

Additional Savings 2018/19 – 2020/21 Full Council – February 2018



Appendix C

www.lancashire.gov.uk

	Contents	Page
1	Additional Savings – Cabinet November 2017	3
2	Additional Savings – Cabinet December 2017	7
3	Additional Savings – Cabinet January 2018	74

Money Matters -Additional Savings 2018/19 – 2020/21 November 2017



www.lancashire.gov.uk

	Contents	Page
3	CORP003 – TERMS AND CONDITIONS	5

CORP003 – TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Service Name:		LCC Wide –	Staffing Budgets	
Which 'start year' c relate to 2018/19, 2		20	2018/19	
Gross budget 2017	/18	£31	9.042m	
Income 2017/18			N/A	
Net budget 2017/18	}	£31	9.042m	
Savings Target and	l Profiling (discrete	year):		
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
£m	£m	£m	£m	
-3.750	-1.250	0.000	-5.000	
FTE implications:				
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000	
Decisions needed to deliver the budgete savings	d Council and	terms and conditions enter into formal co rade Unions to achie	nsultations with the	
Impact upon servio	e This may resu turnover.	ult in low staff morale	and increased staff	
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	s.188 of the (Consolidation which would tr	vould be required to s Trade Union and Act 1992 on the reco rigger a formal consult purpose of the consult	Labour Relations ognised trade unions ation of not less than	

to reach a collective agreement to introduce proposed changes to employment terms and conditions.
The Notice is required as if a collective agreement cannot be reached then the Council could only introduce the changes legally by dismissing staff and at the same time offering re-engagement on the basis of the new terms and conditions
An Equality Analysis will be undertaken for Cabinet to consider to comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty when the outcome of the consultation is reported back to Cabinet.

Money Matters -Additional Savings 2018/19 – 2020/21 (including Equality Impact Assessments) Cabinet – December 2017



www.lancashire.gov.uk

	Contents	Page
1	Street Lighting Maintenance	9
2	Conservation and Collection Team	22
3	Information Centres	25
4	Advocacy Services	38
5	Extra Sheltered Care Services	58

CMTY014 – STREET LIGHTING MAINTENANCE

Service Name:			Street Lighting Maintenance	
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21			2018/19	
Gross budget 2017	/18		£	5.029m
Income 2017/18			£	1.036m
Net budget 2017/18			£	3.993m
Savings Target and	l Profiling (d	discrete y	vear):	
2018/19	2019	9/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£r	n	£m	£m
-1.715	-0.4	46	0.000	-2.161
ETE implicational				
FTE implications: 2018/19	2019/	20	2020/21	Total
0.00	-11.0	-	0.00	-11.00
deliver the budgete savings	Agree cycle Agree	on the illu to the ca	minated network fro	epairs.
Impact upon servic	be rec Likely servic repair	uired res to be cha e will be r s.	ulting in a reduced a inges to performand nore reactive to put	blically reported fault
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	Under	Undertake consultation as necessary		
What are the risks associated with thi saving and how will they be mitigated	s which I of LEI Any ri establ	There is a risk of increased complaints about lights out which is mitigated by the recent and ongoing installation of LED lamps, across much of the network.Any risks could be mitigated through consultation on the establishment of a new policy and its communication to stakeholders.		

What does this service deliver?

The service provides and maintains street lighting and illuminated signs and bollards on the highway network in Lancashire. This includes the design, maintenance and installation of lighting assets. The service also manages the asset data to ensure energy efficiencies are realised.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Cash limit options CMTY014 Street Lighting Budget For Decision Making Items

November 2017

County Council

www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decisionmakers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sectorguidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

To agree proposals on reducing for the County Council's Street Lighting budget.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Reduce routine maintenance and inspection by 50%

Agree to cease night time inspections.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The decision will affect people across Lancashire in a broadly similar way and will be kept under review.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Lighting is provided for all Highway Users and it is not anticipated that there will an adverse impact to these groups over other groups.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

No

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

A reduction in maintenance and inspection may lead to more street lighting faults or in longer times to fix faults. However, faults will continue to be repaired as they are identified. It is though acknowledged that many protected characteristics groups such as older and younger people, disabled people, those with diverse religious or ethnic backgrounds, the LGBT community and male or female residents may feel concerned about any proposals affecting street lighting due to the concerns, perceptions and fears of impacts this may have on crime, hate incidents, hate crimes or other anti-social behaviour.

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific subgroups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

Lighting is provided for all Highway Users and it is not anticipated that there will an adverse impact to these groups over other groups, as the human eye naturally adapts to changes in lighting levels and the changes involve represent a very small proportion compared to the range of light the human eye can adapt to. Consequently it is not anticipated that people with protected characteristics will be adversely affected by this proposal.

It is acknowledged that many protected characteristics groups such as older and younger people, disabled people, those with diverse religious or ethnic backgrounds, the LGBT community and male or female residents may feel concerned about any proposals affecting street lighting due to the concerns, perceptions and fears of impacts this may have on crime, hate incidents, hate crimes or other anti-social behaviour.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

There has been no engagement or consultation regarding this proposal.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities

- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

A reduction in maintenance and inspection may lead to more street lighting faults or in longer times to fix faults. However, faults will continue to be repaired as they are identified.

If faults are not reported or go unfixed this could lead to some feelings of isolation or people being more reluctant to go out, the perception of safety or concerns of crime, anti-social behaviour generally and hate crime from protected characteristics groups. If this is widespread there is a risk that some of the Public Sector Equality Duty's aims such as fostering good relations/community cohesion and advancing equality of opportunity/participating in public life might be affected in connection with this proposal.

Question 4 – Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions

within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

None identified

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how -

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal - briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Continue with the original proposal as no significant changes have been identified.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed. All roads are expected to retain street lighting under this proposal and identified faults will continue to be fixed.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

This proposal contributes towards savings needed to bridge the gap in the medium term financial strategy. Faults will continue to be fixed as they are identified and there is not expected to be any significant disproportionate impact on groups sharing protected characteristics.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Reduce routine maintenance and inspection by 50%

Agree to cease night time inspections.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

The monitoring and review could be done using existing systems that monitor incidents/claims and public contacts. This data could be analysed to inform decisions on lighting levels.

Equality Analysis Prepared By M.DUNWELL

Position/Role Countywide Services Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head P.Durnell

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

CMTY018 – CONSERVATION AND COLLECTION TEAM

Service Name:		Conservation and Collection Team		
Which 'start year' do relate to 2018/19, 20		2019/20		
Gross budget 2017/1	8	£0.707m		
Income 2017/18	-		0.350m	
Net budget 2017/18		£	0.357m	
Savings Target and	Profiling (discrete y	ear):		
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
£m	£m	£m	£m	
0.000	-0.278	0.000	-0.278	
FTE implications:			_	
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
deliver the budgeted savings Impact upon service	 neutral in 20⁻ The Conservent external incommuseums, his the UK and year. There is and to work which would becoming cost The Collecting together with items in LCC⁻ generating exrelated prima Adequate lean conservation retained by L 	19/20. vation function alr ome from providir storic houses and p competes for con potential to increa towards generatin support the object towards generating towards generating support the object towards generating support the object support the objec	ired to become cost eady does generate of services to other private owners across tracts throughout the se this area of activity ng additional income ective of the service primarily curatorial of records about the is very little scope for in this function as it is CC's collections.	

	 The exact number and range of posts would need to be tailored to reflect which collections and which museums remain in LCC's responsibility after the completion of transfer negotiations in 2018. Under any museum transfer arrangements, whilst ownership of collections cannot be transferred to a
	third party, LCC is making the borrower of each collection responsible for the care and conservation of all items included within each loan agreement, which reduces the cost to LCC with each 5 year loan agreement.
	• The intention is to encourage the new operators to generate grant funding for conservation work that could then be undertaken – on a paid basis – by the Conservation and Collection Team.
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	• The conservation service will need to achieve a cost neutral position in 2019/20 by a combination of increasing external income and reducing costs.
	• More external work would need to be undertaken and charges would need to be raised per contract (within what the market for conservation work will bear).
	 Consultation with staff and trade unions
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	• It is not yet known how many museums and consequently which collections will remain the responsibility of LCC or have the responsibility and cost passed onto third parties. Consequently, it is not possible at this stage to calculate what staff numbers and areas of expertise will be required in the future.
	• Whilst LCC retains any collections (even in store) or entire museums, there is a requirement from Arts Council England's Museum Accreditation system for LCC to maintain care of all the items in LCC's ownership. Failure to meet the minimum standards will result in loss of accredited status and inability to apply for a range of funding streams from other bodies (such as Heritage Lottery Fund) that make accredited status a mandatory criteria.
	• For each museum and collection (including the items of the collections held in museum stores) retained by LCC, there will be an amount of time that different members of the team will need to spend with each

museum and collection. Time spent caring for the LCC collections will both affect the opportunity to generate external income and the net budget position.
• Prices to external customers can be increased but not beyond what the market will stand (and that market is particularly effected by any fluctuations in Heritage Lottery Fund investment into museum projects that result in items needing to be conserved)
• A skills mix is required to offer a service to external clients. If the team were to be reduced too far, there is a risk of the service become unviable.

What does this service deliver?

The Conservation and Collections Team is split into two functions:

The conservation service provides specialist support to LCC museums at 18 heritage sites across Lancashire. The service consists of three multidisciplinary sections; Technicians, Conservators, & Designers. They provide support and advice on all aspects of collections care and to ensure their preservation for the future. Conservation staff also actively treat museum exhibits for display. The service has a broad range of experience with materials including archaeological, painting and drawings, natural history, social history, ceramics, modern materials and hazardous materials.

The collections service provides support to the museums and the collections by:

- selecting, buying or borrowing items
- organising records, catalogues and indexes
- making sure exhibits are stored under the right conditions
- arranging conservation and restoration
- helping visitors to interpret and enjoy exhibits and collections
- organising publicity and fundraising
- giving talks

CMTY027 – INFORMATION CENTRES

Service Name:		Information Centres		
Which 'start year' d relate to 2018/19, 20		2	2018/19	
Gross budget 2017	18	£	0.336m	
Income 2017/18		£	0.138m	
Net budget 2017/18		£	0.198m	
Savings Target and	Profiling (discrete y	ear):		
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
£m	£m	£m	£m	
-0.099	-0.099	0.000	-0.198	
FTE implications:				
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
-10.20	0.00	0.00	-10.20	
Impact upon servic	Visitor Centre information. e Popular service	providing transpo	orking at Morecambe ort and local tourist nformation and tickets ase.	
	cease.		C employees would ervices and possibly	
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	Lease at Carnfo Property at C requirements. N	 Consultation with staff and users regarding reductions. Lease at Carnforth will need to be terminated. Property at Clitheroe railway station surplus to requirements. Nelson office would also become vacant and would still incur costs until disposed of/leased. 		
	-	greements with n the required noti	ticket providers are ce period	

What are the risks associated with this saving and how will	Popular information and advice services withdrawn from the public.	
they be mitigated	Closure of buildings will require disposal, which may be difficult to achieve in their locations therefore still a cost associated with the service.	
	Loss of LCC staff ticket booking service from Carnforth.	
	Empty offices require disposing off, may take time therefore still incur costs.	
	Offer offices to local operators, bus/rail to take on service delivery.	

What does this service deliver?

Service provides comprehensive and unbiased public transport information and ticketing service in the outlets. Also provides a ticketing service for LCC employees and Members requiring rail tickets for LCC business.

Morecambe Visitor Centre provides local visitor, tourist and transport information.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Cash Limit Option CMTY027: Travel Information Centres and Morecambe Visitor Centre For Decision Making Items

November 2017

County Council

www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decisionmakers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sectorguidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Travel Information Centres and Morecambe Visitor Centre.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Closure of remaining Travel Information Centres at Preston Bus Station, Nelson Interchange, Clitheroe Interchange and Carnforth Railway Station and withdrawal of two members of staff from Morecambe Visitor Centre.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

No, but no specific locational impacts on people with protected characteristics.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

The services are particularly popular with older people and people with disabilities.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific subgroups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

No specific information but we consider that the services are particularly popular with older people and people with disabilities.

The total number of employees affected is 10.2 FTE.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

Consultation with users, staff, district and parish councils and other affected stakeholders will be carried out before final decision is confirmed.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?

 Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

Proposal may make travel by public transport more difficult for older people and for people with disabilities because other sources of information and tickets are less understandable. Older and disabled people are less likely to use digital alternatives to obtain travel information or tickets. The proposal may be updated following consultations.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Yes. Public Transport operators (bus and rail) are reducing face to face information and moving towards digital delivery of information and ticketing.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal - briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Consultation stage has not yet been undertaken and further work will be required if the proposals progress.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

None identified at this stage. For affected staff, the arrangements set out in the County Council's Transformation Principles will be applied.

Potential mitigations may be identified through the proposed consultation.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected

characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The council is in a position where it needs to make substantial budget savings and, whilst this proposal will have a negative impact on people with protected characteristics, it is considered necessary to make this service reduction.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Closure of remaining Travel Information Centres at Preston Bus Station, Nelson Interchange, Clitheroe Interchange and Carnforth Railway Station and withdrawal of two members of staff from Morecambe Visitor Centre.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

None identified.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Oliver Starkey

Position/Role Head of Service

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

ASC005 – ADVOCACY SERVICES

Service Name:		Single Point of Co Advocacy Service "Lower-Level" Adv (Countywide)	
Which 'start year' do relate to 2018/19, 20		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	18/19
Gross budget 2017/	18	£0.	148m
Income 2017/18		£0.	000m
Net budget 2017/18		£0.	148m
Savings Target and	Profiling (discrete	year):	
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.074	0.000	0.000	-0.074
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	d by 50% but c	dget for "Lower Level continue to provide t atutory advocacy serv	the Single Point of
Impact upon service	Advocacy exist the most vulner Have the important Have consider their live Safeguar Advocacy is a	ts to make sure that rable, are able to: neir voice heard of nt to them. their views and red when decisions ar	n issues that are wishes genuinely re being made about ng people, usually

	especially important when the individual is dealing with public services.
	2. The current situation
	Advocacy services in the county council area are available through a Single Point of Contact Service. The Single Point of Contact Service assesses the person's need, if any, for advocacy. This service is provided by N- compass Northwest Itd.
	If the person is eligible for statutory advocacy (i.e. advocacy that the county council must provide under the Care Act, Mental Capacity Act, Mental Health Act, etc.), the Single Point of Contact service will refer the person to the statutory element of the contract.
	The statutory element of the contract is provided by Advocacy Focus (who receive referrals directly from the Single Point of Contact Service through N-compass Northwest Ltd.) and is not affected by these proposals.
	If the person is <u>not</u> eligible for statutory advocacy, the provider of the Single Point of Contact service (N- Compass Northwest Ltd.) can offer a "lower-level" advocacy service. "Lower-level" advocacy is available to adults aged 18+ who are dealing with adult health and social care services. It is usually provided via a single, or otherwise time-limited, session of support either online, over the phone or face-to-face.
	Offering "lower-level" advocacy allows people to explore issues without needing to access statutory services. This type of advocacy has a preventative role and is intended to reduce the need for more intensive support.
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	Three-month notice to terminate issued to current provider.
	Consultation with Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), service users and other partners
	 Review of future commissioning intentions for advocacy
	 An assessment of the value of the current delivery model in meeting the county council's aims and objectives.

What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	The likelihood of service changes across the county means that demand for "lower-level" advocacy may increase in the future because vulnerable people may require support to make a complaint or access alternative services if services previously relied on to do this are reduced. Reducing this support for residents means that demand for "lower-level" advocacy may manifest as unmet need and, potentially, greater sustained demand on other social care services
	The current service is open to users of a wide range of public services and reduction would likely impact on the experience of service users engaged with the health and social care system.
	Partners may have a view on reduction of the service and its contribution to their own institutional aims. The CCGs currently contribute a small portion of the overall cost of advocacy services (£180,000 per year) but these contributions are not specifically dedicated to "lower- level" or statutory advocacy and a calculation as to their precise value would be required if the budget option is approved.
	There is therefore a risk that reduction of the service will have a number of consequences related to demand for support by users of public services. Termination of the service may create new demands on other services, and may create new unmet needs.
	Engagement and consultation with service users and partners is important throughout this process.

What does this service deliver?

The current purpose of the Single Point of Contact Service for all Advocacy Services and Delivery of "Lower-Level" Advocacy (Countywide) contract is to:

- Offer a Single Point of Contact for all advocacy enquiries in the Lancashire County Council area.
- Provide all "lower-level" advocacy services.

"Lower-level" advocacy is currently offered when advocacy has been assessed as appropriate but when statutory eligibility does not apply. "Lower-level" advocacy involves information, advice, signposting, and peer-to-peer support. The types of "lower-level" advocacy provided by the service varies case by case, consisting of three levels:

- Level 1, a maximum of two sessions (telephone or online only);
- Level 2, telephony-based or online support over a limited number of sessions with a single face-to-face session and;

• Level 3, a maximum of three face-to-face contact sessions in addition to other forms of support.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Budget Option ASC005: Single Point of Contact Service for all Advocacy Services and Delivery of "Lower-Level" Advocacy (Countywide)

For Decision Making

November 2017



Items

www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decisionmakers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sectorguidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Budget Option ASC005: Single Point of Contact Service for all Advocacy Services and Delivery of "Lower-Level" Advocacy (Countywide)

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

1. What is advocacy?

Advocacy exists to make sure that people, particularly the most vulnerable, are able to:

- Have their voice heard on issues that are important to them.
- Have their views and wishes genuinely considered when decisions are being made about their lives.
- Safeguard their rights.

Advocacy is a process of enabling people, usually through the help of an "advocate" who can help the individual to obtain and understand the information they need, attend meetings with them in a supportive role, or who speaks up for the individual in situations where they don't feel able to speak for themselves. This can be especially important when the individual is dealing with public services.

2. The current situation

Advocacy services in the county council area are available through a Single Point of Contact Service. The Single Point of Contact Service assesses the person's need, if any, for advocacy. This service is provided by N-compass Northwest ltd.

If the person is eligible for statutory advocacy (i.e. advocacy that the county council must provide under the Care Act, Mental Capacity Act, Mental Health Act, etc.), the Single Point of Contact service will refer the person to the statutory element of the contract. The statutory element of the contract is provided by Advocacy Focus (who receive referrals directly from the Single Point of Contact Service through N-compass Northwest Ltd.) and is not affected by these proposals.

If the person is <u>not</u> eligible for statutory advocacy, the provider of the Single Point of Contact service (N-Compass Northwest Ltd.) can offer a "lower-level" advocacy service. "Lower-level" advocacy is available to adults aged 18+ who are dealing with adult health and social care services. It is usually provided via a single, or otherwise time-limited, session of support either online, over the phone or face-to-face.

Offering "lower-level" advocacy allows people to explore issues without needing to access statutory services. This type of advocacy has a preventative role and is intended to reduce the need for more intensive support.

The budget option proposes to:

- Continue to provide the Single Point of Contact Service.
- Continue to provide statutory advocacy services.
- Reduce the budget for "Lower Level" advocacy services by 50%.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The decision is likely to affect people who use the service from across the county in a similar way.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes. "Lower-level advocacy" is available to all residents of the county council area who qualify under the specified service criteria. However, the service is predominantly used by client groups with some protected characteristics. Adults with disabilities with a variety of needs are likely to be the most affected.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc. to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific subgroups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

The latest monitoring data shows that 469 people accessed the service in Q2. 2017 (July-September). Approximately half of these people received advocacy support via the service whilst the other half were referred to the statutory element of the service.

The following is a breakdown of low level advocacy by customer group:

Acquired Brain Injury	1
Mental Health	151
Learning disability	87

Parent Carer	22
Communication difficulty	97
Long term ill health	47
Older Person	8
Physical disability	43
Carer	8
Dementia (has capacity)	2
Autism	2
Stroke	1
Total	469

The client group accessing "lower level" advocacy the most are those with mental health issues at 32% followed by those with a communication difficulty at 20% and people with a learning disability at 19%.

Of the 469 customers 283 (60%) are female, 184 (39%) male and 2 (1%) intersex. There is a higher use of the service by females compared with their relative representation in the Lancashire population – 60% users compared to 51% females in the population – and consequently males are disproportionately lower amongst users – 39% of users but 49% of Lancashire's population.

93% of customers are White British with the remaining 7% from BME groups. This is broadly in line with the general Lancashire population.

The county council also receives case studies and personal "I" statements detailing how the service has assisted individuals to achieve their personal outcomes. These are referred to in Q.2.

At this time we do not have information about the workforce that may be impacted by the proposals.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

No. Engagement or consultation has not taken place but if the proposal goes forward some form of consultation will be carried out. The findings of any consultation will help to finalise any mitigations if this budget option progresses.

The most recent monitoring report from the current provider contained this selection of statements from service users:

"Thank you so much for all your help. I couldn't have got through that meeting without you. It has meant so much having someone who listens to me."

"I haven't used advocacy before but it has been very useful to discuss my concerns with you."

"I didn't understand what was happening before and it made me unhappy. Thank you for attending the meetings with me."

"Thank you so much for listening to me today it has been good to get everything of my chest."

"Thanks for your help it's good to know you are there if we need you"

"I feel so relieved that I have put the complaint in, I am so glad of your support"

"It makes such a difference to me that you are supporting me with Social Services"

"Thank you so much I feel so reassured that it's all sorted."

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

Advocacy is typically sought by individuals who often struggle to have their voices heard in engaging with health and social care services. In this case, clients with physical and/or learning or cognitive disabilities and mental health issues are the predominant users of the service.

Reducing the "lower-level" advocacy service by 50% will clearly affect the users of the service as the same number of users would access a reduced service. However, the budget option does not propose to eliminate "lower level" advocacy entirely and does not affect statutory advocacy services (which the county council will continue to provide via commissioned arrangements).

A reduction in the service will likely impact on service users through longer waiting times or prioritising access. There may also be an impact in the quality of provision; in some cases, the service may, for example, deliver a reduced "lower-level" advocacy service by moving away from face-to-face or over-the-phone contact and instead providing individuals with published material, web-based information or signposting to other services, peer support networks, community groups, or other forms of support.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how -

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

No; the intention is to continue with the current proposal.

The impact analysis indicates that, while the users of the service include individuals with protected characteristics, "lower-level" advocacy will continue in reduced form and statutory services will continue to be provided.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

"Lower-level" advocacy is currently offered when advocacy has been assessed as appropriate but when statutory eligibility does not apply. "Lower-level" advocacy involves information, advice, signposting, and peer-to-peer support. The types of "lower-level" advocacy provided by the service varies case by case, consisting of three levels:

- Level 1, a maximum of two sessions (telephone or online only);
- Level 2, telephony-based or online support over a limited number of sessions with a single face-to-face session and;
- Level 3, a maximum of three face-to-face contact sessions in addition to other forms of support.

Some of the impact of a reduced service may be mitigated by evaluating and re-allocating resources within the current offer of "lower-level" advocacy, as detailed above. For example, the service could continue to serve a similar amount of clients as it does currently, but with more clients accessing telephone and online support and a reduced offer of face-to-face contact.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The savings proposed by this budget option are set out in the Cash Limit Template and will assist in bridging the funding gap in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

The proposal is likely to disproportionately impact on people with disabilities and women.

Offering "lower-level" advocacy alongside statutory provision allows people to fully explore their options without needing to immediately access statutory services. "Lower level" advocacy has a preventative role, reducing the need for statutory, intensive support by helping people through provision of information and advice, peer and group advocacy, limited face-to-face interventions, and through self-help resources.

The current delivery model already takes into account the budget context faced by the county council and represents a substantial reduction of "lower level" advocacy provision compared with our previous arrangements (2013-16). For example, the previous contract allowed for up to eight face-to-face sessions while the current service does not offer any more than three sessions.

The likelihood of service changes across the county in the future means that demand for "lower-level" advocacy may increase because vulnerable people may require support to make a complaint or access alternative services if services previously relied on to do this are reduced. Reducing this support for residents means that demand for "lower-level" advocacy may manifest as unmet need and, potentially, greater sustained demand on other social care services.

On balance, given the need to bridge the funding gap, and the potential mitigation available, the proposal is to continue with the option.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

To continue with the current proposal:

- Continue to provide the Single Point of Contact Service.
- Continue to provide statutory advocacy services.
- Reduce the budget for "lower level" advocacy services by 50%.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal. Contract arrangements already in place will continue to monitor and evaluate the impact of the service, and any changes to the service. A commissioning review of all advocacy services is scheduled to take place before commencement of a re-procurement exercise in 2018 with new contracts in place for Spring 2019.

Equality Analysis Prepared by: Kieran Curran

Position/Role: Policy, Information and Commissioning Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head Dave Carr: Head of Service, Policy, Information and Commissioning (Start Well)

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

ASC009 – EXTRA SHELTERED CARE SERVICES

Service Name:		Extra Shelter	ed Care Services
Which 'start year' do relate to 2018/19, 207		20	018/19
Gross budget 2017/1	8	£2	2.600m
Income 2017/18	-).100m
Net budget 2017/18		£2	2.500m
Savings Target and I	Profilina (discrete v	ear):	
	<u> </u>	•••••	
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.483	-0.161	0.000	-0.644
FTE implications:	1		
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
deliver the budgeted savings Impact upon service	schemes out ofService users reassessment of judgement as a are likely to req via home care, greater use of teA few individua residential care regular night-tin cannot be pro contracts or withThere could be 	13 from across the at these location f their needs and be ny community base uire a continuation roving nights serve elecare. Is may have their r e setting if they re ne support or very vided under existin in Personal Budget increased pressure may not be able the and depending on very sures.	as would require a e subject to the same ed service user. Most of service organised vice, reablement or needs best met in a quire extensive and frequent visits which ing domiciliary care

	·
	These changes may also impact on the services of the housing partners in whose properties these services are delivered.
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	 Define and agree criteria to identify low usage/low risk. Communicate and give notice to current service providers and ensure current contracts cover decommissioning period. Adult social care to consolidate the reviews. Commissioning and Adult Social Care to prepare an accurate list of residents and care needs and corresponding hours to identify those at risk of not having their needs met in their current home. Consult with residents, care providers, housing providers and elected members. Adult social care to update support plan and make sure appropriate telecare/homecare is in place. Adult social care to provide intensive input to support a small number of residents who may need to move into residential care if they have significant night time needs.
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	A proportion of service users may not have their night time care needs met and may have to move into residential care. The County Council could receive increased challenges and complaints as a result of this change to service provision. In order to mitigate the risks robust social care assessments identifying eligible social care needs and skilled support planning to meet any needs that are currently met outside of the planned care provided. A consultation with service users and housing providers will be undertaken in advance of implementation. A programme of reassessments and reviews to be phased and/or additional temporary resource established.

easier transition for service users.

What does this service deliver?

