

Section 4

Equality

Analysis Toolkit

BOP036 – Youth Offending Team

For Decision Making Items

November 2015

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 characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances 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

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Reduce the County Council contribution to the YOT Partnership from 1 April 2016, with 6 months provision from reserves to cover the transition to the reduced level of service provision.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Reduction of the revenue budget by £640,000 from 1 April 2016. However, the proposal includes provision to fund the service for 6 months from risk reserve funding. Detailed proposals of how the saving will be delivered are still to be developed.

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.

Yes

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.

Lancashire's Youth Offending Team (LYOT) is managed by a Partnership Board and delivers, in partnership, statutory services for youth justice and children's social care. The service is provided through a multi-disciplinary area based model and consists of staff from the Police, Probation, Health, Education and Social Services. There are also a number of volunteers within the service which support specific areas of delivery.

The service model is derived from the legislative duties outlined in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and is subsequently jointly funded partners. The principal aim of the service is to prevent offending by children and young people with local strategic decision and direction primarily made through the Lancashire Youth Justice Management Board. In addition to these partnership arrangements, a significant proportion (36%) of the service functionality is reliant on grant funding drawn down from the Youth Justice Board (YJB). It has already be confirmed that the YJB will be reduced in-year by £283k in 2015/16. The local authority currently contributes 40% of the total YOT budget.

The YJB has a responsibility to monitor adherence to the National Standards for

Youth Justice Services, which bring together a range of legal frameworks and statutory and effective guidance. These Standards define a minimum required level of service provision but also afford youth justice services the maximum freedom and flexibility to adapt their practice to local context.

Standards also include a number of Strategic and Operational Management Standards. The Strategic Standard 2 ensures that "all service provision takes full account of diversity and equal opportunities (ensuring access to appropriate services and programmes)".

Specifically the service:

- Assess young people who have committed criminal offences.
- Supervises young people subject to court orders and supports diversionary approaches to prevent anti-social behaviour and offending.
- Supervises and supports young people subject to custodial sentences.
- Works with young offenders to prevent re offending and provides meaningful opportunities.
- Works with victims of crime.
- Ensures both victims and perpetrators of crime are safe.
- Prevents first time offending.
- Reduces the numbers of young people entering custody.

The YOT service collects a range of information about the service. Data about Court Disposals for 2014/15 reveals that 88% of 1097 cases involved male users, while the ethnic breakdown showed that 85% were White, 5% were Asian, and 1% were Black. Because the ethnicity of over 7% was not known, it is difficult to say whether any ethnic group is over or under represented among service users.

The service does not record data on disability.

The service targets children and young people aged 10-17.

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)

Proposals have not been developed setting out how the saving would be delivered. Among the actions that will be needed is to consult with the YOT Partnership Board and Partners to identify the totality of funding available and redesign the service in the context of reduced resources. The results of this consultation (and also any outcomes of the wider budget consultation) will be analysed and taken into account when implementing the proposal. The findings of any consultation will be incorporated into this Equality Analysis.

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.

Reduction in the LCC's contribution may significantly reduce the capacity of the service and increase the risk of the service being able to meet its minimum statutory responsibilities.

More information is needed on exactly which elements of the Service would cease or be significantly reduced in order to undertake a full Equality Analysis. However, it is possible that there may be concerns arising in relation to the PSED's general aim of "fostering good relations between communities/groups with protected characteristics" if proposals might affect responses to hate crime, anti social behaviour and community safety or other elements.

Because of the nature of the service, any reductions in service provision will impact disproportionately on children and young people aged 10-17, and their families and communities. Significant reductions may impact disproportionately on males. We do not have enough information to assess whether any ethnic group will be adversely impacted, but if there impacts in the areas outlined above this is possible.

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.

A number of changes to the benefits system may impact disproportionately on some of our most vulnerable and poorer families and communities and that may have a knock-on effect on children and young people, possible increasing demand for YOT 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 remain the same, although implementation (service redesign) will still be subject to further review and 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.

The proposal makes provisions for funding from reserves for 6 months to allow for a transition period for the service to be redesigned in the context of reduced resources. This, together with consultation with YOT Partnership Board and partners will ensure that negative impacts will be further assessed, monitored and minimised.

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 magnitude of the required savings mean that there may be negative impacts on service users, including those who shared protected characteristics. However, the County Council is trying to ensure that services to the most vulnerable (and particularly statutory services) are protected, as

well as redesigning many services in order to ensure more effective and targeted provision.

The proposal will also reduce the county council's per capita expenditure on youth justice (residents aged 10 – 17) from the current 3rd highest to the average level of expenditure for the group of "nearest neighbour" benchmark authorities.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The proposal is to reduce the County Council contribution to the YOT Partnership from 1 April 2016, with 6 months provision from reserves to cover the transition to the reduced level of service provision.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The Equality and Cohesion Team will ensure that appropriate monitoring procedures will be developed following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Saulo Cwerner

Position/Role Equality & Cohesion Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Saeed Sidat

Decision Signed Off By **Saeed Sidat**

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:

Karen Beaumont – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Karen.beaumont@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Adult Services ; Policy Information and Commissioning (Age Well); Health Equity, Welfare and Partnerships (PH); Patient Safety and Quality Improvement (PH).

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Community Services; Development and Corporate Services; Customer Access; Policy Commissioning and Information (Live Well); Trading Standards and Scientific Services (PH), Lancashire Pension Fund

Saulo Cwerner – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Saulo.cwerner@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Children's Services; Policy, Information and Commissioning (Start Well); Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help (PH); BTLS

Pam Smith – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Pam.smith@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Governance, Finance and Public Services; Communications; Corporate Commissioning (Level 1); Emergency Planning and Resilience (PH).

Thank you