

Re-imagining Norfolk – budget consultation 2016-19

Children's Services - equality and rural impact assessments, and findings from the public consultation on budget proposals



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Neil Howard on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (Textphone).

For more information please contact:

Corporate Planning and Partnerships Service

neil.howard@norfolk.gov.uk

01603 224196

Business Intelligence & Performance Service

jeremy.bone@norfolk.gov.uk

01603 224215

Published January 2016

Contents

Introduction	3
Legal and policy context	3
The purpose of equality and rural assessments	3
How the Council assesses the budget proposals for 2016/17	3
Human rights implications	4
Change how we provide parenting support	5
Equality and rural assessment	5
Consultation findings	8
Reduce our funding for youth work.....	13
Equality and rural assessment	13
Consultation findings	19
Change how we provide support to families who are struggling to cope with the challenges they face.....	25
Equality and rural assessment	25
Consultation findings	27
Keep all children's centres open and focus their work on supporting the families that need them most.....	32
Equality and rural assessment	32
Consultation findings	35

Introduction

1. This report summarises the findings of Norfolk County Council's equality and rural impact assessments and public consultation on budget proposals for 2016/17 for Children's Services.
2. It also sets out the legal framework for equality and rural assessments and public consultation.

Legal and policy context

3. Public authorities have a legal duty under the Equality Act 2010 to consider the implications of proposals on people with protected characteristics. The Act states that public bodies must pay due regard to the following when planning, changing or commissioning services:
 - Advancing equality of opportunity for people with 'protected characteristics'¹
 - Eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct²
 - Fostering good community relations³.
4. Good practice in strategic planning also recommends that rural assessments are undertaken on proposals.
5. Under the Local Government and Public Involvement Act 2007, councils have a general requirement to consider, before making decisions on services, whether public consultation is required. They must also take steps to involve local people in decisions about local services that are likely to affect them. In addition, good practice and case law requires that consultation should take place at a time when proposals are at a formative stage; should be based on sufficient information to allow those consulted to give intelligent consideration of options; and should be conscientiously taken into account in the final decision.

The purpose of equality and rural assessments

6. The key aim, with both equality and rural assessments, is to enable elected members to consider the potential impact of decisions on different individuals and communities prior to decisions being taken. Mitigating actions can then be developed if adverse impact is identified.
7. It will not always be possible to adopt the course of action that will best promote the needs of people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas. However, assessments enable informed decisions to be made, that take into account every opportunity to minimise disadvantage.

How the Council assesses the budget proposals for 2016/17

8. The assessment process comprises the following key steps:

- Public consultation is launched – making sure that residents, service users and stakeholders can highlight issues that must be taken into account.
- We gather evidence on each of the proposals – looking at the people who might be affected, the findings of related assessments and public consultation that has taken place (such as the Council’s ‘Big Conversation’ and ‘Putting People First’ strategy and relevant data and research.
- When the Council’s public consultation on the budget proposals for 2016/17 draws to a close, we analysis all the results. We make sure that any impacts highlighted by residents and stakeholders inform the final assessments
- We publish the assessments on the Council’s budget consultation webpages. Committees consider the assessments during the January round of committee meetings. Full Council considers the findings of assessments before meeting on 22 February 2016 to agree the Council’s budget for 2016/17.

Human rights implications

9. Public authorities in the UK are required to act compatibly with the Human Rights Act 1998. There are limited human rights issues arising from the proposals, but any specific issues are addressed in the individual impact assessments.

The details presented in the rest of this document

10. This document presents in order, for each proposal, the equality and rural impact assessment, and the summary of findings of public consultation. It also, following these, provides findings for other areas of the consultation relevant to this committee – so any further ideas or questions that were consulted upon – including the findings of questions on council tax.

Title of proposal:	Change how we provide parenting support
Lead Officers:	Jo Richardson, Tim Eyres, Sarah Jones, Jeremy Bone

Equality and rural assessment

Analysis of proposal & potential impact

Overview – about the proposal

1. We have contracts with four organisations to provide parenting support programmes. They offer advice, one-to-one support and group programmes for parents and carers. We are proposing to not renew these contracts when they end in March 2017. This would save approximately £427,000 per year from 2017-18.
2. We have reorganised our teams in Children’s Services and created six locality early help teams whose role is to support families with the challenges they face before they turn into more serious problems. The early help teams cover all parts of the county, which means that there is parenting support available to families living throughout Norfolk.
3. In addition to our early help teams, we also have contracts with other organisations who can provide parenting support. We have a network of children’s centres, health visitors and school nurses who can support parents and carers across the county. By April 2017 our early help teams will be well established and the organisation now providing health visitors and school nurses will have been working in Norfolk for 18 months.
4. The contracts which are coming to an end are:
 - a. **Action for Children (covering West Norfolk, Breckland, South Norfolk)**
5. Between April 2014 and March 2015, Action for Children received 80 referrals for one-to-one parenting support and ten referrals for one-to-one therapeutic support for children. It ran 15 full parenting programmes, as well as six short parenting programmes. The service also co-facilitated three ante-natal 12 week programmes for pregnant teenagers, in partnership with a specialist midwife in West Norfolk.
6. The services provided were delivered from a range of locations in West Norfolk, Breckland and South Norfolk, primarily focused in Thetford and King’s Lynn.
7. The service users supported by Action for Children are from a variety of backgrounds. However, the majority of parents supported are women, reflecting the fact that women tend to be the primary carers of children.
 - b. **Family Action (covering Breckland and North Norfolk)**
8. Between April 2014 and March 2015, Family Action offered individual support to 50 families. It ran four parenting programmes specifically for parents of children age 3- 11

years old, as well as four other shorter parenting programmes. It also ran drop-in sessions for parents in various venues in North Norfolk.

9. The services provided were delivered from a range of locations in Breckland and North Norfolk. These were primarily focused in Swaffham and surrounding villages, Sheringham, Wells Next-the-Sea and Cromer.
10. The service users supported by Family Action are from a variety of backgrounds, however the majority of parents supported are women, reflecting the fact that women tend to be the primary carers of children

c. Ormiston (support for families with children aged 11-19 in Greater Norwich)

11. Ormiston offer one-to-one support to parents, as well as group sessions. Between April 2014 and March 2015, it supported 11 teenage parents through its Strengthening Families parenting programme. Four families participated on its Triple P parenting programme.
12. The services provided were delivered from City Academy Norwich.
13. The service users supported by Ormiston are from a variety of backgrounds. However the majority of parents supported are women, reflecting the fact that women tend to be the primary carers of children.

d. Family Matters (support for families with children aged 6-11 in Greater Norwich)

14. Between April 2014 and March 2015, Family Matters provided individual support to 37 parents. It also gave specific support to eight fathers and male carers. 44 parents attended drop-in sessions, where they received information and peer support. 50 families took part in parenting programmes.
15. The services provided were delivered from Bowthorpe in Greater Norwich.
16. The service users supported by Family Matters are from a variety of backgrounds. Whilst the majority of parents supported are women, reflecting the fact that women tend to be the primary carers of children, this programme has also targeted fathers.