Extra care is a model of somewhere between sheltered housing and a care home targeted at the older people. It allows residents to continue living independently, typically in a self-contained flat or bungalow, while benefiting from personal care and support delivered in a similar manner to homecare services.

Extra Care allows individuals to live in their own accommodation in an Extra Care scheme, promoting independence with the safety net of 24/7 background support, plus additional planned care as required. The services being procured are the personal care and background support at each scheme.

However new schemes usually aim for a minimum of 60 to 70 units and a high proportion or number of tenants having eligible care needs under the Care Act to ensure the 24/7 provision is cost effective. These schemes do not have such numbers of users of the care services and so are not cost effective compared to alternative models.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

ASC009 Cash Limit Option Physical Support Extra Sheltered Care Services For Decision Making Items

November 2017



www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decisionmakers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sectorguidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Cessation of some of the onsite 24 x 7 Extra Care Service that is available in 13 sheltered accommodation schemes across the County.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Cease Extra Sheltered Care services in the lower usage or lower risks schemes. These are likely to number 6-8 schemes out of 13 from across the county.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

There are many sheltered accommodation schemes across the county owned and managed by various Registered Social Landlords and District or City Councils. The schemes are typically 30-50 individual rented flats, they have a visiting scheme manager and are aimed at the over 55's.

For the last 15+ years LCC has commissioned 24 x 7 onsite background (at least 1 x care worker onsite 24×7) and planned care for a small number of residents that live within 13 specific schemes located across Lancashire.

Over the years the number of residents using the service has fallen as people stay in their homes for longer or choose not to move to this style of accommodation. Residents have to have eligible social care needs identified through a social care assessment under the Care Act to access this service and pay for their planned care visits out of their personal budgets. The schemes, their location and the number of flats and number of residents using the service is as follows :-

Scheme Name	Location	Number of	Number of
		extra care	flats in the
		users with	scheme not

		eligible care	using
		needs	service
Ainscough Brook House,	Ribbleton	10	25
Bannister Brook House	Leyland	10	24
Greenwood Court	Leyland	13	37
Marlborough Court	Skelmersdale	12	38
Kirk House,	Accrington	15	33
HyndBrook House	Accrington	12	17
Plessington Court	Longridge	14	25
St Ann's Court,	Clitheroe	14	21
Stanner Lodge	Lytham St Ann's	6	48
Croft Court	Freckleton	6	16
Torrentum Court ,	Thornton Cleveleys	7	32
Parkside Court	Lancaster	10	26
Beck View	Lancaster	9	27
	Total	130	369

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender

- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes. Older People, particularly those with disabilities or poor health

By the very nature of the accommodation being specifically for over the 55 years of age this decision would impact disproportionately those with the protected characteristic of disability, age and gender (women).

This decision would not affect the majority of residents in most of the schemes because they do not use the service.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific subgroups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

By the very nature of the accommodation being specifically for over the 55 years of age this decision would impact disproportionately those with the protected characteristic of disability, age and gender (women). This decision would not affect the majority of residents in the accommodation because they do not use the service.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

No – if the proposal goes forward consultations in each scheme would be an essential part of any implementation plan.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?

 Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

The impact of the decision will be analysed in detail after a consultation but we anticipate the following:-

Some people with protected characteristics may not be able to continue to live in their homes if they have significant needs that cannot be met by visiting care workers and/or telecare/technology. Until social care reviews have been completed for the 130 people it is not known how many will be effected. All people affected will have their statutory eligible care needs met, although it is possible some individuals may have to move to a different setting that does have 24 hour x 7 day care provision on site.

There is an opportunity for people to pool resources together to collectively purchase care to replace this service, but this is not something that any agency or group could insist upon and therefore is judged unlikely to proceed

Question 4 – Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

This proposal may add to the cumulative effect of reducing the amount of accessible social housing that is available to people with protected characteristics

that need support over 24×7 . It may also increase the exposure of people to the financial impact of possible future changes to the charging policy for non-residential care.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how -

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Until the social care reviews have been completed to identify the people affected current eligible social care needs and alternative solutions explored the options remain the same. The consultation will inform the decisions also.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

There are a number of services that can be used to try and mitigate the impact on the tenants that will be affected. There is visiting domiciliary home care service, possibly employing the same care workers who currently work at the schemes, there are various rehabilitation and reablement services that can be used, there are telecare and technology solutions and statutory social care needs will always be met. Service users at these locations would require a reassessment of their needs and be subject to the same judgement as any community based service user: Most are likely to require a continuation of service organised via home care, roving nights service or reablement or greater use of telecare.

Where the impact of the proposal means that service users might be better supported in residential care, the wishes of the individual will be considered carefully as part of the assessment and subsequent decision.

As previously discussed there is an opportunity for people to pool resources together to collectively purchase care to replace this service, but this is not something that any agency or group could insist upon and therefore is judged unlikely to proceed

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The reason this service is the subject of a budget option is because the cost of providing onsite care 24 x 7 at only 13 sheltered schemes meeting 130 number of residents needs is not equitable when compared to the situation of the adults and older people that live in their homes in the community or in other sheltered schemes. It represents a more generous offer than can be afforded given the financial pressures on the council, and it is not cost effective compared to alternative patterns of provision for older people

These schemes are small and do not offer the economies of scale that larger built for purpose accommodation does. The other issue is that some of the schemes are not popular with potential residents and any voids are becoming increasingly hard to fill with people who have social care needs. This means that most of the residents in the schemes do not use the service and the numbers are gradually falling even more.

As previously discussed social care reviews are required to identify if any particular resident has a need for the service, but initial estimates based on review activity indicate that there is a relatively low number of people who use the service that have social care needs for background 24 hours x 7 days a week care.

It is acknowledged that some older and disabled people living in the schemes may be particularly adversely affected but, as previously mentioned there are a number of services that can be used to try and mitigate the impact. There is visiting domiciliary home care service, possibly employing the same care workers who currently work at the schemes, there are various rehabilitation and reablement services that can be used, there are telecare and technology solutions and statutory social care needs will always be met. As previously discussed there is an opportunity for people to pool resources together to collectively purchase care to replace this service, but this is not something that any agency or group could insist upon and therefore is judged unlikely to proceed

The proposal will deliver Budget savings as set out in the cash limit template.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Cease Extra Sheltered onsite care services only in the lower usage or lower risk schemes. This will affect between 6-8 out of 13 such schemes across Lancashire and the tenants who live within the schemes now and those who may be considering moving into such schemes in the near future.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Will monitor the admissions to residential care placements, any increase in calls to the telecare, any increase in admissions to hospital from the people affected.

The Equality Analysis will be revised once the consultation with current users has concluded

Equality Analysis Prepared By Policy, Information & Commissioning Manager – Age Well

Position/Role Policy, Information & Commissioning Manager – Age Well

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head Dave Carr, Head of Service: Policy, Information and Commissioning (Start Well)

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

Money Matters -Additional Savings 2018/19 – 2020/21 Cabinet January 2018



www.lancashire.gov.uk

	Contents	Page
1	CYP001b – SCAYT+	76
2	CYP015 - YOT	90
3	CMTY024 – COMMUNITY TRANSPORT	103
4	CMTY026b – DISCRETIONARY CONCESSIONARY TRAVEL	130
5	PH012 – CRIME AND DISORDER	141
6	PH015 – CHILDREN AND FAMILY WELLBEING SERVICE	154

<u>CYP001b – SUPPORTING CARERS OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE</u> LOOKED AFTER TOGETHER (SCAYT+)

Service Name:		SC	CAYT+	
Which 'start year' do relate to 2018/19, 20		20	2018/19	
Gross budget 2017/	18	f0	.638m	
Income 2017/18			.000m	
Net budget 2017/18			.638m	
Savings Target and	Profiling (discrete y	ear):		
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
£m	£m	£m	£m	
-0.225	-0.225	0.000	-0.450	
		-		
FTE implications:				
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
savings	 funding from the Children wh placed with t Children who Order and w of the order. Please note this unless the adop stage is has been 	Adoption Support F o are on a placer heir adoptive parent o are subject to a S ho were looked afte s could potentially otion support fund en assumed that this	ment order and are ts. Special Guardianship er prior to the making be a 2 year saving is extended. At this s saving is recurrent.	
Impact upon service	parents of looke help them under person's behaviou those behaviou therapeutic supp after children. SCAYT+ does r Adoption Suppor adopted childre	ed after children and erstand the reason ours and give them rs. The service a port to some of the m receive some fundir ort Fund (ASF) for n. If the work that	bort to carers and adopted children to for the child/young tools to help manage also provides direct fore damaged looked ang from the National r specific work with SCAYT+ undertook c work with children	
	who would attr	act funding from t	the ASF this would let whilst maintaining	

a service to looked after children, albeit this service would be reduced.
SCAYT+ would provide support to Children who are placed with their adopted family and the proposed adopters at an increased level than they have done previously.
They would also provide support to children and carers where there is a Special Guardianship Order in place and the child was looked after immediately before the order.
Whilst this would provide additional support to a group of children currently not under the remit of SCAYT+, and thus support keeping families together and reducing the need for social care intervention, it will reduce the capacity within the team amount to support carers of looked after children through difficult periods when in crisis.
The predicted impact will be:
 Positive Impact Decrease in breakdown of placements for children who are subject to Special Guardianship Order, which often result in Children's Social Care providing costly placements or at the least foster placements.
• Decrease in need for Children's Social Care intervention at level 4 at a later stage in the child's life.
Increase in the emotional wellbeing and educational attainment of this cohort of children.
 Negative Impact Possible increase in placement breakdowns for looked after children, but the service would still support some Looked After Children.
• There is a risk that as young people experience more placement breakdowns the costs of future placements increases.
 Lack of ability to challenge court requested therapeutic services.
• Children and Young Peoples' emotional needs remain unmet; increase in risk taking behaviour, self-harming behaviour, poor emotional and mental health.

	 Future costs to adult services as young people enter adulthood with unmet emotional and mental health needs. 	
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	• Review and change the eligibility criteria for access to the service.	
	• Ensure that every request for therapeutic support that attracts funding from the Adoption Support Fund is directed to SCAYT+ where possible.	
	• SCAYT+ to provide the multiagency specialist assessment that attracts the £2,500 funding.	
	• SCAYT + to provide the intervention agreed that attracts up to £5000 of funding per child/family.	
	Delivery of service under this eligibility criteria only has funding until 2020 if this is not extended then the funding would cease.	
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	Cost The service will only generate income if they are proactively and innovatively selling themselves. This can be mitigated against by assurance from the service that the Adoption Support Fund is being invoiced for completed work by the team.	
	 Impact on children and young people currently in care Possible increase in placement breakdowns. 	
	• Possible unmet emotional and mental health needs.	
	The above will be mitigated to a degree by targeting Family Support placements where risk of breakdown is identified.	

What does this service deliver?

SCAYT+ provides a targeted service of advice on emotional health and wellbeing to children looked after, foster carers, residential and other child care staff. The service helps to:

- Improve the emotional health and wellbeing of Lancashire's children who are looked after/ adopted and whom Lancashire has a responsibility.
- Increase the understanding about emotional health and wellbeing issues for children and young people who are looked after/ adopted amongst all those working within the professional and carer network.

- Maintain a professional training programme for foster carers, adopters and staff to ensure the services are equipped to deliver quality care to children and young people.
- Provide therapeutic advice and support to the carers of looked after children and young people.
- Provide therapeutic support to children and young people post adoption who have been assessed as needing a service.
- Support in assessing children and young people's emotional health needs.
- Provide therapeutic support directly to children and young who have emotional health needs.
- Provide advice and guidance to professionals working with children with emotional health needs.

From April 2016 to March 2017, 364 children and young people were referred to the service :

305 were Children in Care, 50 were children who had been adopted, 9 were children who were waiting adoption.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

CYPoo1b: SCAYT+ income generation For Decision Making Items

January 2018

County Council

www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision- makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Redirect a proportion of the work of SCAYT + to work with more children who would attract monies from the Adoption Support Fund.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to redirect a proportion of the work of SCAYT+ so it generates income by providing specialist multi-agency assessment and intervention to children and families who attract funding from the Adoption Support Fund (ASF).

SCAYT+ would provide support to Children who are placed with their adopted family and the proposed adopters at an increased level than they have done previously.

SCAYT+ would also provide support to children and carers where there is a Special Guardianship Order in place and the child was looked after immediately before the order.

Whilst this proposal will provide additional support to children currently not under the remit of SCAYT+, and thus support keeping families together and reducing the need for social care intervention, it will reduce the capacity within the team to support carers of looked after children through difficult periods when in crisis.

From April 2016 to March 2017, 364 children and young people were referred to the service. 305 were Children in Care, 50 were children who had been adopted, and 9 were children who were waiting adoption. Assuming 1/3 of capacity is redirected, this could mean that around 120 fewer Children Looked After, or their carers, would be able to access the service.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The proposal will affect people across the County. However given there are more children who are in care in East Lancashire and Central Lancashire than in North of Lancashire it is expected that Children in Care from the East and Central are more likely to be affected.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality

- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes. The proposal will impact on children an	d young people.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

From April 2016 to March 2017, 364 children and young people were referred to the service. 305 were Children in Care, 50 were children who had been adopted, and 9 were children who were waiting adoption. Assuming 1/3 of capacity is redirected, this could mean that around 120 fewer Children Looked After, or their carers, would be able to access the service.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

There has been no consultation to date. Consultation will need to take place with stakeholders/partners and young people. This is proposed to be done through an engagement day with stakeholders/partners and young people.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities.
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

The proposal is likely to impact upon the emotional wellbeing of looked after children as access to specialist/targeted support for carers of children looked after and, on occasion, therapeutic services would not be as readily available.

This could lead to an increase in breakdowns of placements and place a vulnerable group of young people at heightened risk to emotional harm and worsened life chances.

Question 4 – Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Yes. Investment in and access to services to support children and young people's emotional wellbeing and mental health is a key priority for the Sustainability and Transformation Partnership, Health and Wellbeing Board and the Lancashire Safeguarding Children's Board who have challenged the System as a whole to improve access to services for those who need them and provide interventions earlier, for those that need them.

Reprioritising funding away from support for carers of children looked after has the potential to result in carers not being supported to help children looked after improve their mental health, helping to avoid crisis and to support them through crisis where necessary. Whilst most of the work of SCAYT+ is with carers, there are occasions when SCAYT+ will work directly with children and young people. This proposal may place pressure on the wider system, which is already challenged.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how – For example: Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

The proposal is unchanged given the need to bridge the financial gap in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

Potential mitigation is through:

- Consultation with stakeholders and children and young people.
- Provide 3 month notice period to any service or child involved with SCAYT+ and refer for assessment those considered to be in need of service to NHS funded Child and Adolescence Mental Health Services or, where thresholds for this service are not met, the County Council's Emotional Wellbeing Services delivered as part of the Children and Families Wellbeing Service.
- Ensure that all cases are subject to rigorous review to identify whether they meet the eligibility criteria for Adoption Support Fund funding and that Adoption Support Funding is secured in all appropriate cases.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The driver for this proposal is to support the County Council in bridging the financial gap that exists in the MTFS.

Whilst the option will reduce the availability of support for Children Looked After and their carers, the majority of the SCAYT+ service activity will still be directed to that cohort. Also, by seeking to increase the level of activity funded from the Adoption Support Fund we will be able to sustain current structures for the duration of that funding, meaning that some flexibility is available to provide an appropriate response in times of crisis. There may though be in excess of 100 children and young people or their carers who are no longer able to access the service each year and who will either not receive a service or who will need to be referred to already stretched alternatives. There is likely to be considerable challenge from Partners within the Children and Young People's Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Transformation Programme to the proposed reduction in service.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Re direct a proportion of work so that similar service is provided to a different cohort of children who attracted ASF monies and are likely to currently be without service or LCC are commissioning these service from the independent sector.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Head of Service to monitor Business Intelligence to provide data to monitor Finance to monitor Evaluate impact of service

Equality Analysis Prepared By Josephine Lee (Senior Strategic Manager Childrens Social Care) / Dave Carr (Head of Service: Policy, Information and Commissioning (Start Well)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact: Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

CYP015 – YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM (YOT)

Service Name:		Youth Offending Team (YOT)		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21		2	2018/19	
Gross budget 2017	/18	f.	3.405m	
Income 2017/18			2.062m	
Net budget 2017/18			1.343m	
		~		
Savings Target and	Profiling (discrete y	ear):		
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
£m	£m	£m	£m	
-0.336	0.000	0.000	-0.336	
-				
FTE implications:				
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
savings	consider bringi Currently the se funding from the recent peer revie and a recomm Youth Offendir oversight of the The numbers of to the youth just the service is in savings. A full s enable a 25% re contribution to the It is considered reduce its cont	 therefore must be delivered. Savings cannot be achieved by cutting functions, and the service would wish to consider bringing currently commissioned functions. Currently the service commissions prevention work via funding from the Police and Crime Commission. In the recent peer review this was considered an inspection risk and a recommendation was made that Lancashire's Youth Offending Team should have management oversight of the delivery of prevention services. The numbers of young people who are first time entrants to the youth justice system has declined and therefore the service is in a position to contribute to the budget savings. A full service restructure would be necessary to enable a 25% reduction in Lancashire County Council's contribution to the budget. It is considered that if Lancashire County Council (LCC) reduce its contribution to the budget, partners will do likewise. Therefore the total reduction to the service is likewise. 		
Impact upon servic	25% reduction £1,007,503 from consider that in	The 2017/18 contribution from LCC is £1,343,337 and a 25% reduction on this would mean a contribution of £1,007,503 from 2018/19. However, it is important to consider that in light of LCC making a reduction of 25% it is likely that all other partners would expect to make a		

	reduction of a similar amount. As we have already seen this financial year the Health Service is already looking to reduce their contributions (and have in the North of the county) and it is likely that the Police are looking to do the same in the next few years. The table below shows the partner contributions and how it would look if they were to reduce by 25%:		
	Partner	Contribution 2017/18	25% reduction
	Youth Justice Board	£1,356,763	£1,017,572
	Health	£218,112	£163,584
	Bail Support	£144,500	£108,375
	Police	£155,100	£116,325
		£1,874,475	£1,405,856
Actions needed to	 restructure would be required, amounting to a total of £0.804m. The service last restructured in September 2016, the impact of which was considerable for some staff. A further restructure will impact on service and staff morale and compulsory redundancy is likely. Service delivery may be impacted upon during the period of restructure and increase risk if inspected. If offending rates do increase the service may not be able to fulfil its statutory functions. The Youth Offending Team is joint funded by LCC and 		
deliver the target savings	statutory partners, governance is from the Youth Justice Partnership Board. The Board will need to be fully involved in any service proposals and will need to sign off and future savings targets. It will be imperative that the Board is consulted as options are being developed.		
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	Partners are likely to reduce their funding contribution to match the LCC reduction in budget. This would need to be factored in within any restructure design.		
	service has not responsibilities. time low. The n also significantli increase again.	got the capacity First time offende umbers of young y reduced but re There is no fo	ncrease again and the to fulfil court directed er rates are at an all- people in custody has cently has started to preseeable mitigation urt activity, however

investing in prevention services in the Youth Offending Team would support managing young people away from criminal justice.
Risk that service delivery will be impacted upon during and post a restructure and staff leave
Consultation and good communication throughout the restructure can mitigate to a degree.
Loss of knowledge and experience in Youth Offending Team, can be mitigated to a degree by engagement with staff.

What does this service deliver?

Lancashire Youth Offending Team (LYOT) delivers statutory youth justice services in Lancashire. The service is measured against other YOTs and against three national targets;

- Reduction of first time offenders
- Reduction of reoffenders
- Reduction of number of young people in custody

LYOT has recently had a peer review which recommended bringing preventative services under the management and control of the service.

LYOT provides reports to the courts, and delivers interventions as directed by the court to young people involved in criminal behaviour.

LYOT has responsibility to supervise young people on orders and in Custody The service works to National Standards and is subject to inspection by HMIP

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

CYPo15: Budget savings to YOT For Decision Making Items

January 2018

County Council

www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision- makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Reduction in the contribution to the Youth Offending Team from Lancashire County Council.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Lancashire County Council's contribution to the Youth Offending Team budget to be reduced by 25%

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

Impact on young people involved within the criminal justice system, their victims and communities.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

The impact would be on young people aged 10 to 18 involved in the criminal justice system. Impact could extend to their victims and their communities.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

No consultation has taken place at this time. Should the proposal be agreed consultation will need to take place with the Lancashire Youth Justice Board and with all members of the service.

It is proposed that partners and board members would be told at the next board meeting, and asked to contribute ideas to an implementation plan.

Members of the service will be consulted and asked to contribute their ideas to an implementation plan.

Formal consultation on a plan would then be for a period of 3 weeks.

If the YOT budget is reduced from April 2018, consultation would need to commence within 2 weeks of the decision being made.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

Impact on Young People known to the criminal justice system including;

- Less contact with allocated worker
- Potentially additional travel to get to appointments if local bases are closed
- Reduced family work

Impact on victims including;

• Reduced service to victims

Impact on communities;

• Reduction of prevention work with young people increasing criminal behaviour in communities

Question 4 – Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Potential to impact on police, courts, secure estates, children looked after if young people are not accessing services to support them desist from criminal behaviour.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal? Please identify how – For example: Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Original proposal to be continued and results of consultation to inform implementation plan.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

The number of young people becoming known to the criminal justice system has reduced both nationally and locally. Should this trend continue the savings can be managed with manageable impact on service delivery. Should the trend change however and numbers increase there would be a significant impact on the ability to deliver all statutory services.

Additionally a recent Peer review identified that there was capacity within the service.

Partners will reduce their funding contribution to match the LCC reduction in budget. This would need to be factored in within any restructure design.

Risk that first time offender rates increase again and the service has not got the capacity to fulfil court directed responsibilities. First time offender rates are at an all-time low. The numbers of young people in custody has also significantly reduced but recently has started to increase again. There is no foreseeable mitigation against changes to police/ court activity, however investing in prevention services in YOT would support managing young people away from criminal justice.

Risk that service delivery will be impacted upon during and post a restructure and staff leave/ lose focus. Impact of this if the YOT were to be inspected. Consultation and good communication throughout the restructure can mitigate to a degree. Loss of knowledge and experience in YOT, can be mitigated to a degree by engagement with staff.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

There is currently capacity to reduce the LCC contribution to the YOT budget. 25% does not appear an unrealistic amount but, this is likely to be matched by partner contributions which will necessitate a significant reduction to the YOT. Should the numbers of young people coming to the attention of youth justice

increase capacity within the service would need to increase proportionately in order to respond.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

To continue with the proposal as set out in the cash limit template. The proposed reduction can be supported with manageable impact on the young people, victims and communities. Recognition is however acknowledged that if the numbers of young people coming to the attention of Youth Offending Team increase a reinvestment may be required.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Performance monitors impact on a quarterly basis.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Barbara Bath Position/Role Head of Service, Fostering, Adoption, Residential and YOT Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

CMTY024 – COMMUNITY TRANSPORT

Service Name:		Comm	Community Transport	
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21		:	2018/19	
Gross budget 2017	/18	f	£1.003m	
Income 2017/18			£0.307m	
Net budget 2017/18			E0.696m	
	Profiling (discrete y	vear):		
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
£m	£m	£m	£m	
-0.254	-0.087	-0.050	-0.391	
-0.204	-0.007	-0.050	-0.391	
FTE implications:				
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
savings	Cease provisio Transit (BEST subsidised, tax employment wh alternative pu (Consultation of completed). Th has been subs Transport since	(Consultation on the withdrawal of this service has been completed). The service was initially grant funded, but has been subsidised by the budget for Community Transport since 2010/11.		
Impact upon servic	services will be The viability of resulting in add being lost. Eleven workers	Journeys for those who rely on door to door Dial-a-Ride services will be reduced. The viability of Community Transport may be put at risk resulting in additional services offered by the operators being lost. Eleven workers living in Burnley will no longer be able to access employment using the Burnley BEST service.		
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	transport op	erators.	ce notice on community s on reduced working	

	Burnley BEST contract not retendered.	
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	If the Lancashire County Council funding were to be reduced, the financial viability of the Community Transport operators could be compromised.	
	A reduction in service will have a negative impact on users, many of whom have protected characteristics as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty. These impacts are addressed in the accompanying Equality Impact Assessment.	
	Employees currently relying on Burnley BEST may no longer be able to access their jobs.	

What does this service deliver?

Community Transport services are provided to eligible users by a consortium of Community Transport operators the consortium operates services in Ribble Valley, Preston and South Ribble, Chorley and West Lancashire under contract to Lancashire County Council. LCC's Travelcare provides an off-peak Dial-a-Ride service in the other six districts.

The consortium provides Dial-a-Ride which are door-to-door services within their operating areas, using vehicles specially adapted to make them easy to use. Vehicles are equipped with lifts and passenger restraints so that wheelchair users can travel without having to transfer to a seat. Services may run to a broad route and timetable. Customers are required to book these services at least 24 hours in advance.

Community Transport also provides a Community Car Scheme where volunteer drivers pick up pre-arranged bookings and take individuals to various appointments, as required.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

CMTY024 (1 of 2): Reduction in Dial-a Ride/Community Transport Provision For Decision Making Items

January 2018

County Council

www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision- makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at <u>Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk</u>

Name/Nature of the Decision

Reduction in Dial-a Ride/Community Transport Provision

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Dial-a-Ride and Community Transport (CT) services are largely provided across Lancashire by a combination of in-house provision through the Travelcare service and through a contract with the Lancashire Community Transport (LCT) consortium. The proposal is to reduce County Council funding for these activities. Whilst CT operators obtain some funding through grant awards and other means, the overwhelming majority of funds come from the County Council.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

These changes are likely to have disproportionate effect on smaller communities and those living in rural areas.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

The proposal will have a disproportionate effect on people using the service with the protected characteristics of age, disability and, to a lesser extent, gender. The services provided by Lancashire Community Transport are largely provided by volunteers who may also have protected characteristics.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

Dial-a-Ride and other Community Transport services are extensively used by many of our more vulnerable citizens. There are more than 6,200 regular users who, between them, made in excess of 166,000 journeys in 2016/17. The rules for its use are that it is restricted to those who are unable to use conventional bus services or there is no provision. The services are door to door and are of particular help to those who are too frail to use bus services or may have a disability that makes it impractical as the services offer a high level of assistance to passengers boarding and alighting and with their luggage. The services are provided by five delivery partners: Burnley, Pendle and Rossendale CVS, Central Lancs Dial-a-Ride, Little Green Bus, Preston Community Transport and West Lancs Dial-a-Ride along with Lancashire County Council's Travelcare who provide off-peak Dial-a-Ride services in the remaining areas.

The services play a major role in promoting good health and wellbeing, reducing loneliness and isolation and help people access important services.

Lancashire Community Transport currently provides volunteering opportunities for over 160 people who contribute over 33,000 hours pa, equivalent to a financial contribution of approx. £400k per annum.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

Consultation will take place with service users, Lancashire Community Transport providers, community groups, local councils, MPs and volunteers.

Some comments supplied by LCT include:

Feedback from passengers includes:

- 'Community Transport is a real life-line and I don't know what I would do without it'.
- 'I am in my 90's, live alone and have poor health. I thought I was destined to spend the rest of my life as a prisoner in my home when Social Services told me about my local community transport. What a godsend, I am able to get my weekly shopping, go to medical appointments and visit places that I thought I would never see again'.
- I am in my late 80's, have a heart complaint and I live in a granny flat on my daughter's farm. She has breast cancer and is not well enough to look after me as well as the farm. Without community transport I would be totally isolated. I am now able go to medical appointments without worrying that I am putting unfair pressure on my family.'

Feedback from Volunteers:

- 'When I came to help out at community transport, I had previously suffered a nervous breakdown which left me with no self-confidence, self-esteem or selfworth. After driving for community transport for over two years, I applied for a part-time job armed with a new set of important transferrable skills that helped me to get the job. I will never be able to thank community transport enough for believing in me and investing so much time and effort in me to put me 'back on track'.
- 'I had taken early retirement and happened to be looking through a local magazine and came across an advert from my local community transport who were looking for volunteer drivers. Being a volunteer gives me a purpose in life. Speaking to the passengers, I realise that I make a massive difference to their lives, which gives me a very good feeling of self-worth.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities.
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.
- If the LCC funding were to be reduced substantially, many Community Transport operators would be at risk of no longer being financially viable. More than 6,200 individuals and over 1,000 community groups benefit from their services.
- The impact of Lancashire County Council reducing its funding will be a negative impact on some of the most vulnerable members of society and may put at risk the financial viability of some Community Transport services in Lancashire.

This negative impact would include increases in:

Social isolation

- Missed medical appointments
- Loneliness for already vulnerable people
- Mental health issues due to inability to access services
- Malnutrition due to lack of access to food supplies
- Debt issues resulting from people with no means of increasing their weekly income, having to pay for unaffordable transport services rather than the more manageable fare that are charged for the Dial-a-Ride services.
- Decline in physical health and mobility
- Lack of access to key local services

The close relationships that Dial-a-Ride drivers often have with their passengers can be invaluable in detecting issues with passengers such as health crises or similar. The difference that volunteering opportunities make to individuals in terms of raised self-esteem, self-worth, confidence and inclusion in society by providing services to individuals that change their lives should not be underestimated as many volunteers take up their roles due to the fact that they are bored, they feel isolated because they are no longer working and their personal mental health may suffer as a result of this. Along with the loss of volunteering opportunities, it is estimated that the equivalent of 3 full-time posts would be lost within LCC's Travelcare operation.

Lancashire Community Transport provides training for drivers such as The Minibus Driver Awareness Scheme (MiDAS) along with other care skills.

The impact on other local services, including wellbeing services, would be substantial as many local projects rely heavily on community transport as the only affordable means of ensuring that participants are able to access their services. LCT indicate that it makes a financial contribution to the local economy by delivering people to local shopping opportunities of around £2.6m per annum representing a return on investment of £5.20 per £1.

There is a high risk that many Community Transport and Dial-a-Ride users will no longer be able to sustain independent living and will place added pressure on Adult Social Care and Health services.

All of these elements contribute to the Public Sector Equality Duty's general aim of advancing equality of opportunity for those with protected characteristics including in particular supporting their participation in public life, which could be detrimental were the Service to significantly reduce.

Question 4 – Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g.

increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Yes. Many local services, especially in smaller communities are being withdrawn and concentrated in fewer centres. Such services include banks post offices, local shops, doctors and other services.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal? Please identify how –

For example: Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

The proposal will be reviewed following consultation.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

Enhancements of the tendered bus network will mitigate some of the impacts for some users but not for those who rely upon assistance and particularly for those who rely on door to door transport because they are unable to walk to a bus stop. No mitigation has been identified for volunteers.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is

required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

This proposal has been brought forward because of the extreme financial challenges that the County Council is facing. The potential significant adverse impact on CT users – over 6,200 people and 1000 groups – who will have protected characteristics including age and disability will be substantial. Whilst some mitigations will be provided by the re-introduction of some rural weekday bus services, this may not be of benefit to all those who currently use CT services. Additionally there will be an adverse impact on volunteers and employees with CT operators.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how? The proposal is to reduce County Council funding for Dial-a-Ride and Community Transport activities.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Monitoring may rely upon evidence of increased demand on social care and health services. Such impacts may be difficult to distinguish from the impact of other factors.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Oliver Starkey Position/Role Head of Service: Public and Integrated Transport

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head Decision Signed Off By Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager <u>Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk</u> Thank you Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

CMTY024 (2 of 2): Burnley BEST Dial-A-Ride Taxi Service For Decision Making Items

January 2018

County Council

www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision- makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting <u>AskEquality@lancashire.gov.uk</u>

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis is available from your Service contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team or from Jeanette Binns <u>Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk</u>

Name/Nature of the Decision

The future of the Burnley BEST Dial-A-Ride Taxi Service.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to cease the Burnley BEST Dial-A-Ride Taxi Service.

The Service was set up in 2010 following cessation of an Urban Bus Challenge Fund project which had run for the previous 5 years which supported people in Burnley and Pendle to travel to work or training where there was no public transport or the person was unable to use it due to mobility difficulties.

The post 2010 Service is provided by Crusader Cars who use their own vehicles and take bookings for journeys. Lancashire County Council maintains the list of members/users and assesses eligibility for membership.

The Scheme is available for members to make journeys to and from work or training between 05.30 a.m. and 23.00 p.m. Monday to Saturday, although journeys must be booked at least 24 hours in advance. The cost to passengers of journeys has remained unchanged since March 2010 at £2 per journey or £18 for a saver strip covering 10 journeys.

The cost of the Burnley BEST scheme has risen gradually during this period (see costs below taken from payment summaries).

	Net Cost	Rev/Cost	Subsidy per passenger
2010/11 (part			
period)	£13,135.50	27%	£4.33
2011/12 Actual	£21,026.90	30%	£4.29
2012/13 Actual	£28,139.98	27%	£5.02
2013/14 Actual	£28,538.41	26%	£5.78
2014/15 Actual	£29,953.29	21%	£6.81
2015/16 Actual	£31,316.33	21%	£7.01
2016/17 Estimated	£31,359.08	21%	£7.10

Over the same period the number of users has steadily reduced. Initially there were over 30 regular users in 2010, by 2016 this had reduced to 11 regular users.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

No. The Burnley BEST Dial-A-Ride Taxi Service operates in Burnley and Pendle and specifically in the LCC Electoral Divisions of Nelson South, Pendle Central, Burnley Rural, Pendle East, Pendle West, Burnley Central East, Burnley North East, Padiham & Burnley West and Burnley South West.

To be eligible to use the Scheme members must need the service to access employment or training, be unable to use the public transport network in East Lancashire either due to lack of appropriate services at times required or due to mobility difficulties. Eligibility is assessed before people can be accepted on to Burnley BEST.

Currently there are 11 regular users of the scheme.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Information about Burnley BEST current users was obtained from the consultation responses received in August to October 2016. 10 responses were received. Of those responding to the equality/demographic questions.

5 were male and 5 were female. This is reflective of the Lancashire population in terms of gender, 51% female and 49% male.

All 10 respondents were aged 35-64, which is higher than the Lancashire County Council area population of 58% of residents in the 20-64 age group and Burnley and Pendle where 59% of residents are aged 20-64.

None of the respondents stated that they had a disability. This contrasts with the Lancashire population whose day to day activities are limited a little (10%) or a lot (10%) and those in Burnley (12% have day to day activities limited a lot and 11% have activities limited a little) and Pendle (10% of residents have day to day activities limited a lot and 11% have day to day activities limited a little). In comments, however, one respondent did say that they had poor eyesight which meant they were unable to drive.

8 respondents were white British, 1 identified as White Rhodesian and 1 as Asian Pakistani. This is broadly reflective of the ethnicity of population in Lancashire but lower than the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) percentage for both Burnley (12.6% BME residents) and Pendle (20.1% BME residents).

Given the limited numbers of users it is difficult to assess disproportionate impacts on any particular protected characteristics groups, the impact will be shared equally amongst service users.

Information on other protected characteristics was not requested in this consultation. Any change in arrangements would have some level of impact on current Scheme Members and most significantly on regular Burnley BEST users.

Any decision to cease or significantly change support for Burnley BEST could also adversely affect the contractor Crusader Cars and may impact on their drivers and call handlers.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

Information about Burnley BEST current users was obtained from the consultation responses received in August to October 2016. 10 responses were received. Of those responding to the equality/demographic questions. 5 were male and 5 were female. This is reflective of the Lancashire population in terms of gender, 51% female and 49% male.

All 10 respondents were aged 35-64, which is higher than the Lancashire County Council area population of 58% of residents in the 20-64 age group and Burnley and Pendle where 59% of residents are aged 20-64.

None of the respondents stated that they had a disability. This contrasts with the Lancashire population whose day to day activities are limited a little (10%) or a lot (10%) and those in Burnley (12% have day to day activities limited a lot and 11% have activities limited a little) and Pendle (10% of residents have day to day activities limited a lot and 11% have day to day activities limited a little). One respondent, however, did comment that they had poor eyesight which meant that they were unable to drive.

8 respondents were white British, 1 identified as White Rhodesian and 1 as Asian Pakistani. This is broadly reflective of the ethnicity of the population in Lancashire

but lower than the BME percentage for both Burnley (12.6% BME residents) and Pendle (20.1% BME residents).

Information on other protected characteristics was not requested in this consultation. There are currently 11 scheme users. Any change in arrangements will adversely impact these members but will most significantly impact those who regularly use the Burnley BEST Scheme.

Any withdrawal of or significant change in support for Burnley BEST would also impact on the contractor Crusader Cars and potentially on its drivers and call handlers.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

Initially when the Burnley BEST was relaunched in 2010 approaches were made to Burnley Borough Council, Pendle Borough Council and 21 companies/organisations associated with Scheme members at that time seeking ideas of how the costs could be supported or seeking contributions towards the financing of the Scheme – these were unsuccessful. A consultation had also been carried out with Scheme members who were very appreciative of the relaunched service.

In August 2016 all current and recently lapsed Burnley BEST members were sent a personal consultation questionnaire. An 8-week consultation period was set with a closing date in October set for receipt of completed/returned questionnaires. 10 responses were received.

10 respondents used Burnley BEST every or most days and one respondent used it a few times a week.

4 respondents made journeys between 5:30 a.m. and 7:30 a.m. whilst 5 used it between 7:30 and 9:30 a.m. and 1 respondent between 9:30 and 3p.m. 9 respondents made journeys between 3p.m. and 4:30p.m and 1 made journeys between 8p.m. and 10 p.m.

10 respondents used Burnley BEST to travel to and from employment. Comments included that the journeys were not possible by public transport to meet shift patterns, etc or that the durations of journeys (e.g. 2 hours each way) made them impossible on public transport.

None of the respondents could identify an alternative means of getting to work if the Burnley BEST facility ended, 9 indicated that they would use none of the other methods suggested and 1 respondent didn't know what they would do.

All 10 respondents said that they would be unable to pay the full cost of £9 per journey suggested in the consultation to make Burnley BESTself-financing. Some indicated that they may be able to make a higher contribution towards the journey costs but others said they were on the minimum wage and would find increases in fares difficult to meet.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities.
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

As only those who cannot use public transport in East Lancashire either because it is not available or due to mobility difficulties/disabilities are eligible to use the Scheme, any cessation of the arrangement will inevitably make it more difficult or impossible for those people to get to and from work or training.

None of the respondents to the consultation stated that they had a disability but all indicated that either because of their shift patterns or because of the journey times involved in using public transport the only way they could get to and from work was by using Burnley BEST. Any change would affect their ability to participate in public life and adversely affect their equality of opportunity to work. A number of respondents said that they would have to change jobs or give up their jobs if the Scheme was no longer available and one stated that they had taken their current job because the service was available to get them to and from work. Respondents said this was because the journey was complicated or no bus services would allow them to reach work for their contracted working times.

Although no-one identified as having a disability amongst respondents in the monitoring/demographic questions, one respondent said they had poor eyesight and therefore could not drive. Another respondent identified as a single parent and said the service was essential to allow her to continue working and look after her child. A respondent also said the Service was particularly important "to working mums".

Respondents were also concerned as to whether any changes might result in an increase in fares for journeys. A number identified that they were on the minimum wage and that any change would have implications for their finances. The cost of travel for those taking Burnley BEST journeys has been unchanged since 2010 at £2 per journey or £18 for a saver strip covering 10 journeys. Any change to make the Service more reflective of its actual costs either by charging an increased flat rate fare (£9 per journey was suggested in the consultation) or by charging on a more individualised arrangement based on the length of journey will inevitably impact on the financial resources of current Scheme members. The extent of the impact will vary for each individual Member but is most likely to affect those who frequently use it.

The impact on community cohesion/fostering good relations is difficult to identify. However, many respondents did emphasise how courteous the drivers and other staff of Crusader Cars have been with them.

Several respondents said that the service allowed them to get to and from work safely, whilst another said that in addition to a lengthy bus journey to work if the service were withdrawn, they would also need to cross a very busy road which raised safety concerns for that respondent.

The availability of Burnley BEST has contributed for those current and previous scheme users to potentially reducing social isolation. Going to work is often

identified as generally good for people's health and wellbeing and contributing to reduced social isolation as a person is travelling (with a driver in this situation) and working with colleagues. Should scheme members be unable to remain in work – as some have suggested – this could contribute to increasing their social isolation. It is unlikely that any decision to cease or change the Burnley BEST service would have a disproportionately adverse effect in terms of younger or older people, ethnicity, gender or disability. However, there is potentially a significant adverse impact for those who use the Scheme compared to other members of the population who do not if changes to its operational arrangements are made and particularly if it is withdrawn.

This is a Scheme which only operates in the Burnley and Pendle areas and has no equivalent financed by the County Council elsewhere in Lancashire, however the County Council does provide administrative support to West Lancashire Borough Council for a similar scheme in the Up Holland/Skelmersdale area. It is arguable that residents in other parts of the county may face similar difficulties in getting to and from work or in selecting what jobs they may be able to take up and which are impracticable for similar reasons to those which the Burnley BEST consultation respondents have identified. Those situations, however, would not be impacted in the same way by a County Council decision as will the situation for the current users of Burnley BEST.

Question 4 – Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

This proposal is part of a wider proposal to reduce financial support for Community Transport Services operating in Lancashire.

As part of the County Council's 2016/17 budget a budget option affecting withdrawal of support for subsidised bus services was included. The final outcome of this proposal was the creation of a £3 million fund to retain a number of bus services particularly to assist people to access education, employment, health, social and leisure activities. Bus operators and other Councils also assisted in retaining other

routes. However, over 40 services were ended including a number of early morning and late evening/night Services, other Services have merged or routes have changed. This may have impacted on the availability of alternative Services which, for a few Scheme members, may increase the effect of this decision. Subsequently additional funding has been made available in 2017 to increase weekday bus services in various parts of the county with many changes taking effect from December 2017, though these may not significantly benefit current users of Burnley BEST.

It is possible that some members of Burnley BEST may be affected by changes associated with the Government's reforms to welfare benefits including changes affecting Universal Credit or other "in work" benefits.

As many respondents stated that they were on the minimum wage, rises in inflation or the cost of living may also increase the impact of any changes made to the Burnley BEST scheme.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal? Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

This proposal was developed in 2016 but was not taken forward at that time. It is substantially unchanged except that it is to consider ceasing the Burnley BEST scheme from 31 March 2018.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

The possibilities for mitigating the possible impact of this decision appear to be very limited and their possible effectiveness will be dependent on people meeting eligibility criteria or on other individuals being willing to participate in them.

One respondent in their comments indicated they had poor eyesight which prevents them from driving, this might raise the possibility for that individual of considering approaching the DWP's Access to Work Scheme which can potentially assist eligible disabled people with additional work related costs arising from a disability. This could include assistance with costs of travel to and from work if the additional cost is associated with a person's disability – e.g. an inability to drive for disability related reasons - and no suitable public transport available may be grounds for eligibility under the Access to Work Scheme.

The County Council has promoted car sharing initiatives at different times, consideration could be given to whether a specific targeted promotion could be carried out to assist these individuals.

Consideration might also be given to whether it is practicable for any of the current service users to travel together potentially reducing the cost per journey. This would rely on members being prepared to have their details shared and to potentially have slightly increased journey times.

Consideration of assessing with Crusader Cars whether there are opportunities for Scheme members to make greater use of "pooled" journeys.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

Given the increasing cost to the County Council of supporting the Burnley BEST scheme, periodic reviews of its sustainability have taken place since 2010. This has coincided with a period of unprecedented financial restraint for the County Council. More recently the County Council has had to move towards prioritising Services on the basis of those which are statutory. The support provided by the Burnley BEST Scheme does not fall within the range of provision which the County Council is statutorily required to deliver.

At the present time the income for the Burnley BEST scheme meets only around 21% of its running costs and requires a significant contribution form the County Council to continue operating. Currently the County Council contributes over £31,000 per annum to the Scheme which might be seen as around £2,800 for each user annually.

Furthermore, it is estimated in the Medium Term Forecast that the County Council faces a significant funding gap to deliver its statutory services.

It is acknowledged that any change to arrangements for members/users of the Burnley BEST Scheme will have a significant adverse impact on the individuals concerned in terms of their ability to travel to and from their place of work, possibly to continue their employment and maintain their current living standards/income. Whilst some mitigation may be possible through promotion of car sharing opportunities, member(s) being eligible for Access to Work support if their conditions/disabilities meet its criteria or considerations of other arrangements, this may not remove the disadvantage for some or all of the current users.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how? The future of the Burnley BEST Dial-A-Ride taxi service.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Review and monitoring arrangements will be considered in light of the outcome of this decision.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Oliver Starkey, Head of Service: Public and Integrated Transport

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head Decision Signed Off By Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

Where specific actions are identified as part of the Analysis please ensure that an EAP001 form is completed and forwarded to your Service contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team.

Service contacts in the Equality & Cohesion Team are: Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

CMTY026b - DISCRETIONARY CONCESSIONARY TRAVEL

Service Name:		Discretionary Concessionary Travel			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21			20	2018/19	
Gross budget 2017	/18		£26	£26.349m	
Income 2017/18			£7.	£7.769m	
Net budget 2017/18		£18	£18.580m		
Savings Target and	d Pro	ofiling (discrete y	ear):		
2018/19		2019/20	2020/21	Total	
£m		£m	£m	£m	
-0.043		-0.044	0.000	-0.087	
	I				
FTE implications:					
2018/19		2019/20	2020/21	Total	
0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	
deliver the budgeted savings Impact upon service		holders for travel before 0930 Monday to Friday from 50p to £1.00. Disabled NoWcard holders who rely upon bus travel before 9.30 will need to pay £1.00 instead of 50p.			
Actions needed to deliver the target savingsFull consultation with disability groups on the in and include seeking views on coinage usability. Communication plan for bus operator driver awar Concessionary Travel scheme will need amen although as it is a discretionary element it o introduced at a suitable time during the lifespar current scheme.What are the risksGroups representing disabled people are likely to out the lifespare		e usability. or driver awareness. need amendment, element it can be g the lifespan of the e are likely to object			
		to this proposal increased for ov		harge has not been	

Blackpool Council and Blackburn with Darwen Council and Blackburn with Darwen Council also operate a 50p charge. A communication plan will be required for cross boundary services.	
---	--

What does this service deliver?

The service manages the mandatory national concessionary travel scheme for Lancashire County Council.

A charge allowing those passengers, with a disabled person's pass, to travel before 0930 Monday to Friday is a discretionary element of the scheme.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

CMTY026b: Discretionary Concessionary Travel – Increase charges before 9.30am For Decision Making Items

January 2018

County Council

www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision- makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Discretionary Concessionary Travel

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Modify the Concessionary Travel Scheme to increase the Monday to Friday pre-0930 fare for Disabled NoWcard holders from 50p per journey to £1.00.

The current English National Concessionary Travel Scheme allows free travel after 0930 on Monday to Friday and all day on Saturdays and Sundays up to 2300. However, Lancashire County Council currently provides a discretionary enhancement to the national scheme by allowing Disable NoWcard holders the opportunity to travel for 50p per journey before 0930 on Monday to Friday. The 50p fare has been in place since 1 April 2008.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

No specific locational impacts on people using the disabled person's NoWcard.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified. Changes to the facility that allows holders of a disabled person's NoWcard to travel before 09.30 on payment of 50p will be restricted to people with a qualifying disability.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

There are currently 19,906 holders of disabled persons NoWCards in Lancashire (as at November 2017).

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

Consultation with users and staff will be carried out before final decision is confirmed.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be

– will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities.
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

The proposal will make it more expensive for disabled people to travel before 9.30am. Consultation responses may reveal further effects.

Any effects will particularly be felt by those making a journey which requires more than one bus prior to 9:30am.

Question 4 – Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Disabled people are still being transferred from Disability Living Allowance (DLA) to Personal Independence Payment (PIP) in Lancashire which can result in a change to the amount of benefit received. A component of both DLA and PIP is about mobility but the assessment criteria has changed so the mobility component may be reduced at the same time as the pre-9:30 concession price is increased. Also some disabled people who receive Employment and Support Allowance may be included in those affected by the Universal Credit roll-out difficulties.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal? Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Consultation stage has not yet been undertaken and further work will be required if the proposals progress.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

None identified for disabled people travelling before 9.30am.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The council is in a position where it needs to make substantial budget savings and this proposal will have a negative impact on people with protected characteristics, particularly those with fixed or low incomes or those making journeys which require more than one bus to be taken. The proposal to amend the arrangements for holders of disabled NoWcards may be difficult for those travelling from neighbouring areas with enhanced discretionary travel arrangements.

However, the fare has not risen since 2008 and whilst the rise to £1 does represent a significant increase, it does retains the possibility for people to pay using a single coin which many may find easier than using several coins.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Raise the pre-9:30 am. fare from 50p to £1 per journey on buses.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Feedback from those affected.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Oliver Starkey Position/Role Head of Service

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head Decision Signed Off By Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

PH012 – CRIME AND DISORDER – POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS

Service Name:			Crime and Disorder – Police Community Support Officers		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21 Gross budget 2017/18		2	2018/19 £0.319m		
		£			
Income 2017/18		£	£0.000m		
Net budget 2017/18		£	£0.319m		
Savings Target and	I Profiling (discrete	year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total		
£m	£m	£m	£m		
-0.220	-0.045	0.000	-0.265		
FTE implications:					
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total		
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
savings Impact upon servic	E Lancashire Co not directly em embedded in Team, manage and deal with network, espec	County Council (LCC). Lancashire County Council provides funding, but does not directly employ the PCSOs. However two PCSOs are embedded in the Council's Safe and Healthy Travel Team, managed on a day to day basis by officers of LCC, and deal with issues of crime and disorder on the bus network, especially in relation to young people travelling to and from school.			
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	Children and Police and Constabulary a A minimum	Consultation required with LCC colleagues e.g. in Children and Family Wellbeing Service, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, Lancashire Constabulary and PCSO staff. A minimum of four months' notice to Lancashire Constabulary is required.			
What are the risks associated with thi saving and how wil they be mitigated	this crime and disorder escalating into more serious criminal activity, which has a higher community and public service				

 An increase in harm / reducing support to the most vulnerable individuals / communities through e.g. anti-social behaviour A reduction in restorative justice approaches and behavioural change work
 A reduction in delivery of multi-agency initiatives to reduce low level crime and disorder e.g. through diversionary activities A reduction in capacity for community engagement / achaging activity
 cohesion activity A reduction in capacity to deliver multi-agency Early Action interventions, which may impact on delivery of outcomes for children and young people delivered through the Children and Family Wellbeing Service e.g. Troubled Families Programme.
It is anticipated that the proposal will reduce PCSO capacity in the County. There are currently 281 PCSO posts (265.72 FTE) in Lancashire Constabulary, of which 50 FTE are part-funded by a mixture of schools, colleges and local authorities.
LCC currently part funds 17 Lancashire Constabulary Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), generally employed in Early Action roles across the County; with 2 posts embedded in the Council's Safe and Healthy Travel Team, manged on a day to day basis by officers of LCC, and dealing with issues of crime and disorder on the bus network, especially in relation to travel to and from school.
Should LCC withdraw funding, it is understood that the Constabulary is likely to consolidate the remaining budget, resulting in the likely retention of 9 out of the current 17 posts.
LCC will also continue to work strategically with partners to reduce crime and disorder in the County.

What does this service deliver?

Context:

A police community support officer (PCSO) provides a link between the community and the constabulary. Their roles vary widely and can include working to reduce vehicle speeding, reporting vandalism, and reducing antisocial behaviour. PCSOs don't have powers to arrest, but instead they work, often with partner agencies, to protect the community through collaboration.

Currently there are 281 PCSO posts (265.72 FTE) in Lancashire Constabulary, of which 50 FTE are part-funded by a mixture of schools, colleges and local authorities.

LCC has a statutory duty to work with partners to reduce crime and disorder (as do all local authorities) under the Crime and Disorder Act. The PCSOs support the work of LCC, whilst also providing the visible operational commitment of LCC to community safety, albeit under the auspices of the Constabulary.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

PH012: Crime and Disorder For Decision Making Items

January 2018

County Council

www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision- makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Budget Option PH012 – CRIME AND DISORDER

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Agree to cease funding for the Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) posts currently part funded by Lancashire County Council (LCC).

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The decision will impact across the County where LCC funded PSCOs are deployed in the Police Divisions, often in the areas of the County where deprivation and crime & disorder issues are highest; with the two PCSOs embedded in the Safe and Healthy Travel team deployed across the bus network.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above - e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

It is likely that any decision will impact most on race / ethnicity / nationality in that there are often concentrations of Black Minority Ethnic communities in the most deprived parts of the County. Also possibly there may be impact on age (young people). However the proposal will not cease deployment of PCSOs altogether, although capacity will be reduced. If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

Lancashire Insight provides data in relation to population by a range of demographics including ethnicity and age. Currently there are 281 PCSO posts (265.72 FTE) in Lancashire Constabulary, of which 50 FTE are part-funded by a mixture of schools, colleges and local authorities. LCC currently part funds 17 Lancashire Constabulary Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), generally employed in Early Action roles across the County; with 2 posts embedded in the Council's Safe and Healthy Travel Team, manged on a day to day basis by officers of LCC, and dealing with issues of crime and disorder on the bus network, especially in relation to travel to and from school.

Should LCC withdraw funding, it is understood that the Constabulary is likely to consolidate the remaining budget, resulting in the likely retention of 9 out of the 17 posts.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

If the budget option goes forward consultation will be required with partners / stakeholders prior to final approval.

Consultation required with LCC colleagues e.g. in Children and Families Wellbeing Service, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, Lancashire Constabulary and PCSO staff.

A minimum of four months' notice to Lancashire Constabulary is required.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities.
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

There is the possibility of low level crime and disorder escalating into more serious criminal activity, which has a higher community and public service costs associated, including:

- An increase in youth offending criminal behaviours
- An increase in harm / reducing support to the most vulnerable individuals / communities through e.g. anti-social behaviour
- A reduction in restorative justice approaches and behavioural change work
- A reduction in delivery of multi-agency initiatives to reduce low level crime and disorder e.g. through diversionary activities
- A reduction in capacity for community engagement / cohesion activity
- A reduction in capacity to deliver multi-agency Early Action interventions, which may impact on delivery of outcomes for children and young people delivered through the Children and Family Wellbeing Service e.g. Troubled Families Programme.

It is anticipated that the proposal will reduce PCSO capacity in the County.

It is possible that any decision will impact most on the characteristic of race / ethnicity / nationality, in that there are often concentrations of Black Minority Ethnic communities in the most deprived parts of the County. Amongst other issues, PCSOs deliver activity aimed at reducing the incidence of hate crime. However the proposal will not cease deployment of PCSOs altogether, although capacity will be reduced, so the degree of impact may be considered as relatively low.

Question 4 – Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

There may be implications in relation to potential decisions around changes proposed for the Children and Family Wellbeing Service and Youth Offending Team.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how -

For example: Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Continuing with original proposal – PCSO capacity will be reduced, but not totally removed.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

Liaise with Lancashire Constabulary to mitigate any adverse effects in terms of deployment of remaining part funded PCSO capacity.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The proposal is driven by the need for budget savings. It is understood that other agencies are likely to maintain investment in PCSOs and that the Constabulary is likely to consolidate the remaining budget, resulting in the likely retention of 9 out of the 17 posts.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

To cease funding for Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) posts currently part funded by LCC. It is possible that any decision will impact most on the characteristics

of race / ethnicity / nationality in that there are often concentrations of Black Minority Ethnic communities in the most deprived parts of the County. However the proposal will not cease deployment of PCSOs altogether, although capacity will be reduced, so the degree of impact may be considered as relatively low.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Monitor through analysis of crime and disorder data, in liaison with Lancashire Constabulary.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Clare Platt Position/Role Head of Health Equity, Welfare & Partnerships

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head Decision Signed Off By Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

PH015 – CHILDREN AND FAMILY WELLBEING SERVICE

Service Name:			Children and Family Wellbeing Service		
Which 'start year' does this option 2018/19 relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21 2018/19					
Gross budget 2017	/18	f2	0.881m		
Income 2017/18			6.185m		
Net budget 2017/18			4.696m		
0					
Savings Target and	Profiling (discrete y	/ear):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total		
£m	£m	£m	£m		
-1.250	0.000	0.000	-1.250		
	·		·		
FTE implications:					
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total		
-34.28	0.00	0.00	-34.28		
	partners courses for Agree to reduct service has been current staffing agreed service potential. In or staffing resource the high level of unable to delive parts of the Cou	 Funding of group activity delivered by 3rd party partners i.e. parenting courses, employability courses for parents Agree to reduce the staffing budget by £0.500m.The service has been operational since April 2017 and the current staffing structure was approved to enable the agreed service specification to be delivered to its full potential. In order to achieve this proposal the current staffing resource would need to be reconfigured. Due to the high level of current staffing vacancies we have been unable to deliver the full service specification in some parts of the County. 			
	to: Convert 8. additional Conference enable the model of d				

	 Convert 12.08fte vacant resource Grade 4 to develop and implement a suitable 'Commissioning Framework' to enable commissioning of Voluntary and Community Faith Sector providers, with expertise in delivering targeted youth support services in a group work context to deliver priority targeted activity for young people (predominantly evening provision). Agree to reconfigure remaining current staffing structure to: Prioritise case holding roles and functions in order to meet the demands of the national Troubled Families Programme Prioritise resources to ensure we meet our minimum statutory responsibilities Prioritise Outreach and Group Work offer There would be no requirement to undertake a full consultation as this was completed as part of the original transformation agreed by Cabinet in November 2015. This is purely a reconfiguration of existing staffing resources.
Impact upon service	 Based on the current number of vacancies implementing this budget option in 2018 would have the following impact: Stretching to maintain reach and statutory universal commitments as part of the children's centre core offer will be extremely difficult with this scale of capacity reduction. This may impact on performance levels and key performance indicators which may be at risk within the Ofsted inspection framework. The scale of vacancies has a significant impact on the services' ability to deliver its published service offer as agreed by Cabinet in September 2016. We are currently operating below our planned caseload capacity and are at risk of being unable to achieve the agreed Troubled Families targets. This puts at risk the TFU anticipated annual income.

	 We have had to scale back public access and group based programmes in neighbourhood centres. The service is delivering its offer through 79 neighbourhood centres. The impact of this scale of reduction will mean that core delivery in centres will need to be scaled back resulting in service users being unable to access support in some of our centres. There would be an impact on partners who utilise Children's Centre premises for service delivery within the community, reducing communities access to services such as private Nursery Day Care providers, Job Centre Plus, Citizens Advice Bureau, Welfare Rights, Midwifery and Birth Registrations
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	 Consultation with stakeholders including service users, staff, Voluntary Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) and other external partners. Consultation to identify neighbourhood centres that were to be retained if service provision was scaled back. Complete consultation on the reconfiguration of the service offer. Realign the District non staffing budgets Progress procurement of VCFS Commissioning Framework to deliver 12 – 19 service offer Manage partnership expectations Adhere to HR and contractual obligations Progress immediately with conversion of some vacant current capacity as detailed above. (This would not need to be part of the consultation)
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	• Ability to maintain reach and statutory universal commitments as part of the children centre core offer will be extremely difficult with this scale of capacity reduction. This may impact on performance levels

and key performance indicators which may be at risk within the Ofsted inspection framework
Mitigated by the review of neighbourhood centres to be retained that would ensure we meet the statutory requirements i.e. that provision could cover the required reach areas. Consult with universal partners to ensure universal support remains accessible.
• The scale of vacancies has a significant impact on the services ability to deliver its published service offer as agreed by Cabinet in September 2016.
Mitigated by revising the current service offer in line with reduced resource capacity i.e. scale back group based activity.
• We are currently operating below our planned caseload capacity and are at risk of being unable to achieve the agreed Troubled Families targets. This puts at risk the TFU anticipated annual income.
Mitigated by prioritising case holding to families that meet the TFU criteria.
• The service is delivering its offer through 79 neighbourhood centres. The impact of this scale of reduction will mean that core delivery in centres will need to be scaled back resulting in service users being unable to access support in some of our centres.
Mitigated by ensuring our outreach provision was able to provide access to support in areas where service delivered in neighbourhood centres had been scaled back.
• The reduction of service provision within local communities is likely to attract unwanted attention.
Mitigated by consultation with all key stakeholders and an effective communication plan.
• If we were to reduce the number of designated children centres, buildings built using DfE Capital monies are subject to Clawback (See rules below). There is a potential maximum £32m of clawback.

Mitigated through appropriate change of use and would only reach that level if all current designated children's centres were closed.
• There would be an impact on partners who utilise Children's Centre premises for service delivery within the community, reducing community's access to services such as private Nursery Day Care providers, Job Centre Plus, Citizens Advice Bureau, Welfare Rights, Midwifery and Birth Registrations.
Mitigated by consulting with partners and agreeing how we could continue to work alongside partners in the settings that were to be retained.

What does this service deliver?

The Children and Family Wellbeing Service brings together Children's Centre provision, Young People's Service provision includes those not in employment, education or training (NEET), Prevention and Early Help panel arrangements and the Emotional Health & Wellbeing Commissioning framework.

The service delivers support at an Early Help level for children, young people and families 0-19 yrs (25yrs for those with special educational needs).

The service delivers Lancashire's response to the National Troubled Families Unit (TFU) agenda.

It contributes to reducing demand on children's social care by prioritising step down from social care, particularly from Level 3 children in need cases.

The council's statutory duties relevant to this service include:

- Delivering a 'sufficient' children's centre offer to meet local need so far as this is reasonably practicable (Childcare Act 2006). This is based on population and defined reach areas, with a consideration to retain universal services, whilst concentrating and targeting those children and families who are the most disadvantaged.
- Securing young people's access to 'sufficient' educational and recreational leisure time activities and facilities for the improvement of young people's wellbeing through the delivery of a 'Youth Offer' (Section 507b of the Education and Inspection Act 2006). This includes the duty on the local authority to consult young people about positive activities and other decisions affecting their lives and to publicise information on what positive activities are available in the county/local areas.

Making available to young people below the age of 19 and relevant young adults (i.e. those aged 20 and over but under 25 with learning difficulties) support that will encourage, enable or assist them to participate in education and training (Section 68 of the Education and Skills Act 2008) and ensure that they promote the effective

participation in education or training of young person's 16-17yrs and make arrangements to establish (so far as it is possible to do so) the identities of those young people who are failing to fulfil the duty to participate in education or training – thereby reducing the numbers of NEET young people (Raising Participation Age). The Children and Family Wellbeing Service brings together Children's Centre provision, Young People's Service provision including the NEET agenda, Prevention and Early Help panel arrangements, commissioning frameworks and the Working together with Families programme which is Lancashire's response to the National Troubled Families unit agenda. In addition the redesigned Children and Family Wellbeing Service is expected to deliver the local authority's response to statutory children in need cases.

The Children and Family Wellbeing Service in Lancashire, means identifying as early as possible when a child, young person or their family needs support, helping them to access services to meet their needs, prevent any problems getting worse and reduce the demand for specialist support services. Working together with key partners, we aim to ensure that we have maximum impact on achieving positive outcomes for families.

We prioritise vulnerable groups, individuals and communities, based on assessed levels of need under the following themes:

- Safeguarding and supporting the vulnerable
- Supporting family life
- Enabling learning
- Preparing for work
- Improving community safety
- Promoting health & wellbeing
- Developing healthier places

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

For Decision Making Items PH015: Children & Family Wellbeing Service January 2018



www.lancashire.gov.uk

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision- makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristic are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstance marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting:

AskEquality@lancashire.gov.uk

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis is available from your Service contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team or from Jeanette Binns <u>Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk</u>

Name/Nature of the Decision

Budget option of Children and Family Wellbeing service.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The element of the proposal considered in this analysis relates to a reduction in the non-staffing budget of £0.750m and a reduction in the staffing budget of £0.500m The Children and Family Wellbeing (CFW) service brought together the Young People's Service provision, including the NEET agenda Children's Centres and Prevention and Early Help along with arrangements in Lancashire for responding to the National Troubled Families Programme and the Emotional Health & Wellbeing Commissioning framework.

The CFW service model will continue to deliver the statutory Children's Centre offer, working with children and their families and with young people aged 12-19+ (aged up to 25 where they have special educational needs or disabilities).

The Service will identify as early as possible when a child, young person or family needs support, helping them to access services to meet their needs, working with them to ensure the support offered is right for them, offered in the right place at the right time. CFW is contributing to reducing demand on children's social care by prioritising step down from social care, particularly from Level 3 children in need cases.

The Service currently operates from 79 neighbourhood centres, with 53 being designated Children's Centres. Services are accommodated in a way which meets the diverse needs of children, young people and their families, including outreach services where appropriate.

This budget option includes; Reduction of non-staffing budget £0.750m

This will be achieved by;

- Reducing the resource made available to each district to deliver the core offer of the service i.e. physical resources and equipment
- Funding of group activity delivered by 3rd party partners i.e. parenting courses, employability courses for parents

Reduction of staffing budget £0.500m

The service has been operational since April 2017 and the current staffing structure was approved to enable the agreed service specification to be delivered to its full potential. In order to achieve this proposal the current staffing resource would need to be reconfigured. Due to the high level of current staffing vacancies we have been unable to deliver the full service specification in some parts of the County.

The proposed reduction net of £0.500m would be achieved by

- Convert some of the current vacancy capacity to
 - Convert 8.19 FTE posts at Grade 6 to create 6 new additional FTE Grade 8 posts as Family Group Conference Co-ordinators, this will then enable the Service to be able to have a targeted model of delivery to deliver FGC to cases stepped down from CSC.
 - Convert 12.08fte vacant resource Grade 4 to develop and implement a suitable 'Commissioning Framework' to enable commissioning of VCFS providers, with expertise in delivering targeted youth support services in a group work context to deliver priority targeted activity for young people (predominantly evening provision).
- Reconfigure remaining current staffing structure
 - Prioritise case holding roles and functions in order to meet the demands of the national Troubled Families Programme
 - Prioritise resources to ensure we meet our minimum statutory responsibilities
 - Prioritise management oversight and supervision functions
 - Prioritise Outreach and Group Work offer

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The proposal will affect children, young people and families in all parts of Lancashire but the extent of impact may depend on their location and individual circumstances.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes. The nature of the service is that it is targeted at children, young people and their families. This means that the age protected characteristic (children and young people) and pregnancy and maternity protected characteristic group may be particularly affected. As the service also provides specific support for disabled children and young people up to the age of 25 and disabled parents, the disability protected characteristic group may also be affected more than other people in that age group. Other protected characteristics – e.g. gender and ethnicity – may be affected given the location of proposed service points (ethnicity) and gender of parents/carers using the Service.

Information provided by the Service has also indicated that it supports transgender young people, lesbian and gay service users, teenage parents, young parents and young carers.

The service also has a long tradition of supporting young people and promoting a positive attitude towards inclusiveness across the range of protected characteristics.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

Yes

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

The following information was compiled about the "reach" of the Young People's Service in 2015/16 at the start of the service transformation.

Young People Service Equality statistics. 2015-16 Reach Achieved

During 2015/16 the total 12-19 young people cohort was 104,338. The service provided services to 30,125 young people, 28.9% of the total cohort. This can be broken down by district as follows;

	No Individuals Reached	12-19 Cohort	% Reached
Burnley	3,802	8,554	44.4%
Chorley	2,899	9,341	31.0%
Fylde	1,433	5,585	25.7%
Hyndburn	2,288	8,185	28.0%
Lancaster	3,423	11,086	30.9%
Pendle	2,489	8,576	29.0%
Preston	3,921	12,881	30.4%
Ribble Valley	1,021	5,276	19.4%
Rossendale	1,254	6,564	19.1%
South Ribble	2,126	9,813	21.7%
West Lancs	2,701	9,719	27.8%
Wyre	2,768	8,758	31.6%
	·		
Total	30,125	104,338	28.9%

Gender

During 2015/16 the gender split between male and female service users is pretty balanced with 28.6% of service users being female and 29.2% of service users being male. The service had 5 people accessing services who identified as Trans Male, 2 in Chorley, 1 in Hyndburn, 1 in South Ribble and 1 in Wyre. One service user in Hyndburn identified as Trans Female.

Disability

During 2015/16 8% of service users had a disability or learning difficulty. This varied across districts from 5.2% in Burnley to 11.1% in Rossendale. The breakdown per district is illustrated in the table below.

	SEND	12-19 Cohort	% Reached
Burnley	196	3,802	5.2%
Chorley	194	2,899	6.7%
Fylde	145	1,433	10.1%
Hyndburn	152	2,288	6.6%
Lancaster	341	3,423	10.0%
Pendle	150	2,489	6.0%
Preston	351	3,921	9.0%
Ribble Valley	62	1,021	6.1%
Rossendale	139	1,254	11.1%
South Ribble	228	2,126	10.7%
West Lancs	239	2,701	8.8%
Wyre	224	2,768	8.1%
Total	2,421	30,125	8.0%

Ethnicity

During 2015/16 61.7% of young people who accessed the service were white. For 28.8% of the young people accessing the service no ethnicity is recorded whilst 7.1% Asian young people accessed the service. There are significant variances at district level, for example 22.22% of young people accessing the service in Pendle, 16.73% in Burnley and 14.64% in Hyndburn are from the Asian community.

	Arab	Asian	Black	Chines e	East Europe	Gypsy/ Roma	Mixed	Not Known	White	Total
Total	7	2,133	65	35	6	63	564	8,674	18,578	30,125
12-19 Cohort	19	6,314	231	155	17	161	1,714	32,482	63,245	104,338
% total YP reached	0.0%	7.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	1.9%	28.8%	61.7%	

Whilst 28.9% of the total age 12-19 population accessed the service during 2015/16 this was higher in some communities. For example 39.1% of the total Gypsy/Roma community accessed the service and 36.8% of the Arab community accessed young people's centres.

	Arab	Asian	Black	Chines e	East Europ e	Gypsy / Roma	Mixed	Not Known	White	Total
Total	7	2,133	65	35	6	63	564	8,674	18,578	30,125
12-19 Cohort	19	6,314	231	155	17	161	1,714	32,482	63,245	104,33 8
% Reached	36.8%	33.8 %	28.1 %	22.6%	35.3%	39.1%	32.9 %	26.7%	29.4%	28.9%

Children's Centre Equality Statistics for 2015/16 are as follows:

The Children's Centre data is only available at district level.

Gender

The gender statistics for 2015/16 have been broken down by parents/carers and children registered with the children's centres. County wide 64% of parents/carers registered were female and 36% male. The district profile is illustrated in the table below;

District	Total Parents/ Carers	Female	% Female registered	Male	% Male Registere d
Burnley	8540	5827	68%	2713	32%
Chorley	10182	6316	62%	3866	38%
Fylde	4878	2830	58%	2048	42%
Hyndburn	10373	6851	66%	3522	34%
Lancaster	12999	7987	61%	5012	39%
Pendle	8738	6116	70%	2622	30%
Preston	13124	7964	61%	5160	39%

Ribble Valley	3196	1980	62%	1216	38%
Rossendale	5254	3767	72%	1487	28%
South Ribble	8424	5372	64%	3052	36%
Unknown	2944	1701	58%	1243	42%
West					
Lancashire	7729	5060	65%	2669	35%
Wyre	6323	3951	62%	2372	38%
Grand Total	102,704	65722	64%	36982	36%

The number of children receiving services at a children's centre during 2015/16 was more or less equally split between male and female.

Gender - Children aged 0-5

District	Total Children	Female	% Female registered	Male	% Male Registere d
Burnley	6623	3288	50%	3335	50%
Chorley	8586	4170	49%	4416	51%
Fylde	4094	2012	49%	2082	51%
Hyndburn	9461	4696	50%	4765	50%
Lancaster	10377	5018	48%	5359	52%
Pendle	6926	3347	48%	3579	52%
Preston	9327	4592	49%	4735	51%
Ribble Valley	2368	1164	49%	1204	51%
Rossendale	4520	2225	49%	2295	51%
South Ribble	6257	3012	48%	3245	52%
Unknown	1633	831	51%	802	49%
West					
Lancashire	5851	2839	49%	3012	51%
Wyre	5245	2492	48%	2753	52%
Grand Total	81268	39686	49%	41582	51%

Ethnicity

During 2015/16 15% of all parents and carers who registered to receive a service from a children's centre were from BME communities. Of those registered 44% attended their local centre. This varied across districts with 57% of all registered BME parents/carers in Rossendale attending a local centre whilst only 32% of registered BME parents/carers in Fylde attended a centre.

District	Total Parents/ Carers	BME Carers	% Registered	Number Attended	Of those BME - % Attende d
Burnley	8542	1669	20%	902	54%
Chorley	10182	796	8%	384	48%
Fylde	4878	386	8%	125	32%
Hyndburn	10374	1749	17%	806	46%
Lancaster	12999	1304	10%	512	39%
Pendle	8742	3077	35%	1637	53%
Preston	13133	4549	35%	1686	37%
Ribble Valley	3196	166	5%	92	55%
Rossendale	5254	618	12%	355	57%
South Ribble	8424	397	5%	118	30%
Unknown	2946	247	8%	70	28%
West					
Lancashire	7777	682	9%	269	39%
Wyre	6323	289	5%	101	35%
Grand Total	102770	15929	15%	7057	44%

Disability

Disability statistics are available for both parents/carers and children. 2% of all parents/carers who were registered with the service during 2015/16 reported a disability or learning difficulty. Of those 48% attended a centre to receive services.

District	Total Carers	Carers with SEN	% Registered	Number Attended	Of those with SEN % Attende d
Burnley	8542	152	2%	77	51%
Chorley	10182	151	1%	73	48%
Fylde	4878	64	1%	27	42%
Hyndburn	10374	146	1%	64	44%
Lancaster	12999	286	2%	134	47%
Pendle	8742	82	1%	43	52%
Preston	13133	181	1%	78	43%
Ribble Valley	3196	31	1%	19	61%
Rossendale	5254	99	2%	65	66%
South Ribble	8424	115	1%	51	44%
Unknown	2946	36	1%	9	25%
West					
Lancashire	7777	111	1%	55	50%
Wyre	6323	122	2%	63	52%
Grand Total	102770	1576	2%	758	48%

Disability - Children

District	Total Children	Children with SEN	% Registere d	Number Attended	Of those with SEN % Attende d
Burnley	6625	135	2%	47	35%
Chorley	8586	160	2%	67	42%
Fylde	4094	91	2%	39	43%
Hyndburn	9461	200	2%	87	44%
Lancaster	10377	301	3%	96	32%
Pendle	6926	115	2%	68	59%
Preston	9328	125	1%	45	36%
Ribble Valley	2368	54	2%	23	43%
Rossendale	4520	65	1%	50	77%
South Ribble	6257	134	2%	36	27%
Unknown	1652	39	2%	11	28%
West					
Lancashire	5851	138	2%	58	42%
Wyre	5245	135	3%	59	44%
Grand Total	81290	1692	2%	686	41%

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when. (Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

Consultation will be undertaken if this budget option proposal is approved with all stakeholders including staff, service users and partner agencies.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school?

Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities.
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

There will remain a level of universal service available to those assessed as at Level 1 on the Lancashire Continuum of Need in the form of information, advice and guidance and signposting only. These proposals will mean that stretching to maintain reach and statutory universal commitments as part of the children centre core offer will be extremely difficult with this scale of capacity reduction.

Those assessed as being on Level 2 of the Lancashire Continuum of Need are prioritised with a greater level of support being available to them. Included amongst the prioritised groups are those with disabilities or SEN, those affected by domestic abuse, groups such as Travellers and asylum seekers, etc.

The service is currently operating below planned caseload capacity and further reduction in staffing capacity will put the service at risk of being unable to support the number of families that are referred to the service, particularly those that meet the criteria for the Troubled Families programme.

The service has been unable to deliver its published service offer as agreed by Cabinet in September 2016 and has had to scale back public access and group based programmes in neighbourhood centres which is targeted at vulnerable groups, who are often those with protected characteristics.

The service is delivering its offer through 79 neighbourhood centres. The impact of this scale of reduction will mean that core delivery in centres will need to be scaled back resulting in service users being unable to access support in some areas.

This may mean increased travel for some service users to be able to use an alternative centre. There is concern that the cost or availability of public transport may be an issue for some people and a particular concern that heavily pregnant women or those with very young babies may be particularly disadvantaged by this. This proposal may impact on staff flexible working arrangements, their location of work and other elements of how they deliver their role.

Some group sessions are already over-subscribed and potentially increased demand on a smaller number of children's centres or other resources may exacerbate this difficulty and impact people's ability to participate in some activities. A reduction in service may increase social isolation particularly for the more vulnerable service users coupled with the loss of peer support, mixing with people from different backgrounds and social status and the value of resources and support/help/advice.

Question 4 – Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits). Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

There would be an impact on partners who utilise CFW premises for service delivery within the community, reducing community's access to services such as private Nursery Day Care providers, Job Centre Plus, Citizens Advice Bureau, Welfare Rights, Midwifery and Birth Registrations.

Other budget proposals both nationally – in relation to welfare benefits reform or other support – and locally may also increase the impact of service changes.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal? Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

The impact of this proposal will be mitigated by the service progressing with proposals to work in integrated teams with partners to ensure effective and efficient use of joint resources.

The conversion of 6 new additional FTE Grade 8 posts as Family Group Conference (FGC) Co-ordinators, will enable the service to be able to have a targeted model of delivery to deliver FGC to cases stepped down from Children's Social Care.

The service will develop and implement a suitable 'Commissioning Framework' to enable commissioning of VCFS providers, with expertise in delivering targeted youth support services in a group work context to deliver priority targeted activity for young people (predominantly evening provision).

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

As part of discussions arising from this proposal, mitigating actions have been considered such as;

- clarification on the availability and nature of the universal service offer;
- addition of all new parents, children and young people at risk of or having experience of child sexual exploitation and refugees amongst prioritised groups;
- The availability of detached, mobile and outreach services as part of the Children and Family Wellbeing Service Offer;
- Neighbourhood Centres will be equipped to meet the needs of the services provided in them and some will offer increased flexibility such as variable opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

This proposal has emerged following the need for the County Council to make unprecedented budget savings.

The Medium Term Financial Strategy reported in the December 2017 forecast that the Council will have a financial shortfall of £157 million in its revenue budget in 2021/22 subject to Cabinet agreement of proposed new savings proposals.

This is a combination of reducing resources as a result of the government's extended programme of austerity at the same time as the Council is facing significant increases in both the cost and demand for its services.

It is acknowledged that this will adversely impact on children and young people and their families, some disabled young people, those who are pregnant or on maternity leave and women disproportionately and in some areas people from BME communities or other ethnic groups/nationalities may be disproportionately affected. Mitigating actions have been considered as outlined in this Equality Analysis.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Reduction of non-staffing budget £0.750m

This will be achieved by;

- Reducing the resource made available to each District to deliver the core offer of the service i.e. physical resources and equipment
- Funding of group activity delivered by 3rd party partners i.e. parenting courses, employability courses for parents

Reduction of staffing budget £0.500m

The service has been operational since April 2017 and the current staffing structure was approved to enable the agreed service specification to be delivered to its full potential. In order to achieve this proposal the current staffing resource

would need to be reconfigured. Due to the high level of current staffing vacancies we have been unable to deliver the full service specification in some parts of the County.

It is likely that this proposal if approved will have an impact on most if not all of the groups with protected characteristics.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

The service has established robust monitoring arrangements which will be maintained.

The service will continue to review how existing resources are deployed (internal and external) in order to maintain high quality service provision including the possibility that we may have to deal with reducing staffing capacity.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Debbie Duffell Position/Role Head of Children & Family Wellbeing Service

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Jeanette Binns Decision Signed Off By Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

Where specific actions are identified as part of the Analysis please ensure that an EAP001 form is completed and forwarded to your Service contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team.

Service contacts in the Equality & Cohesion Team are: Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk