

# Equality Impact Assessment Form

## *Young People's Support Services Change Programme (CYPR3)*

### 1. Persons responsible for this assessment:

<b>Name:</b> Francis Gobey, Andrew Webster	<b>Telephone:</b> 7410
<b>Service:</b> Youth Support Services	<b>E-Mail:</b> <a href="mailto:francis.gobey@gloucestershire.gov.uk">francis.gobey@gloucestershire.gov.uk</a>
<b>Directorate:</b> CYPD	<b>Updated:</b> 14 February 2011

### 2. Name of the policy, service, strategy, procedure or function:

#### **Young People's Support Services Change Programme**

A programme of service change within CYPD and its youth support delivery partners. One of three major new CYPD change programmes in response to Meeting the Challenge and service improvement requirements.

### 3. Briefly describe its aims and objectives

#### **Reshaping the provision of youth support services**

A better integrated targeted support to young people with assessed needs, a more effective early intervention & prevention service to young people at risk, and facilitated access to universal provision such as positive activities and information, advice and guidance (IAG).

With substantial savings to be made under MTC, there will be less universal provision by GCC or Prospects, and this will involve redundancies (including PAs & youth workers) and building closures (including youth centres) where they cannot be transferred to community use.

### 4. Who is intended to benefit from it and in what way?

#### **Vulnerable young people**

Better integrated targeted support will improve outcomes for looked after young people, care leavers, young offenders, substance misusers, young parents, runaways & homeless, asylum seekers, and those young people not in education, employment or training (NEET).

A more effective early intervention & prevention service will improve outcomes for individual and groups of young people at risk in communities and localities.

An investment of £300k into districts will benefit young people at a universal level through the provision of positive activities by voluntary and community sector organisations.

### 5. What outcomes are expected?

**Indicators improve** across whole range of outcomes for the above groups of categories of vulnerable young people, leading to better transition to adult life and lower overall cost to public services.

Young people continue to have access to universal provision in their schools and communities.

Local authority long-term risk is reduced by means of MTC savings.

## 6. Have you consulted on this policy?

**Initial commissioning consultation** across Cabinet, CYPD, NHSG and Prospects (GCC's contractor for integrated management of youth support services and provision of the Connexions service) in developing the proposal.

**Specific consultations** have been undertaken with young people, workforce, unions, major partners, VCS & community groups, schools, and with the general public via a website have your say process from Nov 2010 to Feb 2011 – alongside the GCC Budget consultation. A detailed report is available summarising the feedback. Consultation with young people ensured vulnerable groups were represented.

The consultation raised a number of issues – general concerns regarding the loss of service to young people and particular activities. Discussions with parish, district and community organisations are ongoing to consider options for future provision of services. The needs of young people with disabilities and young carers were raised as specific areas where a loss of support might result from the proposals.

Many of the responses relate to the potential implications of the Council's proposal to 'get out of the business' of direct provision of outdoor and environmental education at GCC-owned sites. Again these included concerns about the potential impact on more vulnerable groups. A separate EIA has now been completed to assess the impact of these proposals.

Staff and trade unions representatives have raised some concerns about the implications to the proposals for some specific groups and as a result an additional EIA will be completed to assess the implications of the detailed staffing proposals.

## 7. What evidence has been used for this assessment: e.g. Research, previous consultations, MAIDEN?

Proposals have been built upon extensive internal and external research and inspection evidence, such as the CYP needs analysis, monitoring of the Prospects contract, the review and restructure of Post-16 work, the 2010 Scrutiny report into positive activities, the YOS inspection, Ofsted conclusions on integrated youth support etc.

## 8. Could a particular group be affected differently in either a negative or positive way?

Please evidence that you have used the Consultation toolkit and planning template <http://staffnet/index.cfm?articleid=5203>

	Negative	Positive	Neutral	Evidence
<b>Age</b>			x	Affects young people as a whole, but with a more focused approach to young people at risk or with identified needs.
<b>Disability</b>			x	Reshaped service to continue current inclusive youth support service approach. Some current building provision used by disability groups – will continue in some form.
<b>Gender</b>			x	Reshaped service to continue current inclusive youth support service approach.
<b>Race including Gypsy &amp; Traveller</b>			x	If community groups do not take on provision, a reduction in universal service in Gloucester & Cheltenham (whether redundancy or building closure) may affect BME communities concentrated in those areas.
<b>Religion or Belief</b>			x	Reshaped service to continue current inclusive youth support service approach across all religions represented.
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>			x	Reshaped service to continue current inclusive youth support service approach for LGBT young people.
<b>Transgender</b>			x	Reshaped service to continue current inclusive youth support service approach for any transgender users.
<b>Other groups: eg Rural Isolation, Long term unemployed, Deprivation Health Inequality</b>		x		Young people at risk are the focus of the new service, with those at risk of rural isolation within the priority groups.  If community groups do not take on provision of youth centre buildings and universal services, there may be may adverse affects on some communities.
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p><b>Describe how the proposed activity, policy, strategy, service, procedure or function will contribute to Community Cohesion.</b></p> <p>You will need to consider;</p> <p>Is there equality between those who will and won't benefit from the proposal?</p> <p>Are there strong relationships between groups and communities in the area affected and will the proposed action promote positive relationships?</p> <p>Does the proposal bring groups / communities into increased contact with each other</p>			<p>On the positive side, communities may be galvanised into offering or supporting more local provision at a universal level for young people (though with more Big Society potential from communities with greater resources).</p> <p>On the negative side, communities (including young people) could see the targeting of provision towards young people at risk partly because of their locality as divisive.</p> <p>Young people might interpret the focus on being at risk as an incentive to get into trouble to get a service.</p>

**9. If you have identified a negative impact in question 8, what actions have you undertaken or do you plan to undertake to lessen or negate this impact?**

<b>Action(s):</b>	<b>How will this action be Monitored/Evaluated</b>	<b>When will policy / service / strategy / procedure / function be reviewed?</b>	<b>Carried to Level 2?</b>	<b>Carried to Level 3?</b>
<p><b>Actions</b>                      Ensure direct engagement with diverse groups of young people, ongoing provision of work with disabled young people and young carers in each district.</p> <p>Create new team to provide mobile outdoor and environmental education and D of E for vulnerable groups within the new targeted youth support service.</p> <p>Work with Special Schools on ensuring future opportunities for inclusive outdoor provision</p> <p>Negotiate with parish, district &amp; community organisations and equality groups in local areas to mitigate the impacts of the changes</p> <p>Ensure £300k investment into young people's activities via Districts includes assessment of equalities impacts.</p>	<p>Programme Board</p> <p>Programme Board</p> <p>Change Team</p> <p>Change Team</p> <p>Lead Commissioner</p>	<p>Mar –June 2011</p> <p>June 2011 – first stage September 2012 – review impact</p> <p>Feb – June 2011</p> <p>June 2011</p> <p>July 2011</p>		
<p>Do further EIAs within transition planning – specifically outdoor and environmental education, staffing</p>	<p>Programme Board</p>	<p>Mar-Jun 2011</p>		

**Declaration**

We are satisfied that an Impact Assessment has been carried out on this policy, and where a negative impact has been identified, actions have been developed to lessen or negate this impact.

We understand that the Equality Impact Assessment is required by the County Council and that we take responsibility for the completion and quality of this assessment.

**Completed by: Francis Gobey**

**Date: 14 February 2011**

**Role: Lead Commissioner for Targeted Youth Support**

**Countersigned by Head of Service**

**Date:**

**Date for Review:**

**Please forward an electronic copy to the Equalities Team by emailing**

**[equalities@gloucestershire.gov.uk](mailto:equalities@gloucestershire.gov.uk)**