Potential impact

17. At this stage, no significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas is identified.
18. This is because if the proposal goes ahead, we will continue to provide parents and carers with parenting support. Targeted family support activities will be provided by our early help teams. Other organisations that run services on our behalf, such as children's centres, health visitors and school nurses, will also support families. In addition, families in the Great Yarmouth area will now benefit from support.
19. We do not anticipate that service users in rural areas will experience any significant changes in the kind of support they receive. Neither do we anticipate that the change of arrangements will impact on travel arrangements for people in rural areas currently

receiving support. We are committed to models of delivery that take support to where families are, rather than expecting people to come to services.

20. We are exploring with stakeholders whether the proposals could lead to a loss of jobs or community capacity in rural communities.
21. If the proposal goes ahead, we will ensure that parents who have developed relationships with commissioned organisations are supported in transition at the end of the contracts.

List of evidence used to conduct analysis

- Relevant legislation: Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty; Human Rights Act 1998
- The findings of public consultation on these proposals– as well as feedback from residents and stakeholders in the Council's previous budget consultations (e.g. the Big Conversation and Putting People First).
- Children's Services 0 – 5 years Needs Analysis, November 2014

Consultation findings

Title of proposal
Change how we provide parenting support

<p>Respondent Numbers – Number and percent agree, disagree and don't know/blank where applicable. If relevant also include numbers of respondents who were service users and carers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were 463 responses received for this proposal. • 135 people (29.16%) disagreed with the proposal • 229 people (49.46%) agreed with the proposal • 99 people (21.

Analysis of responses

Organisation, group or petition responses	
<p>Please describe any petitions received.</p>	<p>Of the group of adults with learning disabilities who attended an About With Friends consultation event, 1 agreed with the proposal and 34 disagreed with the proposal.</p>
<p>Please record any groups or organisations which responded.</p>	<p>30 respondents told us they were responding on behalf of a business, organisation or group. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult Day Care Limited • Aylsham Town Council • Break Charity • Broadland YAB • Cinema Plus (Cinema City) • Community Action Norfolk • Diss Town Council • Family Matters (included family and professional's views) • Great Yarmouth Borough Council • Healthwatch • Malcolm Books • Mind • Mums in the Know Norwich • Norfolk County Council and Stonham Home Group • Norfolk Record Society • North Norfolk District Council • Northrepps Parish Council • Ormesby St Margaret Parish council • Ormesby with Scratby Parish Council • Parish Council (not named) • Poringland Parish Council • Sheringham Town council • South Norfolk District Council • Swanton Morley Parish Council • Tasburgh Parish Council • Taverham Parish Council

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BUILD Charity • The Matthew Project • Unite social group. • Your Own Place CIC
Please summarise all petition or group responses.	Of the 24 organisations which responded to an agree/disagree/don't know question, 14 agreed with the proposal: 6 disagreed, and 4 did not know. There was no overall consensus in the responses

Looking at all of the responses, are there any consistent, repeated or notable reasons given for people's views in...

Agreeing with the proposal?	<p>229 (49.46%) people who responded to this question agreed with the proposed change.</p> <p>33 people agreed with the proposal with a proviso concerning continuity, quality of service, or resourcing: "as long as the people who need the support get it from somewhere that is the most important thing. If you can do that without having long term and costly contracts as described above then that's fine". / "This seems reasonable ASSUMING adequate resourcing of the county team(s) and of partner voluntary groups." / "Provided that the service standard does not fall, this appears to be a reasonable way to achieve savings." / "So long as families are still able to receive support in one form or another, I see no issue with the proposed changes."</p> <p>The main reason for agreeing was that we can provide this service ourselves ("in-house") through the new Early Help teams without the need to commission outside organisations. 27 people commented on our ability to provide parenting services: "I am confident that we have the necessary skills, knowledge and experience within Norfolk County Council departments to provide these services without using these particular external organisations". People also noted the risk of potential duplication when NCC and external teams provide similar services: "The new Early Help Service investment should be doing this. Why duplicate funding?". The cost of commissioning services was also noted: "externally bought in services are an expensive option and should be minimised". Some respondents' agreement was based on a broader principal about who should provide services: "I do not agree with outside services" and "I think it is always sensible to run these programmes and support services internally rather than pay external organisations".</p> <p>16 people made reference to how efficiently the service is run: "Surely paying for 4 contracts is not efficient!" / Is sub contracting best value for money? Especially 4 different parties." / "We should be looking at reducing duplication of services." / "This proposal eliminates duplication." / "Need for better co-ordination with existing services."</p>
-----------------------------	--

	<p>116 of the 229 people who agreed with this proposal did not give a reason for their viewpoint. Some wrote freetext responses such as “reluctantly agree”, “see above”, “no further comment” or “seems sensible”, but the vast majority of the 116 wrote nothing so we cannot know the reasons for their agreement.</p>
<p>Disagreeing with the proposal?</p>	<p>135 (29.16%) people who responded to this question disagreed with the proposed cut.</p> <p>The main reasons for disagreeing were that the service is important (a ‘key service’ and is preventative. Some respondents who commented on the preventative nature of parenting services made reference to the possible cessation of the service: “you say early support is key but then take all the funding from parent support programmes”.</p> <p>23 respondents disagreed with changes to parenting services because the provision is a key service, described as “very important” or “vital”: “services that provide parenting support programmes are critical to preventing perpetual cycle of marginalisation, poverty, lack of engagement in education etc. People don't always access this type of support in conventional ways and therefore it is vital that these types of services remain as they often work with the most hard to reach - offering them a safe place to get help with parenting. “</p> <p>20 respondents referred to the service as being preventative, stopping issues before they escalate into crisis: “it would be tragic to think that early support for parents and children is withdrawn, meaning that children develop much greater problems in later life. It is likely to cost the council much more in the long run due to the increased need for crisis care”. / “I think that targeting support early on is an effective way to prevent problems later. “</p> <p>15 respondents considered the proposal to be shortsighted, potentially costing more further down the line: “Parenting support is already targeting those that need the most help. Withdrawing support from these groups will result in poorer outcomes for children who need it the most which will ultimately end up costing society more. It is a short-term policy leaving later generations to pay the price and pick up the bill.” / “Reducing funding to an intervention service is a false economy and will cost more money in the long term.”</p> <p>13 respondents stated that the service would be delivered more effectively by commissioned organisations than by Norfolk County Council: “Early Help teams aren't big enough to do this piece of work. You'll need to spend money to bring in more staff (and management!) so why not just leave it with the existing agencies.” / “I am amazed that despite two recent inadequate Ofsted inspections, NCC still believes it can provide better Early Help services than the voluntary sector and that you are proposing</p>

to end your voluntary sector contracts in order to bring the services back 'in house'. My experience of working with the Early Help Hubs so far are that they are disorganised, do not work in partnership and have staff who are not as experienced or as qualified as the staff in the current voluntary sector services.”

Don't know: Of the 'Don't Know' responses (and where explanatory text is provided), what are the main reasons why people are unable to come to a clear decision?

99 (21.38%) ticked the 'don't know' option. Of these, **23** people **critiqued** the proposal on the grounds of insufficient information (“this is too technical for a lay person to decide upon”); aspects of parenting service provider contracts (“can't tell whether the contracts ending represent good value. If they don't why did you enter into them - and why are you more likely to get it 'right' this time?”); and the evidence base or outcomes (“I believe you should sponsor independent research to establish whether your early intervention support is effective.” / “Do not know enough about the impact”).

Analyst notes

Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings

No comments were received about our actual or perceived **legal** duties.

55 people **critiqued** the proposal on the basis of:

- **insufficient information** on which to reach a decision: “would need more information as to how alternatives will be delivered”.
- queries about the **effectiveness of the service**: “poor outcomes for this sort of investment”.
- doubts about **our capabilities to manage** the service: “this seems counter to your aspiration to become a smaller council - what evidence is there that NCC is better at providing these services ? Council Services are rated as inadequate I don't have any faith that these would be provided better by NCC”.
- the **role of the voluntary sector**: “The Early Help Hubs are a new initiative with no track record of delivery. Its focus mirrors many of those services delivered by the VCSE identified for cuts (CHL011,CHL009 etc). This is viewed as a real concern by many VCSE organisations who see this as a disinvestment in the VCSE sector in favour of NCC internally delivered services. This is a significant concern in itself with the potential to harm future working relationships with the sector.”
- **targeting of services**: “The Troubled Families agenda presents some contradiction to the 'early support' aim of Children's Services as families that are on this list need specialist support not early intervention.”

A few respondents talked about the '**stigma**' of services provided by Children's Services, in contrast to the more 'neutral' position of voluntary agencies:

- "Most families are wary of intervention from social services as this has a **stigma** attached to it and also the fear (real or imagined) that their child can be removed from them."
- "People seem to prefer to receive support from a voluntary agency: It is seen as less obtrusive, there is less **stigma** attached to asking for help, it often provides people with a chance to connect with locally based community organisations, it is seen as being more flexible."

"As a provider of parenting support within the voluntary sector using charitable funding I am very aware there is a **stigma** attached to receiving services from the state and parents are

Summary completed 20.1.16, Business Intelligence and Performance Service, v5 FINAL

Title of proposal:	Reduce our funding for youth work
Lead Officers:	Jo Richardson, Tim Eyres, Sarah Jones, Jeremy Bone

Equality and rural assessment

Analysis of proposal & potential impact

Overview – about the proposal

1. We support activities for young people and youth work in Norfolk. Our seven youth advisory boards (YABs) are one way we do this. They are a partnership of local organisations and young people. Their role is to work together to understand what young people in different parts of Norfolk need and whether there are sufficient activities and services on offer locally for young people.
2. We also work closely with the voluntary and community sector to support people to set-up and run safe, sustainable and high-quality youth groups and projects.
3. We have to make significant savings over the next three years. So we have to think again about how we make sure there are sufficient positive activities for young people, how youth advisory boards work and how we support youth work in Norfolk.
4. We are proposing to:
 - Gradually stop the funding we give to our youth advisory boards to pay for local activities for young people, whilst they find alternative sources of funding over the next three years
 - Stop the funding we give to our youth advisory boards to pay for positive activities for young people that are at risk of becoming not in education, employment or training (NEET) or at risk of coming into care
 - Stop funding the young people and debt project in Norwich
 - Reduce our funding for Momentum Norfolk by 45%
 - Reduce our funding for promoting activities to young people.
5. This proposal would save us approximately £605,000 in 2016-17, £105,000 in 2017-18 and £105,000 in 2018-19. A total of £815,000 each year by 2018-19.

About Youth Advisory Boards

6. There are seven youth advisory boards (YABs) in Norfolk (one per district area).
7. YABs are a partnership of local organisations and young people. Their role is to work together to understand what young people in different parts of Norfolk need and whether there are sufficient activities on offer locally for young people to do in their leisure time. The law says that the council must make sure there are sufficient positive activities for young people in Norfolk. Each YAB is supported by a youth and community worker who is paid for by us, but employed by a local voluntary organisation.

8. We give each YAB a budget of £45,000 per year which they can use to help local organisations and communities do more for young people. Our aim is that they use their money to increase the number and range of activities in their area, so they might use it to help a project get started or to significantly expand.
9. We also give each YAB a share of £330,000 per year to fund projects that are for young people at risk of becoming not in education, employment or training (NEET) and young people at risk of coming into care. Each YAB gets a different amount because each area is different and the young people living there have different needs.
10. We are proposing to gradually stop the funding we give to the youth advisory boards to pay for local activities for young people, whilst they find alternative sources of funding over the next three years. There are opportunities to bid for funding from the Big Lottery, national government departments and European funding opportunities. Gradually reducing the funding would give them time to adjust to the new way of working and to find alternative funding.
11. We are also proposing to stop the funding we give to our youth advisory boards to pay for positive activities for young people that are at risk of becoming not in education, employment or training (NEET) or at risk of coming into care. We would stop giving the YABs this funding from 2016-17. As part of their move to find alternative sources of funding, the YABs could bid for money to help local projects that work with these two groups of young people.
12. Some of the youth advisory boards have already been successful in bidding for money from other sources, but we would support all the YABs with this transition. For example we would offer them all our training on how to bid for funding. We would also share information about appropriate funding opportunities that they could apply for. We recently submitted a bid to the Cabinet Office's Delivering Differently fund to secure funding to explore how else we can make the youth advisory boards more sustainable and effective. Although this was unsuccessful it helped us to work with some of the current providers to think about how we might want to develop YABs going forward
13. We would continue to pay for each youth advisory board to have support from a dedicated youth and community worker. Their role is important in terms of making sure that the partnership works well together and is focused on improving local services for young people. They help to make sure that young people are at the heart of the YAB's decision-making.
14. It is likely that the youth and community worker role would need to adapt to the new way of working though. For example they would need to have the skills to help YABs apply for funding. We would also need to explore whether it would be helpful to change the legal status of the youth advisory boards from partnerships to legal entities so that they could apply for funding.
15. How successful each youth advisory board is depends on how well the different organisations involved work together. There is a risk that if a YAB is not successful at attracting a lot of funding, then it might not appear to be worthwhile to other organisations and for young people to get involved in. There is also a risk that if alternative funding cannot be secured, more young people might end-up not in education, employment or training or coming into care.

16. In addition to continuing to pay for youth and community work to support the YABs, we also plan to continue our support for young carers and to invest in services that respond to young people's mental health needs. The support and activities that we fund for young carers and young people with mental health needs are not organised by the YABs.

How YABs identify priorities – evidence base

17. A key role of YABs is to make sure that the activities they commission address the needs of young people in rural and urban areas, and young people with protected characteristics. YABs develop a local needs analysis (based on the district's demographic profile, intelligence from agencies and young people's views) to identify priorities. A number of YABs currently identify rurality as an issue, for others the priorities are particular groups/cohorts:
- South Norfolk YAB: rural focus across all part of the district
 - Norwich YAB: mental health, lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender (LGBT) support
 - North Norfolk YAB: mental health, special educational needs (SEN), young men excluded from education, LGBT
 - West Norfolk YAB: Eastern European (Hanseatic Union), rural communities (mobile project)
 - Great Yarmouth YAB: those living in poverty, LGBT, mental health
 - Broadland YAB: Mental health, rural (grants for transport and getting to services)
 - Breckland YAB: ESOL classes for young people with English as a second language.
18. The district population profiles used by YABs are published on Norfolk Insight: www.norfolkinsight.org.uk/jsna/youngpeople

Demographic information – NEET young people

19. The young people who make up the NEET cohort are not a homogenous group. A wide range of individual circumstances and experiences contribute to a young person's NEET status and often it is the presence of multiple factors which affect a young person's ability to make a successful transition into post 16 education, training or employment.
20. Whilst young people from urban areas are more likely to be NEET, NEET young people living in rural areas often experience greater difficulties in being able to access provision due to lack of transport. They may also experience isolation from their peers which can exacerbate issues of confidence and self-esteem.
21. In the NEET group as a whole, young men made up a slightly higher proportion of the group in November 2013.
22. In addition to Free School Meals (FSM) and lack of qualifications it is evident from analysis of the Norfolk NEET group that a number of personal circumstances or factors increase the likelihood of a young person becoming NEET. These include:
- Learning difficulty or disability (LDD)
 - Pregnancy or teenage parent

- Leaving care
 - Attendance and exclusions
 - Criminal record
 - Short Stay School
23. Nationally there has been a substantial drop in the percentage of young people who are NEET. However, many areas have reported that the percentage of young people who are not able to participate in employment, education or training due to health, and specifically mental health issues, is increasing. This is a pattern which we are also seeing in Norfolk and are seeking to evidence and address.
24. The NEET/at risk of care funding of £330k has previously been distributed across the seven YABS based on need defined by risk of NEET indicators and volume of troubled families work, as well as numbers of adolescents entering the care system.

Young people and debt project in Norwich

25. We have jointly funded a project with Norwich City Council to provide benefits advice and support to young people that are at risk of receiving unemployment benefit sanctions for doing things such as arriving late to appointments at the Job Centre. We set the project up because there was an increase in the number of young people being sanctioned and this was putting them in real difficulty. The project has also considered what other support young people more generally need to prevent them from getting into financial trouble.
26. In the three months between April and June 2015, 25 young people received benefits advice because they had received sanctions and 29 young people received money management and debt advice.
27. We are proposing to stop funding the young people and debt project in Norwich. We have learnt a great deal from the project that we will share with our workforce and other organisations. If our proposal went ahead then people working for the council, such as our early help team, would be able to provide debt advice to young people who need it. This would mean that there would be more people who are able to give advice to young people. Norwich City Council could decide to continue to fund the project if this proposal goes ahead.

Momentum Norfolk

Momentum Norfolk supports voluntary and community groups that work with young people. They employ a small team of community development workers to:

- Give advice on how to set-up and run a youth group or project
 - Develop and share tools and resources for working with young people
 - Provide training on working with young people
 - Help youth groups get Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks to make sure their staff and volunteers are safe to work with young people.
 - Run a small grants programme
 - Support youth groups to find funding.
28. Momentum Norfolk works with 270 youth groups across Norfolk – 220 of which pay to receive full membership benefits. Between April 2013 and March 2014, they offered advice and support to 624 people setting-up or running a youth group,

processed 1,224 DBS checks, ran or organised training for 273 people and awarded grants to 21 youth groups.

29. We are proposing to reduce our funding for Momentum Norfolk by 45%. This would save £50,000 per year from 2016/17. If this proposal goes ahead, we would work with Momentum Norfolk to prioritise the work it carries out and the service it offers.

Funding for promoting youth activities

30. We have a small budget that is used for raising awareness of the activities on offer for young people in Norfolk. This helps us with our legal duty to make sure there are sufficient positive activities for young people in Norfolk. For the past two years we have given each youth advisory board £3,500 to promote leisure activities locally and in a way that appeals to young people. We are proposing to reduce how much we spend on this by 50%.
31. YABs have spent some previous funding on things that they will continue to benefit from, for example they have used it to create websites and to get training to help them write policies and procedures so that their social media accounts are used safely.

Potential impact

32. If the proposal goes ahead, it may have a disproportionate impact on young people, as young people and organisations supporting young people are the main beneficiaries of the funding and support.
33. However, at this stage, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will have a significant detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or rural areas. This is because, if the proposal is agreed, we will continue to work with YABs to ensure they continue to prioritise equity for young people from rural areas and with protected characteristics.
34. The loss of £45,000 previously paid to different voluntary organisations to provide activities could conceivably make some smaller organisations unsustainable, even though organisations will have been aware that funding was time limited. However, some smaller organisations may have planned on the basis of continued but unconfirmed funding to operate their programmes, and may not be sustainable without it. However, it is not possible to predict this on the basis of the evidence available.
35. Stakeholders are currently reflecting on what the proposed loss of funding may mean for them as an organisation. We are exploring with stakeholders whether the proposals could lead to a loss of jobs or community capacity in rural communities. The County Council will work with stakeholders to explore their future options.

Action to address any negative impact

	Action/s	Lead	Date
1.	Continue to work with YABs to ensure they continue to prioritise equity for young people from rural areas and with protected characteristics.	Assistant Director, Early Help & Prevention	From 1 April 2016
2.	Work with affected stakeholders to ensure that the reduction in funding does not disproportionately impact on groups supporting young people with protected characteristics or rural areas.	Assistant Director, Early Help & Prevention	From 1 April 2016

List of evidence used to conduct analysis

- Relevant legislation: Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty; Human Rights Act 1998
- The findings of public consultation on these proposals– as well as feedback from residents and stakeholders in the Council's previous budget consultations (e.g. the Big Conversation and Putting People First).

Consultation findings

Title of proposal
Reduce our funding for youth work

Respondent Numbers – Number and percent agree, disagree and don't know/blank where applicable. If relevant also include numbers of respondents who were service users and carers

- There were **530** responses received for this proposal.
- 325 people (61.32%) disagreed with the proposal
 - 138 people (26.04%) agreed with the proposal
 - 67 people (12.64%) told us that they did not know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Analysis of responses

Organisation, group or petition responses	
<p>Please describe any petitions received.</p> <p>Please record any groups or organisations which responded.</p>	<p>Of the group of adults with learning disabilities who attended an About With Friends consultation event, 35 agreed with the proposal and none disagreed.</p> <p>45 respondents told us they were responding on behalf of a business, organisation or group, these were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult Day Care Limited • Aylsham Town Council • Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk (Policy & Partnerships Team) • Break Charity • Broadland District Council • Broadland YAB • Chill and Chat young people's group, MAP • Chloe Smith MP • Cinema Plus (Cinema City) • Community Action Norfolk • Diss Town Council • Flegg Youth Action Group, Flegg High School • Great Yarmouth Borough Council • Great Yarmouth YAB youth action group based at Flegg High School • Great Yarmouth YAB youth action group based at MAP in Great Yarmouth • Great Yarmouth Youth Action Group • Horizons (a youth project run by MAP) • King's Lynn and West Norfolk Youth Advisory Board (YAB) • Malcolm Books • Mind • Momentum

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mums in the Know Norwich • Norfolk County Council and Stonham Home Group • Norfolk Record Society • Norfolk Young Carers Forum • North Norfolk District Council • Northrepps Parish Council • Norwich City Council • Ormesby St Margaret parish council • Ormesby with Scratby Parish Council • Parish Council (not named) • Poringland Parish Council • Sheringham Town council • South Norfolk District Council • Swanton Morley Parish Council • Tasburgh Parish Council • Taverham Parish Council • The Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk • The BUILD Charity • The Matthew Project • Thetford Town Council • Unite social group. • YMCA Norfolk • Young members of the Chill 'N' Chat Social Group • Your Own Place CIC
<p>Please summarise all petition or group responses.</p>	<p>Of the 39 organisations which responded to an agree/disagree/don't know question, 8 agreed with the proposal and 28 disagreed: the main reasons for disagreeing were services are preventative, vital to young people's wellbeing, and save money in the longer run. The remaining organisations said they didn't know or didn't answer. 7 did not know. Organisational responses are included in the comments below.</p>

Looking at all of the responses, are there any consistent, repeated or notable reasons given for people's views in...	
<p>Agreeing with the proposal?</p>	<p>138 (26.04%) people who responded to this question agreed with the proposed cut.</p> <p>The main reasons for agreeing with the proposal are about partners' and individuals/communities roles in providing youth activities.</p> <p>19 comments were received about the role of partners in delivering services: "this is a service that I think is more appropriate for the voluntary and community service". / "Much of this can and should be funded by the voluntary sector, and does not need to be a priority for the council". / "Parish councils can play a much wider and more important role in this by engaging with youths and encouraging them to participate in activities such as walking</p>

	<p>footpaths and cutting back hedges etc. doing jobs for aged or vulnerable adults.”</p> <p>The responsibility of individuals and communities in resourcing youth services was mentioned by 18 people: “we cannot continue to prop up local activities for young people. Communities should fund and organise this for their young people”. Other suggestions included increased participation by parents (“more effort should go into making parents sort the problems out as well as finding things to do”).</p> <p>Alternative means of funding for youth activities was a point made in 13 comments: “I can see that this might be the only option. Every effort should be made to help the youth advisory boards to find alternative funding” or “totally agree, cancel this budget. If Youth advisory boards are set up they should be self-funding”. One respondent suggested that “private funding has to be the key - this is not a statutory requirement provision I'm guessing”. However the difficulties in sourcing funding in a time of austerity was also noted by some who agreed with a proviso: “providing alternative funding can be sourced”.</p> <p>13 people said the service is ‘not essential’: “youth work is unimportant close the service”, or that it is not a priority area, “although I am sure this is a good cause the money should go towards more vulnerable people such as disabled, old people and vulnerable children.”</p> <p>64 of the 138 people who agreed with this proposal did not give a reason for their viewpoint. Some wrote freetext responses such as “reluctantly agree”, “see above”, “no further comment” or “seems sensible”, but the vast majority of the 64 wrote nothing so we cannot know the reasons for their agreement.</p>
Disagreeing with the proposal?	<p>325 (61.32%) people who responded to this question disagreed with the proposed cut.</p> <p>The main reason for disagreeing was that youth services are a preventative service which helps to prevent issues from escalating. 76 people commented on the preventative element of youth services and some specifically referred to the YABs: “they are excellent in providing preventative work hence saving money in the future”. / “Any work with the young of the county is about early intervention and promoting aspiration and encouraging them to build a better future.” / “The cost of 'mopping up' after young people turn to crime and drugs, therefore further reducing their life opportunities is INFINITELY more than what you propose to save!”</p> <p>66 people told us that the proposal was short-sighted as cuts made now would create greater costs in the future: “There is a real risk that by reducing funding for youth work more young people</p>

	<p>might end-up not in education, employment or training or coming into care, and thereby cost NCC much more money in the long run. Short sighted!" / "Those who are at risk of becoming NEET are vulnerable and require targeted support. The cost of not doing so will have the effect of costing more in the short, medium and longer terms."</p> <p>The role of youth services in supporting young people's wellbeing and development was also mentioned by 65 people: "It addresses personal, social and emotional development, essential to equip young people with the skills and tools to affect and create a better society in the long term. To cut youth work services is short term thinking". Some respondents focussed on the benefits of maintaining services which promote wellbeing "if we are to help the youth of today become the balanced adults and active citizens of the future, who will contribute positively to society, we must protect youth work services" and some on the negative effects of ceasing youth services: "the youth needs something to do, otherwise they find things to do, which can cause trouble for the whole community."</p> <p>63 people commented on the cumulative nature of previous and proposed cuts to youth services: "Norfolk has already cut the youth service in previous cuts. Please keep these vital and life changing services for young people" and "I thought you had cut 10 million from youth work already". Some respondents noted that "young people have already had the brunt of a lot of cuts" and one person described the service as having been "cut to the bone". The effect of cumulative cuts on young people was noted: "Youth Sector has been drastically cut over the past years and the effects are noticeable with young adults less prepared for the world after full time education".</p> <p>63 people disagreed on the grounds that youth services are a key service, described as 'very important' or 'vital': "these services are just too important to be cut. We should not risk vulnerable young people being set adrift without adequate support; there is too much danger that they would be lost to society".</p>
--	---

Don't know: Of the 'Don't Know' responses (and where explanatory text is provided), what are the main reasons why people are unable to come to a clear decision?

67 (12.64%) ticked the 'don't know' option. There was no consensus around the reasons people gave for choosing this option: in addition to certain **provisos**, only the **preventative** nature of youth services was mentioned more than 6 times.

Analyst notes	
Any other things you think report writers should	No comments were received about our actual or perceived legal duties.

know when presenting findings

2 comments were received about carers: both said young carers are vulnerable and should be supported.

45 people **critiqued** the proposal on the basis of:

- the **effectiveness** of current provision: “You shouldn't need 7 youth advisory boards if any needed one running properly would do”.
- the **evidence base** underpinning services: “they should be evaluated better and more results driven by the youth workers involved” and “they are so poorly evaluated they cannot prove their worth”.
- **existing youth work is poor**: “our youth work is already the poorest virtually in the country. So much was lost 5 years or so ago”.
- It appears to **contradict other proposals or our aims**: “this proposal flies in the face of the strategy being proposed in Adult Care (invest to save) and will result in more challenging children further down the line”. / “I fundamentally disagree with this proposal and do not believe that it is in line and consistent with the council's professed approach to early help.”
- **perceptions of NCC**: “this proposed cut is an indication of NCC’s lack of respect for the voluntary sector and lack or acknowledgement of the significant contribution it is making to NCC's key priorities” and “we feel young people's views are not being taken into consideration”.
- **‘disproportionate’** targeting: “youth services in Norfolk have been disproportionately targeted for savings compared to other authorities and compared to other services within your authority. ... this is also disproportionate to other areas of savings in the current consultation , and furthermore is concerned that the drop is being misrepresented.”

Concern was expressed that if the proposal went ahead it would be more difficult for young people to make their **views heard** and that they would be ‘disenfranchised’:

- “This is one of the worst ideas that I have ever heard. ... Young people are ignored far too much already, without further reducing their ability to help shape how their services are run.”
- "The YAB is also responsible for the collective voice of approximately 6000 young people being heard by

	<p>organisations across the district and their needs and ideas being integrated into services."</p> <p>"Young people are disenfranchised - no democratic way to express their view despite paying tax from 16. Who speaks up for them?"</p>
--	---

Summary completed 20.1.16, Business Intelligence and Performance Service v5 FINAL

Title of proposal:	Change how we provide support to families who are struggling to cope with the challenges they face
Lead Officers:	Jo Richardson, Tim Eyres, Sarah Jones, Jeremy Bone

Equality and rural assessment

Analysis of proposal & potential impact

Overview – more about the proposal

1. We have contracts with two organisations to run Family Intervention Projects. They work with families who have multiple challenges in their lives, such as unemployment, homelessness, poor school attendance, substance misuse, domestic abuse and mental and physical health problems.
2. We are proposing to not renew these two contracts when they end. Instead our early help teams and partners within the early help hubs will provide support to families. This would save approximately £580,000 per year from 2017-18.
3. Norwich City Council and Stonham Homestay run these services. Our arrangement with Norwich City Council will come to an end in March 2017. Children's Services contributes £100,500 of funding, with Norwich City Council providing £300,000. Children's Services contributes £430,000 to the Stonham Homestay Family Intervention Project.
4. Since we commissioned Norwich City Council and Stonham Homestay to run these services, the Government has launched its nationwide Troubled Families programme phase II to work with families facing multiple challenges. The Government has identified that Norfolk has 5650 families facing multiple challenges. Over the past 3 years our Children's Services' teams and the FIP providers have successfully worked with 1700 of these families.
5. Our reorganisation and the expansion of the Troubled Families programme in Norfolk has resulted in new opportunities for supporting families differently. We are proposing to not renew the contracts we have for the Family Intervention Projects when they end. Instead our social work and early help teams and partners working in our early help hubs will provide support to families.
6. The Family Intervention Projects delivered by Norwich City Council and Stonham Homestay are delivered from a range of locations in Norfolk. This was based on an expectation that Stonham would cover all of the county except for Norwich. The County Council did not stipulate locations for delivery beyond this coverage requirement. In practice FIP delivery has been higher in Great Yarmouth, Thetford and Norwich.
7. The service users supported through the two projects are from a variety of backgrounds. The City Council's report for 2014/15 indicated that 50% of families

had two parents present and over 50% had 2 or less children. A report on the youth mediation element (supporting young people at risk of becoming homeless AND NOT AFFECTED by this budget proposal) showed around a third of referrals were female and two thirds male.

8. The volume of service users is higher in more deprived communities. The volume tends to be higher in urban communities, but families come from a wide range of communities.

Potential impact

9. At this stage, no significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas is identified. This is because if the proposal goes ahead, our early help teams would continue to provide support to families. This would mean that families would continue to be supported, but they would receive the support from a different person providing an alternative intervention.
10. It should be noted that deprivation is an issue for many of those currently supported by these contracts.
11. We do not anticipate that the change of arrangements will have any impact on travel arrangements for people in rural areas currently receiving support. We are committed to models of delivery that takes support to where families are, rather than expecting people to come to services.

List of evidence used to conduct analysis

- Relevant legislation: Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty; Human Rights Act 1998
- The findings of public consultation on these proposals– as well as feedback from residents and stakeholders in the Council's previous budget consultations (e.g. the Big Conversation and Putting People First).

Consultation findings

Title of proposal
Change how we provide support to families who are struggling to cope with the challenges they face

Respondent Numbers – Number and percent agree, disagree and don't know/blank where applicable. If relevant also include numbers of respondents who were service users and carers
<p>There were 463 responses received for this proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 135 people (29.16%) disagreed with the proposal • 229 people (49.46%) agreed with the proposal • 99 people (21.38%) told us that they did not know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Analysis of responses

Organisation, group or petition responses	
<p>Please describe any petitions received.</p> <p>Please record any groups or organisations which responded.</p>	<p>Of the group of adults with learning disabilities who attended an About With Friends consultation event, 1 agreed with the proposal and 34 disagreed with the proposal.</p> <p>30 respondents told us they were responding on behalf of a business, organisation or group. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult Day Care Limited • Aylsham Town Council • Break Charity • Broadland YAB • Cinema Plus (Cinema City) • Community Action Norfolk • Diss Town Council • Family Matters (included family and professional's views) • Great Yarmouth Borough Council • Healthwatch • Malcolm Books • Mind • Mums in the Know Norwich • Norfolk County Council and Stonham Home Group • Norfolk Record Society • North Norfolk District Council • Northrepps Parish Council • Ormesby St Margaret Parish council • Ormesby with Scratby Parish Council • Parish Council (not named) • Poringland Parish Council • Sheringham Town council • South Norfolk District Council

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swanton Morley Parish Council • Tasburgh Parish Council • Taverham Parish Council • The BUILD Charity • The Matthew Project • Unite social group. • Your Own Place CIC
Please summarise all petition or group responses.	Of the 24 organisations which responded to an agree/disagree/don't know question, 14 agreed with the proposal: 6 disagreed, and 4 did not know. There was no overall consensus in the responses.

Looking at all of the responses, are there any consistent, repeated or notable reasons given for people's views in...

Agreeing with the proposal?	<p>229 (49.46%) people who responded to this question agreed with the proposed change.</p> <p>33 people agreed with the proposal with a proviso concerning continuity, quality of service, or resourcing: "as long as the people who need the support get it from somewhere that is the most important thing. If you can do that without having long term and costly contracts as described above then that's fine". / "This seems reasonable ASSUMING adequate resourcing of the county team(s) and of partner voluntary groups." / "Provided that the service standard does not fall, this appears to be a reasonable way to achieve savings." / "So long as families are still able to receive support in one form or another, I see no issue with the proposed changes."</p> <p>The main reason for agreeing was that we can provide this service ourselves ("in-house") through the new Early Help teams without the need to commission outside organisations. 27 people commented on our ability to provide parenting services: "I am confident that we have the necessary skills, knowledge and experience within Norfolk County Council departments to provide these services without using these particular external organisations". People also noted the risk of potential duplication when NCC and external teams provide similar services: "The new Early Help Service investment should be doing this. Why duplicate funding?". The cost of commissioning services was also noted: "externally bought in services are an expensive option and should be minimised". Some respondents' agreement was based on a broader principal about who should provide services: "I do not agree with outside services" and "I think it is always sensible to run these programmes and support services internally rather than pay external organisations".</p> <p>16 people made reference to how efficiently the service is run: "Surely paying for 4 contracts is not efficient!" / Is sub contracting best value for money? Especially 4 different parties." / "We should be looking at reducing duplication of services."/ "This proposal</p>
-----------------------------	--

	<p>eliminates duplication.” / “Need for better co-ordination with existing services.”</p> <p>116 of the 229 people who agreed with this proposal did not give a reason for their viewpoint. Some wrote freetext responses such as “reluctantly agree”, “see above”, “no further comment” or “seems sensible”, but the vast majority of the 116 wrote nothing so we cannot know the reasons for their agreement.</p>
<p>Disagreeing with the proposal?</p>	<p>135 (29.16%) people who responded to this question disagreed with the proposed cut.</p> <p>The main reasons for disagreeing were that the service is important (a ‘key service’ and is preventative. Some respondents who commented on the preventative nature of parenting services made reference to the possible cessation of the service: “you say early support is key but then take all the funding from parent support programmes”.</p> <p>23 respondents disagreed with changes to parenting services because the provision is a key service, described as “very important” or “vital”: “services that provide parenting support programmes are critical to preventing perpetual cycle of marginalisation, poverty, lack of engagement in education etc. People don't always access this type of support in conventional ways and therefore it is vital that these types of services remain as they often work with the most hard to reach - offering them a safe place to get help with parenting. “</p> <p>20 respondents referred to the service as being preventative, stopping issues before they escalate into crisis: “it would be tragic to think that early support for parents and children is withdrawn, meaning that children develop much greater problems in later life. It is likely to cost the council much more in the long run due to the increased need for crisis care”. / “I think that targeting support early on is an effective way to prevent problems later. “</p> <p>15 respondents considered the proposal to be shortsighted, potentially costing more further down the line: “Parenting support is already targeting those that need the most help. Withdrawing support from these groups will result in poorer outcomes for children who need it the most which will ultimately end up costing society more. It is a short-term policy leaving later generations to pay the price and pick up the bill.” / “Reducing funding to an intervention service is a false economy and will cost more money in the long term.”</p> <p>13 respondents stated that the service would be delivered more effectively by commissioned organisations than by Norfolk County Council: “Early Help teams aren't big enough to do this piece of work. You'll need to spend money to bring in more staff (and management!) so why not just leave it with the existing agencies.” / “I am amazed that despite two recent inadequate Ofsted inspections,</p>

	NCC still believes it can provide better Early Help services than the voluntary sector and that you are proposing to end your voluntary sector contracts in order to bring the services back 'in house'. My experience of working with the Early Help Hubs so far are that they are disorganised, do not work in partnership and have staff who are not as experienced or as qualified as the staff in the current voluntary sector services."
--	--

Don't know: Of the 'Don't Know' responses (and where explanatory text is provided), what are the main reasons why people are unable to come to a clear decision?

99 (21.38%) ticked the 'don't know' option. Of these, **23** people **critiqued** the proposal on the grounds of insufficient information ("this is too technical for a lay person to decide upon"); aspects of parenting service provider contracts ("can't tell whether the contracts ending represent good value. If they don't why did you enter into them - and why are you more likely to get it 'right' this time?"); and the evidence base or outcomes ("I believe you should sponsor independent research to establish whether your early intervention support is effective." / "Do not know enough about the impact").

Analyst notes

Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings	<p>No comments were received about our actual or perceived legal duties.</p> <p>55 people critiqued the proposal on the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • insufficient information on which to reach a decision: "would need more information as to how alternatives will be delivered". • queries about the effectiveness of the service: "poor outcomes for this sort of investment". • doubts about our capabilities to manage the service: "this seems counter to your aspiration to become a smaller council - what evidence is there that NCC is better at providing these services ? Council Services are rated as inadequate I don't have any faith that these would be provided better by NCC". • the role of the voluntary sector: "The Early Help Hubs are a new initiative with no track record of delivery. Its focus mirrors many of those services delivered by the VCSE identified for cuts (CHL011,CHL009 etc). This is viewed as a real concern by many VCSE organisations who see this as a disinvestment in the VCSE sector in favour of NCC internally delivered services. This is a significant concern in itself with the potential to harm future working relationships with the sector." • targeting of services: "The Troubled Families agenda presents some contradiction to the 'early support' aim of Children's Services as families that are on this list need specialist support not early intervention."
--	---

Title of proposal:	Keep all children's centres open and focus their work on supporting the families that need them most
Lead Officers:	Jo Richardson, Tim Eyres, Sarah Jones, Jeremy Bone

Equality and rural assessment

Analysis of proposal & potential impact

Overview – about the proposal

1. Children's centres offer all families with children under five a range of services, information and support in their local community. The support varies but most offer advice from pregnancy and after a baby is born, play sessions, parenting support, information about children's health needs, training courses for adults, as well as support finding specialist groups and services.
2. Children's centres help to reduce inequality and improve children's health, education and social development so that they are ready to start school. However we need to make significant savings over the next three years and so we need to think again about how our children's centres work.
3. We are proposing to keep all children's centres open and focus their work on supporting the families that need them most. This would save approximately £3,044,000 (£1,826,000 in 2016-17, £609,000 in 2017-18 and £609,000 in 2018-19).
4. Children's Services Committee formed a task and finish group to consider how well our children's centres were performing and the future of children's centres. They reported their findings to the committee in January 2015. As a result of the findings, we are proposing to keep all children's centres open and focus their work on supporting the families that need them most. For example families who are struggling with unemployment, substance misuse, domestic abuse, mental or physical health problems.
5. Our current revenue budget for children's centres is approximately £12,540,000 per year. We would reduce the funding for children's centres by 25%, whilst at the same time asking them to focus their work on these families and to make their service more efficient. We would gradually reduce the funding over the three years, reducing it by £1,826,000 (15%) in 2016-17, a further £609,000 (5%) in 2017-18 and a final £609,000 (5%) in 2018-19. This would save a total of £3,044,000 per year from 2018-19.
6. Other organisations run our children's centres on our behalf. All of the current contracts for running our children's centres end in March 2016. We are asking all the organisations that run the children's centres whether they would like to extend their contacts until the end of March 2019. If there are any organisations that do not

want to extend their contract under the proposed new arrangements, we would go out to tender for a new organisation to run the centres between April 2016 and March 2019.

7. We will discuss with the organisations that run the children's centres what changes they would need to make if this proposal goes ahead. It might mean that some families would have to pay for some activities run by children's centres. It might also mean that some services stop. It would be up to each children's centre to work with families and their local community to decide which services and activities to run.

Who the proposal is most likely to affect

8. In total there are 53 children's centres across Norfolk (see Annex 1).
9. As well as providing and signposting families to universal services, children's centres must reach and tailor services towards target groups who have been identified as potentially vulnerable to poor outcomes. This includes:
 - Lone parents
 - Young carers
 - Looked After Children
 - Teenage parents and pregnant teenagers
 - Children in workless households
 - Children in Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups
 - Disabled children and parents
 - LGBT (Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender)
10. Children's centres have had to balance the necessity of providing a universal offer for all children and young people with the duty to support those most in need. Over recent years, children's centres have successfully developed targeted work as they increase their reach and better understand the needs of the communities they serve. However, the recent task and finish group on children's centres examined a range of issues (some highlighted below) that bring into a sharper focus the need to prioritise the work of children's centres on supporting families that need them most:
 - Black, Asian and minority ethnic groups and families with English as a second language may be two groups that are not well served;
 - Fathers and Male Carers seem to be doing poorly in terms of service delivery;
 - Families with a Pregnant Teenager – data shows very low figures for Great Yarmouth, for example, where we would expect there to be larger numbers.

(Extract from Children's Centre Report March 2014).

Potential impact

11. At this stage, no significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas is identified. This is because if the proposal goes ahead, we will continue to keep all children's centres open and focus their work on supporting the families that need them most. The proposal may have positive impacts on some protected groups given increased prioritisation of support.

12. However, if the proposal goes ahead, it may be the case that some children's centres start charging for services that were previously free. It is recognised that some people with protected characteristics (e.g. disabled people) tend to fall into lower income groups compared to other people. In view of this, consideration should take place of a discretionary concessionary rate. This would enable disabled parents or others on low incomes who might not otherwise be able to afford the entry fee to continue to receive support.

Action to address any negative impact

	Action/s	Lead	Date
1.	Consideration given to applying discretionary concessionary rates to any proposal to introduce fees. This would enable disabled parents or others on low incomes who might not otherwise be able to afford the entry fee to continue to receive support.	Assistant Director, Early Help & Prevention	From 1 April 2016

List of evidence used to conduct analysis

- Relevant legislation: Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty; Human Rights Act 1998
- The findings of public consultation on these proposals– as well as feedback from residents and stakeholders in the Council's previous budget consultations (e.g. the Big Conversation and Putting People First).

Consultation findings

Title of proposal
Keep all children's centres open and focus their work on supporting the families that need them most.

Respondent Numbers – Number and percent agree, disagree and don't know/blank where applicable. If relevant also include numbers of respondents who were service users and carers
<p>There were 475 responses received for this proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 324 people (68.21%) agreed with the proposal • 98 people (20.63%) disagreed with the proposal • 53 people (11.16%) told us that they did not know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal

Analysis of responses

Organisation, group or petition responses	
Please describe any petitions received.	Of the group of adults with learning disabilities who attended an About With Friends consultation event, 4 agreed and 22 disagreed with the proposal.
Please record any groups or organisations which responded.	<p>27 respondents told us that they were responding on behalf of a business, organisation or group. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult Day Care Limited • Aylsham Town Council • Break Charity • Broadland YAB • Cinema Plus (Cinema City) • Cromer Town Council • Diss Town Council • Great Yarmouth Borough Council x3 • King's Lynn and West Norfolk Youth Advisory Board (YAB) • Long Stratton Parish Council • Malcolm Books • Mind • Mums in the Know Norwich • Norfolk County Council and Stonham Home Group • Norfolk Record Society • North Norfolk District Council • Northrepps Parish Council • Ormesby St Margaret parish council • Ormesby with Scratby Parish Council • Parish Council (not named) • Poringland Parish Council • Sheringham Town council • South Norfolk District Council • Tasburgh Parish Council • Taverham Parish Council

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BUILD Charity • The Matthew Project • Unite social group. • Your Own Place CIC
Please summarise all petition or group responses.	18 of the organisations agreed with the proposal but no reason was cited more than twice so no consensus emerged. Of the 8 organisations which disagreed, three noted the preventative nature of the service. 1 organisation ticked 'don't know'.

Looking at all of the responses, are there any consistent, repeated or notable reasons given for people's views in...

Agreeing with the proposal?	<p>324 (68.21%) people who responded to this question agreed with the proposed cut.</p> <p>The main reason for agreeing with the proposal is that services should be better targeted. 38 people commented on the need for a different focus or target of services: "this is a large saving and there are many families who do not need this service, so I think the focus on those who do need the service is correct", and "it seems to make sense to keep these centres open with a more focussed remit". / "Service is required however needs to be focused to those who really need it." / "Although I would love for all families to receive help and support from children's centre, I appreciate that during lean times we may need to focus efforts on those than need support most."</p> <p>29 people agreed but with a proviso: "Yes I agree as long as they actually provide a broader range of services" and "I agree in principle but.....only if the way these families are supported changes significantly. I don't think more of the same that clearly hasn't worked in the past will be good value for money". / "As long as the service continues to support those in most need."</p> <p>20 comments were received about the service being important, or a 'key service': "Children's centres are a vital part of the community." / "This is the most significant and realistic strand of providing early help to children and families" and "this is vitally important. The centres are successful and will be in greater need in the future." / "A very necessary resource."</p> <p>196 of the 324 people who agreed with this proposal did not give a reason for their viewpoint. Some wrote freetext responses such as "reluctantly agree", "see above", "no further comment" or "seems sensible", but the vast majority of the 196 wrote nothing so we cannot know the reasons for their agreement.</p>
	98 (20.63%) people who responded to this question disagreed with the proposed cut.

<p>Disagreeing with the proposal?</p>	<p>The main reasons for disagreeing are that services should be universal and the service is a preventative one.</p> <p>27 people said that Children’s Centres should provide services for everyone: “access to family centres should not be restricted” and “this should be universal”. A few people pointed to the difficulty in assessing need if services ceased to be universal: “who would decide on which families are 'in most need' and how?”, and also to the risk of inaccurate assessment: “all children and parents need this access, many children may fall through the net as they do not actually appear in your target group but they may still be at risk. Post-natal depression, domestic violence, social pressures are present in lots of different families with differing circumstances and may not be on any radar”.</p> <p>18 people disagreed because they said existing services are preventative (“if you don't support borderline families you will end up with more families in crisis”) and a universal approach is better than targeting services: “isn't prevention better than cure. Some support to all will save in the long run, rather than targeted support when things have unravelled and families are in great difficulty” and “if you don't support borderline families you will end up with more families in crisis”. / “Again this approach will mean preventative work will not occur leaving schools and the LA to pick up the pieces further down the line.”</p>
---------------------------------------	---

<p>Don't know: Of the 'Don't Know' responses (and where explanatory text is provided), what are the main reasons why people are unable to come to a clear decision?</p>	
<p>53 (11.16%) ticked the 'don't know' option. There was no consensus around the reasons people gave for choosing this option although 13 people critiqued the proposal.</p>	

<p>Analyst notes</p>	
<p>Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings</p>	<p>No comments were received about our actual or perceived legal duties.</p> <p>45 people critiqued the proposal on the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • insufficient information about evidence, outcomes or value for money: “No evidence that any of this is value for money.” / “Hard to judge the impacts on people using these services.” / “Not sure that children's centres have consistently supported those families most at need?” • our approach: “it is apparent that demand for this service is not being reduced, as such that would indicate that it is ineffective at changing the situation that the problem families present themselves. These continued problems are not being changed by these services. A complete re-evaluation

	<p>is needed as this just seems to support the continuation of the problems”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• eligibility (universal v targeted): “Who would decide on which families are 'in most need' and how? This is a dangerous precedent to set as the threshold would be lower than it should be, depending on the funds available, and families who still need the support but are not identified as in MOST need would not be supported.” / “Would this lead to a further division in society - the labelling of 'needy' and 'not needy'?”• the information supplied: “what does this actually mean in practice, very hard to make a decision on something so vaguely laid out.” / “Families that need them most” is a very vague concept; we need more details as to exactly which families would be excluded from the reduced service”. / “This proposal isn't clear. Is it suggesting that families who do not really need the support wouldn't be welcome, or that they would have to pay? How would it be determined if you 'need' support or not?”. / “Not clear what savings are proposed.” / “A very poorly worded proposal - it seems like you are pretending to be investing in Children's Centres when in fact you are cutting the budget. Not cool.”
--	---

Summary completed 20.1.16, Business Intelligence and Performance Service, v5 FINAL

1 The **protected characteristics** are: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity might mean:

- (a) Removing or minimizing disadvantages suffered by people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- (b) Taking steps to meet the needs of people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of others;
- (c) Encouraging people who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such people is disproportionately low.

2 Prohibited conduct:

Direct discrimination occurs when someone is treated less favourably than another person because of a protected characteristic they have or are thought to have, or because they associate with someone who has a protected characteristic.

Indirect discrimination occurs when a condition, rule, policy or practice in your organisation that applies to everyone disadvantages people who share a protected characteristic.

Harassment is “unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic, which has the purpose or effect of violating an individual’s dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that individual”.

Victimisation occurs when an employee is treated badly because they have made or supported a complaint or raised a grievance under the Equality Act; or because they are suspected of doing so. An employee is not protected from victimisation if they have maliciously made or supported an untrue complaint.

3 Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between people and communities involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to (a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding.