group – well organised and fantastic staff. Shame it's not on for all the holiday. It would be a good idea to have it working on a Saturday morning.

2014 Kempston Scheme:

My child has loved the play scheme all the leaders were great. The only thing about the play scheme is I wish it ran all day. As a working parent it's not always possible for my child to attend due to my working pattern. Overall this is a 5 star service! I hope to bring my child next year!

Sustainable Communities Strategy

The following are extract is taken from Bedford Borough's Sustainable Communities Strategy 2009-2021.

'What the Partnership will do

To deliver our goal of a Healthy Borough, we will: Increase healthy life expectancy for all across the Borough. Reduce health inequalities by focussing effort on deprived areas and increasing opportunities for healthier lifestyles'. (p.23)

Healthy Bedford Strategy

As part of the Healthy Bedford Borough Strategy 2010-2015 the benefits and importance of being physically active are of highlighted. The following objective relates to the work that the Sports Development Team delivers.

‘1.1 Increased Physical Activity

Physical activity is essential for physical and mental well-being at all stages of life. Regular physical activity at a moderate level can bring about major health benefits and can help to achieve reductions in coronary heart disease, obesity, hypertension, depression and anxiety. Even relatively small increases in physical activity are associated with some protection against chronic disease and improved quality of life.’ (P.25)

Sporting Future Strategy

A new Government Strategy published on 17th December 2015 called ‘Sporting Futures: A New Strategy for an Active Nation’ has been developed following nationwide consultation with a wide range of networks, organisations and individuals. The strategy will shape and guide the development of sport and funding over the coming years. The following are extracts from this document relating to the importance of the schemes that the Sports Development Team deliver;

‘Local Responsibilities

Councils also have an important leadership role to play, bringing schools, voluntary sport clubs, National Governing Bodies of sport (NGBs), health and the private sector together to forge partnerships, unblock barriers to participation and improve the local sport delivery system. So local authorities have, and will continue to have, an absolutely crucial role to play in delivering sport and physical activity opportunities.

“Sport can be the glue that keeps communities together and is a persuasive tool in promoting shared interests alongside fostering a keen sense of civic pride.

I have seen at first-hand the positive power sport and recreation exert, from children of all backgrounds emulating their heroes at their local community facilities to supporters working together to protect the assets they value.”

MARCUS JONES MP Minister for Local Government Department for Communities and Local

Government

Since the devolution of public health from the National Health Service (NHS) to local authorities in 2013, many councils have taken the opportunity to integrate physical activity into public health policy as part of a wider shift from a system that treats ill-health to one that promotes wellbeing. In many areas, local Health and Wellbeing Strategies have highlighted physical inactivity as an issue that needs to be tackled and agreed approaches to tackling it. Local authorities also have responsibility for wider policy areas which can have a significant impact on the physical activity of the local population, including management of rights of way, parks and other green spaces.

Being close to where people live, high quality multi-use local green spaces can play a key role as sporting venues and as alternative settings for sport and healthy activity for communities including new audiences that are less likely to use traditional sports centres. The opportunities to realise the multiple benefits that can be achieved for communities by investing in green spaces and routes as venues for sport and healthy activity should be considered whenever they arise.' (P.13)

'6.2. Physical Activity

Government is committed to reducing physical inactivity. This commitment and the rationale for it were set out in the *Moving More, Living More* report of February 2014¹³. This also reiterated government's aim to increase the number of people meeting the UK Chief Medical Officer (CMO) guidelines on physical activity and reduce the number of people deemed to be inactive by being active for less than 30 minutes a week. PHE's *Everybody Active, Every Day* report in October 2014 set out clear guidance for public sector bodies and others to promote physical activity, under the four themes of:

- Active society: creating a social movement
- Moving professionals: activating networks of expertise
- Active environments: creating the right spaces
- Moving at scale: interventions that make us active

Government, working with local government, will ensure that the recommendations in PHE's report *Everybody Active, Every Day* are properly implemented. PHE will report annually on progress in implementing *Everybody Active, Every Day*, including by showcasing examples of good practice.' (P.26)

‘6.3 Children and Young People

“Opportunity for children to take part in and develop a love of sport and physical Activity is vital to ensuring their long-term enjoyment and participation.

“Provision for children and young people will rightly sit at the heart of a new strategy for sport in this country. We want to see healthy, happy active children becoming healthy, happy active adults and the talented primary school children of today becoming our sporting stars of the future.”

EDWARD TIMPSON MP Minister for Children and Families Department for Education

A positive experience of sport and physical activity at a young age can contribute to a lifetime of participation. Unfortunately, a negative experience may narrow perceptions of sport and put someone off forever¹⁸. This is why we need to ensure that the sport and physical activity ‘offer’ is right for children and young people. This is particularly true for under-represented group’ (P.32)

‘...less than a quarter of under 11s are active for an hour a day and the gender gap in participation is already starting to emerge’ (P.34)

Change4Life Evidence Review 2015

A further point of research from the Change4Life Government programme aiming to get people of all ages more active on a daily basis. The Summer Play and Games Schemes have supported the Change4Life ‘Shake-up’ initiative for the past 2 years.

‘The importance of physical activity for children and young people’s health is well established and there is increasing recognition of the potential of physical activity to impact on a wide variety of health and wellbeing outcomes. Despite concerted efforts to encourage children to be more physically active, worrying gaps still remain; with 79% boys and 84% girls aged 5-15 years in England not meeting the current physical activity recommendations’. (P.8)

What further research or data do you need to fill any gaps in your understanding of the potential or known effects of the activity?	<p>Identifying any possible Play Scheme alternatives (with cost implications) for low income families in Bedford or those whom require rest bite and directing families to the Families Information Service (FIS) for details on these.</p> <p>Researching how equality groups e.g. young carers, looked after children, children with disabilities, race groups, religion/faith groups and low income families will be affected and how we can support Bedford Borough Council's Social Services and Disability Teams in the future after the removal of this internal resource.</p> <p>Research into the risk of negative public opinion around aforementioned cuts and guidance on how to best manage service users concerns/support.</p>
--	--

General Equality Duty

Which parts of the general equality duty is the activity relevant to?			
	Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation	Advance equality of opportunity	Foster good relations
Age	-	<p>The range of schemes offered to young people in their local areas enables parents/carers to make healthy lifestyle choices for their children's summer activities.</p> <p>The schemes enable young people an opportunity to develop socially, physically and mentally out of a school setting.</p>	<p>Play Schemes reduce barriers to community involvement and the coming together of different age groups.</p> <p>As the schemes are open to young people aged 5-13 years they cater for age groups that span across 2 levels of schooling e.g. lower and middle school age or primary and secondary age. By catering for all age groups this lessens the impact of school transitions on those in attendance that perhaps don't have many opportunities to play/participate with children of different ages, abilities and at</p>

			different stages of development.
Disability	<p>Inclusive schemes which reduce inequalities by engaging young people in activities suitable or adaptable for the majority in turn seconding the great work of local schools in integrating young people with disabilities into mainstream activities.</p> <p>Employees are recruited in line with the Council's Equal Opportunities Policy.</p>	Staff gain qualifications and on the job experience of delivering inclusive play, games, sports and arts and crafts sessions within a free play setting. This increases employability and community awareness as their knowledge is passed on away from the Play schemes and into their future lives.	The schemes support local disability groups by referring to them and by offering a service suitable for a number of their service users.
Gender reassignment	-	-	-
Pregnancy and maternity	-	-	-
Race		Play Scheme Employees receive on the job experience of delivering sessions to young people from varied backgrounds whom at times do not understand spoken English.	<p>The Play Schemes aim to encourage community cohesion and socialisation by integrating young people from multicultural groups.</p> <p>Young people with English as an additional language (EAL) play alongside young people with English as their first language.</p> <p>Children to develop relationships out of a school setting with children that may not attend their local school or be within their established friendship</p>

			groups.
Religion or belief	-	-	<p>Play Schemes offer the opportunity to increase community awareness of different beliefs within the same community by encouraging participation for all.</p> <p>Schemes aim to decrease the division of faith groups within Bedford wards and thus do not put emphasis on certain religious groups over others during the delivery of the schemes.</p> <p>Trust in hard to reach communities has built up over the last 35+ years.</p>
Sex	-	-	-
Sexual orientation	-	-	-
Marriage & civil partnership	-		

Impact on equality groups

Based on the evidence presented what positive and negative impact will your activity have on equality?				
	Positive impact	Negative impact	No impact	Explanation
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Based on evidence provided from the last 6 years on average 60% of service users are aged 5-8years old and 40% are aged 9-13years old and therefore the

				most affected age group would be 5-8year olds. On average (based on figures 2010-15) 692 5-8year olds would be affected each summer and 451 9-13year olds would be affected each summer by cutting the summer Play and Games Schemes.
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Based on figures provided within this report the most affected disability group would be those that have behavioural disabilities.</p> <p>However knowledge gained from reviewing the summer services that are available in Bedford for those with mild to moderate behavioural difficulties compared to those with mild to moderate ASD or Physical disabilities, it is likely that other disability groups would be affected to a greater degree. For example Autism Bedfordshire run an excellent summer scheme which last for 2 weeks in the summer holidays – this means that these parents/carers only have 2 weeks of rest bite over the summer and a number of families/council departments chose to refer to the Summer Play schemes as a key alternative resource alongside Autism Beds provision, without the Council schemes parents/carers could struggle to find alternative provision.</p>
Gender reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	-
Pregnancy and maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	-
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Over the past 4 years Play scheme figures illustrate that the following race groups were of a higher representation on the schemes than the Bedford Borough average as recorded in the 2011 Census;</p> <p>Black/ (Play Scheme average 5.4%, Bedford Average 3.9%) Mixed (Play scheme average 8.4%, Bedford average 3.4%) Other Ethnic Group (Play scheme average 3.3%, Bedford average 0.70%)</p> <p>If the schemes were to stop, the race group most highly represented over the past 4 years is White British and therefore the highest number of participants</p>

				affected would come from this race group (on average 65.6% of all participants).
Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The religious groups that would have the highest number of participants affected by the play scheme cuts would be 'Christians', despite this religion being represented to a lesser degree on the play schemes (50.2%) as than the Bedford Borough Average (59.3%).</p> <p>Religions that are on average more highly represented on the Play schemes than in Bedford's general population include;</p> <p>Hindu (Play scheme average 2%, Bedford average 1.50%)</p> <p>Muslim (Play scheme average 6%, Bedford average 5.50%)</p> <p>Other Religion (Play scheme average 3.8%, Bedford average 1%)</p> <p>No Religion (Play scheme average 24.9%, Bedford average 23.60%)</p> <p>Religion Not Stated (Play Scheme average 11.8%, Bedford Average 6.60%)</p>
Sex	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	-
Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	-
Marriage & civil partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	-
Other relevant groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Low Income Families;</p> <p>Figures provided in the evidence section of this report highlight that of the 18 play schemes that Bedford Borough Council operate, only the area of Wootton had less unemployed families attending the Play schemes than the areas average Job Seekers Claimants in August 2015.</p> <p>The wards with the most unemployed parents/carers and therefore the places that cutting the summer play scheme provision may most affect low income families are (in order of highest to lowest);</p> <p>Harpur (46.4% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) * Also a LSOA</p>

				<p>Great Barford (40% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Queens Park (33.3% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) *Also a LSOA Goldington (28.6% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) *Also a LSOA Kingsbrook (28.2% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015)*Also a LOSA Stewartby (22.7% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Putnoe (22.4% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) *Also a LSOA Kempston West (18.0% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Riseley (12.7% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Shortstown (12.5% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Roxton (12.5% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Wixams (11.3% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Brickhill (10% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Wymington (8.3% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Clapham (6.3% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Oakley (6.1% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015) Biddenham (3.1% were unemployed parents/carers in 2015)</p> <p>Young Carers According figures from the last 4 years on average 1% of Play scheme service users were young carers and would be affected by the cuts to this service.</p> <p>Looked After Children/In Care Of the service users that completed an About You Equality Form in the past 4 years (2012-15) 2% of children attending the schemes were looked after/in care and would be affected by a cut in service. Bedford Borough's Children's Services, Adoption and Fostering Team, Youth Services and Disabilities Team would need to re-source suitable low cost alternative for parents/carers in their systems. In 2015 6 young people had sessions funded by these departments. If the Schemes are cut such funding for attendance at other schemes is highly likely to increase.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Commissioned services

What equality measures will be included in Contracts to help meet the three aims of the general equality duty?	N/A
What steps will be taken throughout the commissioning cycle to meet the different needs of protected equality groups?	N/A

Actions

	What will be done?	By who?	By when?	What will be the outcome?
Actions to lessen negative impact	1) Working with Children's services & schools.to take on Play Scheme type activities. 2) Families Information Service (FIS) can provide information on alternative Play schemes provision to parents/carers who are needing childcare over	1)Sports Development 2)FIS	1)Immediately (Spring 2016) 2)Summer 2016	1) Schools will be contacted to see if there is any interest in offering their own provision. Our recommendation would be to target areas in which Play Schemes previous operated. 2) Alternative play scheme provisions may be accessed if suitable and income will go to an external source.

	<p>the summer (provide list of Play schemes from FIS and details on how they operate/how they differ)</p> <p>3) Consider lessening the funding reduction and focus on key equality areas within Bedford Borough as determined by IMD figures and research into existing low cost activities across Bedford (if there are any available).</p>	3)Exec	3)Following Consultation - Spring 2016	<p>3) This option would lessen the negative impact from public opinion, continue to support the training and experience of employees looking to find employment in a child based setting, thus increasing standards for future employers and will support families in key areas to access high quality, Ofsted reviewed low cost play provision. This will ensure that the Council are still offering rest bite for parents/carers which is supporting the vision of 'corporate parenting' and improving opportunities for social, physical and mental development in children within Bedford over the summer holiday period.</p>
Actions to increase positive impact				
Actions to develop equality evidence, information and data				
Actions to improve equality in procurement / commissioning				
Other relevant actions				

Recommendation

No major change required	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Adjustments required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal is to stop the summer play and games schemes. This will likely have a negative equality impact on children aged 5-13 years. The negative impact is likely to be limited if there are some suitable alternative provisions available, particularly to low income families.</p> <p>The adjustments required are actions to lessen this negative equality impact in implementing this proposal. Actions have been identified and include working with Children's services & Schools to take on Play Scheme type activities targeting in areas where the summer play and games schemes operate; and signposting parents and carers to alternative provision.</p>
Justification to continue the activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Stop the activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Summary of analysis

In preparing this report, due consideration has been given to the Borough Council's statutory Equality Duty to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations, as set out in Section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010.

The Play Scheme have seen many change since originating over 35 years ago as a free summer scheme operating in 4 local parks. Their reputation for outstanding service, reviewed and approved by Ofsted is reinforced by the sheer number of families whom benefit from the service. They are the most attended and diverse schemes in Bedford and are still focused on their original goals; to create community cohesion, encourage active participation in local green spaces and provide children with social interaction, health benefits and unforgettable summer experiences.

Play Schemes and Summer Sports Courses are the only early intervention sports offer from the Sports Development Team. All other courses are aimed at ages 14+. The schemes have supported the Change4Life initiative over the past 2 years, a document published by

Change4Life as referred to earlier in this analysis states the importance of physical activity early in life with 79% of boys and 84% of girls ages 5-11 years old not participating in the NHS recommendation for sport and physical activity.

Stopping the Play Schemes will have a negative effect on a number of equality groups due to the diversity that the schemes currently achieve. Public opinion of the cut is likely to cause strain on the Bedford Borough Council Customer Services Team, Families Information Service (FIS), Children's Services, and Disability Groups not to mention on the parents, carers and young people themselves.

Key IMD statistics alongside Play Scheme parent's unemployment and part time employment figures illustrate the importance and demand for the service in their wards. With 5 Play Scheme wards in the top 20% of England's LSOA's namely Harpur, Queens Park, Goldington, Kingsbrook and Putnoe the Play schemes offer a low cost opportunity for children from low income families to access socialisation, physical development and mental stimulation over the long summer break.

In cost terms, based on 2015 Play Scheme figures the schemes cost £11 per child per session to run and there was an admission charge of £2, therefore the cost to the Council (mainly on staffing and venue hire) was £9 per child per session or £4.50 per hour that a child was active and engaged.

The long term cost of removing the play schemes is unknown but is likely to include an increase in crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB), increase in health costs of sedentary lifestyles, more demand on schools to re-engage students after a summer break with less sanctions and opportunities for development. Less integration of race groups and religious groups within local communities and an increase in the social and economic divide between those that can afford summer provision and those that can't.

Monitoring and review

Monitoring and review	Review date