

**Children, Young People and Family Hub Programme****Final Business Case Equality Impact Assessment - Residents**

The Children, Young People and Family Hub Programme was established in 2017. Its primary objectives are to:

- Work in Partnership to improve outcomes for children through a whole family approach;
- Develop improved ways of working across care, education, health, police and the voluntary and community sectors to deliver early intervention services to children, young people and their families;
- Site services closer to families, and in a way that promotes co-location and co-delivery of services;
- Work with partners to design and deliver the improved ways of working, the siting of services closer to families, and creating more cost-effective delivery.

A pilot programme to test new ways of working commenced in September 2017 in the East Central area. This was followed by a similar pilot in West area in January 2018 and the South Area commenced in May 2018.

The pilot included the following:

- Dividing the Borough into three areas and reorganising Early Help Service staff to focus on service users in smaller local areas;
- Locating staff to work in buildings across the local areas they serve so they are closer to their service users
- Co-location of staff from different organisations in the same buildings to improve accessibility of services and more collaborative working to support service users.
- Introduction of weekly panels (comprising representatives from partner organisations) in each of the three local areas to consider complex case referrals and swiftly provide team based solutions around the child / young person and their family
- A collaborative approach to staff training and development to develop common and consistent high-quality support and improved knowledge of partner support available to help children, young people and their families.

An outline business case was submitted to CELS committee in January 2018. This was to seek agreement to develop a full business case to further develop the pilot for more formalised and permanent ways of working. This was then followed by public consultation from 1 February to 27 March 2018. A summary of the public consultation and analysis of respondents' protected characteristics is at Appendix 3. It should be noted however that despite extensive promotion and writing out to users who had used services since November 2017, response levels were low with 153 completing an on-line questionnaire and only around 70 answering personal profile questions. This has meant that reliable sub analysis of responses from those with protected characteristics was not always possible.

Proposals for the full business case include:

1. Formalise arrangements trialled in the pilot phase establishing multi-agency panels in each locality to review complex cases for Early Help and taking a partnership based approach to the delivery of a package of solutions
2. Reconfiguration of Council staff into hub teams with no reduction in front line staffing
3. Improved use of Children's Centre and Youth Centre buildings to deliver an integrated 0-19\* offer in local communities
4. Continue to commission schools to deliver universal and universal plus Children's Centre services to support continued early engagement antenatally/postnatally and the provision of structured

outreach programmes of activity to ensure access to early education and health services. To bring in-house the Family Support element of services to be delivered by the local Early Help Services teams to ensure a unified and consistent approach to delivery.

5. Deliver traded non-statutory services at full cost recovery. These services include:

- Finchley and Greentops Youth Activity Centres
- Duke of Edinburgh facilitation service
- Alternative education service
- Face to face counselling service for schools
- Child care places at Newstead

Whilst these proposals will reduce costs, there should be no changes to the availability of these services that will impact service users.

\*Or up to 25 years for young people in care or with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities.

### Initial Equality Assessment (EIA) - Resident/Service User

<b>1. Details of function, policy, procedure or service:</b>	
Title of what is being assessed: <b>Children, Young People and Family Hub Programme (also known as 0-19 Hubs)</b>	
Is it a new or revised function, policy, procedure or service? <b>Revision to Service</b>	
Department and Section: <b>Family Services</b>	
Date assessment completed: <b>23 April 2018</b>	
<b>2. Names and roles of people completing this assessment:</b>	
Lead officer	<b>Jill Barnes – Project Manager</b>
Other groups	<b>Children, Young People and Family Hub Programme Board</b>

<b>3. How are the following equality strands affected? Please detail the effect on each equality strand, and any mitigating action you have taken / required. Please include any relevant data. If you do not have relevant data please explain why / plans to capture data</b>			
Equality Strand	Affected?	Explain how affected	Indicate what action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?
1. Age	Yes x / No <input type="checkbox"/>	Data for children and young people shows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Based on the latest Lower Super Output Area statistics, there are 93,590 children and young people aged 0-19 living in Barnet.</li> <li>- The spread of ages is</li> </ul>	Consultation work with young people aged 12-16 and with parent carers of children of all ages has already taken place on how they access early help services, and the results of which are being used to influence the model.

**3. How are the following equality strands affected?** *Please detail the effect on each equality strand, and any mitigating action you have taken / required. Please include any relevant data. If you do not have relevant data please explain why / plans to capture data*

Equality Strand	Affected?	Explain how affected	Indicate what action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?
		<p>uneven, with proportionally more 0-4 and 5-9 year olds living in the borough (62.5%) than 10-14 and 15-19 year olds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The services under consideration in the programme are directly delivered to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young People aged 11-18 via the Youth Service</li> <li>• Families with children aged under 5 who access the current children's centre offer</li> <li>• Families with children of any age who are supported through current family support arrangements</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Whilst our proposals include a response to previously agreed reductions in expenditure, we have avoided loss of front line staff delivering Early Help Services and focused the reduction in spend in management posts and integration of some services. There will be no building closures. Our proposed model is looking at improving access and availability of services across the Borough and especially in areas of greatest need.</p> <p>An open public consultation was held 1 February-27 March 2018.</p> <p>This included a focus group of young people age 12-16.</p> <p>Our proposals include repurposing the use of some of our buildings so that they are available to service users for access to, and participation in, a broader range of services across 0-19 years.</p> <p>This was supported by 61% of respondents with 21%</p>

**3. How are the following equality strands affected?** Please detail the effect on each equality strand, and any mitigating action you have taken / required. Please include any relevant data. If you do not have relevant data please explain why / plans to capture data

Equality Strand	Affected?	Explain how affected	Indicate what action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?
			<p>disagreeing. Of those who disagreed, just under half at 48% disagreed citing concern over quality of service and concern that children of all ages using the same facilities could increase safety issues.</p> <p>We will mitigate against these issues by carefully planning events and activities so that different groups use facilities at different times. We will ensure continued quality of services through on going monitoring and evaluation of services and rigorous CPD for staff.</p>
2. Disability	Yes x <input type="checkbox"/> / No <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>For children with a disability, the 2011 ONS census<sup>Error!</sup> shows:</p> <p>Bookmark not defined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there were 16,028 children with a disability.</li> <li>of those identified as having a disability, 0.43% had a severe disability</li> <li>The number of children with a disability is evenly distributed across all age cohorts. However, there is a higher number of children ages 0-4 with a severe disability.</li> <li>Twice as many boys have a severe disability compared to girls.</li> </ul> <p>It is unknown how many children with SEN or a</p>	<p>A targeted focus group was held during the public consultation with parents of children with SEND to gather views from this group. This focus group raised concerns with the current service including quality of handovers between staff, staff rotation, duplication of services and confusion for families. They recognised that our proposals to change the service are intended to resolve those issues but expressed concern that problems could be exacerbated without investment in a robust system to share information effectively and appropriately. They also worried that relocation of services could be confusing for families and in</p>

**3. How are the following equality strands affected?** Please detail the effect on each equality strand, and any mitigating action you have taken / required. Please include any relevant data. If you do not have relevant data please explain why / plans to capture data

Equality Strand	Affected?	Explain how affected	Indicate what action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?
		<p>disability use current services, as this information is not routinely collected for open sessions. However, analysis of the pilot panel showed that 4 out of 39 families discussed and supported had a child with SEND (10.2%).</p> <p>The census and the Council do not routinely collect data on the number of parents with a disability living in Barnet, so it is difficult to make an assessment of the impact of service change without a baseline.</p> <p>Our public consultation received 73 responses to the question "Do you have any children in your household with a disability." 21% responded yes and 3% prefer not to say.</p>	<p>some cases if being required to attend a different centre, could cause distress.</p> <p>In response to these concerns, we can confirm that the partnership is currently updating Information share agreements and that processes have been put in place to ensure only relevant data is shared once consent is provided.</p> <p>It is not our intention to relocate any services as such – rather that we will make services accessible from more locations. This means that there should be no confusion or distress for families.</p>
<b>3.</b> Gender reassignment	Yes x <input type="checkbox"/> / No <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Data is unavailable at this point. The protected characteristics will be taken into account at a later stage if data becomes available.</p> <p>In the absence of data no impact on this protected characteristic can be considered.</p>	<p>In our public consultation we asked "is your gender identity the same as you were assigned at birth? We received 67 responses to this question with 90% saying yes and 10% saying prefer not to say.</p> <p>The council provides services to children, young people and their families, irrespective of gender identity preference.</p>
<b>4.</b> Pregnancy and	Yes x / No <input type="checkbox"/>	Due to the services offered by the Children's Centre, women	

**3. How are the following equality strands affected?** Please detail the effect on each equality strand, and any mitigating action you have taken / required. Please include any relevant data. If you do not have relevant data please explain why / plans to capture data

Equality Strand	Affected?	Explain how affected	Indicate what action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?
maternity		<p>who are pregnant, or who have had a baby are the most likely users of services.</p> <p>In Barnet, there were 5,261 live births in 2015/16, a rate of 64.5 live births/1000 women of childbearing age.</p> <p>Of the recent panel evaluation, 6 out of 45 children (13%) where support plans were discussed and developed at panel were either unborn, or within the first year of life.</p> <p>In our public consultation, 40 responders were pregnant and 43 were on maternity leave.</p>	<p>Sub group analysis of consultation questions did not high light any differences in responses from this group compared with any others.</p> <p>Our proposals are about co location with partners and improving access to services so they are closer to where people live. We therefore expect no negative impact upon this group.</p>
5. Race / Ethnicity	Yes x <input type="checkbox"/> / No <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Barnet's diversity is amplified for children and young people compared to the country as a whole with those from minority ethnic groups accounting for 52% of children living in the area compared with 30% nationally.</p> <p>We do not have complete service user data on ethnicity</p>	<p>A question on ethnicity was included in our public consultation. 70 people responded. The largest groups were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 44% White British</li> <li>• 14% Prefer not to say</li> <li>• 13% white other</li> <li>• 10% Asian British 6% other and</li> <li>• 1% each of the other</li> </ul>

**3. How are the following equality strands affected?** Please detail the effect on each equality strand, and any mitigating action you have taken / required. Please include any relevant data. If you do not have relevant data please explain why / plans to capture data

Equality Strand	Affected?	Explain how affected	Indicate what action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?
		of service users, it is difficult to assess the impact of service change in relation to ethnicity.	groups  Subgroup analysis to consultation questions did not high light any differences in responses from minority groups compared with any others.
<b>6.</b> Religion or belief	Yes x <input type="checkbox"/> / No <input type="checkbox"/>	There is currently no direct data which measures religion of children and young people or parents of children and young people living in Barnet. The only data collected is related to the overall population and based on the 2011 census data.	<p>A question on religious beliefs was included in our public consultation. 69 people responded as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 39% Christian</li> <li>• 20% prefer not to say</li> <li>• 12% no religion</li> <li>• 7% Atheist</li> <li>• 6% Jewish</li> <li>• 6% Hindu</li> <li>• 3% Muslim</li> <li>• 1% Buddhist</li> </ul> <p>Subgroup analysis of responses to consultation questions did not high light any differences in responses from minority groups compared with any others.</p> <p>The council provides services to children, young people and their families, irrespective of their religion or beliefs.</p> <p>The Council has recently commenced a staff training and development programme to help staff better understand the needs of different religious and ethnic groups. This is intended to help</p>

<b>3. How are the following equality strands affected? Please detail the effect on each equality strand, and any mitigating action you have taken / required. Please include any relevant data. If you do not have relevant data please explain why / plans to capture data</b>			
Equality Strand	Affected?	Explain how affected	Indicate what action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?
			them better understand how access to and delivery of services can be improved taking into account the needs of different groups.
7. Gender / sex	Yes x / No <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Population data for 0-19 year olds living in Barnet show that the gender split is as follows:</p> <p>Female: 48%</p> <p>Male: 52%</p> <p>National trends around the usage of Children's Centres show that mothers are more likely to use Children's Centres. However, services are available for all parents, regardless of gender.</p>	<p>Respondents to our public consultation were asked their gender. Of 72 responses, 68% were female, 6% preferred not to say and 26% were male.</p> <p>We were not surprised with this split as parent / carers using children's centres are predominantly female.</p> <p>Sub group analysis of consultation questions did not highlight and differences between male and female responses.</p>
8. Sexual orientation	Yes x <input type="checkbox"/> / No <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Data is unavailable at this point. The protected characteristics will be taken into account at a later stage if data becomes available. It is estimated that ^6% of the UK adult population identify as LGBT.</p> <p>In the absence of data no impact on this protected characteristic can be considered.</p>	<p>Respondents to our public consultation were asked about their sexual orientation. 67 people responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 72% heterosexual</li> <li>• 25% prefer not to say</li> <li>• 3% other</li> </ul> <p>The council provides services to children, young people and their families, irrespective of sexual orientation. Evidence suggests that sexual orientation in young people can be a key factor in health and well-being of the young person.</p>
9. Marital Status	Yes x <input type="checkbox"/> / No <input type="checkbox"/>	Data suggests 8.2% of families in Barnet are lone parents with	Respondents to our public consultation were asked if they



**3. How are the following equality strands affected?** Please detail the effect on each equality strand, and any mitigating action you have taken / required. Please include any relevant data. If you do not have relevant data please explain why / plans to capture data

Equality Strand	Affected?	Explain how affected	Indicate what action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?
		dependent children.	<p>were a lone parent. 75 responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 71% No</li> <li>• 16% yes</li> <li>• 13% prefer not to say</li> </ul> <p>Sub group analysis of consultation questions did not high light and differences between lone parents and others.</p>
<b>10. Other key groups?</b>	Yes x <input type="checkbox"/> / No <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Low income families</b></p> <p>Figures suggest that 4% of Barnet's LSOAs are in the most deprived 10% of LSOAs nationally with an estimated 3,772 children aged 0-15 living in these LSOAs (mid 2012).</p> <p>Overall, data suggests that 14% of children in Barnet are living in the 33 most deprived LSOAs, defined as LSOAs which are in the lowest 20% for IDACI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proportion of children entitled to free school meals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in primary schools is 16.7% (the national average is 14.5%)</li> <li>• in secondary schools is 13.1% (the national average is 13.2%)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 19% of children under five (5,000 children) live in low income families.</li> </ul> <p><b>Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET)</b></p> <p>Overall in Barnet 2.3% of 16-18 year olds are NEET. Males are</p>	<p>Respondents to our public consultation were asked about their employment status. 75 responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 71% No</li> <li>• 16% yes</li> <li>• 13% prefer not to say</li> </ul> <p>Sub group analysis of consultation questions did not high light and differences between the different groups.</p> <p>The council provides services to children, young people and their families, irrespective of family circumstances. It is not anticipated that the proposed changes to services will have a negative impact upon these groups.</p>

**3. How are the following equality strands affected? Please detail the effect on each equality strand, and any mitigating action you have taken / required. Please include any relevant data. If you do not have relevant data please explain why / plans to capture data**

Equality Strand	Affected?	Explain how affected	Indicate what action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?
		<p>over-represented as NEET 61%, compared to 51% in general population. However to note that overall 2.3% is significantly lower than the 33 other local authorities and in the country</p> <p><b>Young Carers</b></p> <p>The 2011 Census revealed that there are 2,911 children and young people aged 0 – 24 providing unpaid care in Barnet. Nationally there is a trend of under identification, as young people often do not report that they have caring responsibilities at home. Using estimates, that there could be up to four times more young carers living and caring in Barnet. This would mean there are over 11,600 young carers in Barnet, one in ten of the 0 – 24 population.</p>	

**5. Please outline what data sources, measures and methods could be designed to monitor the impact of the new policy or service, the achievement of intended outcomes and the identification of any unintended or adverse impact?**

*Include how frequently monitoring could be conducted and who will be made aware of the analysis and outcomes*

The outcomes of the review are based on those set out in Children and Young People's Plan 2016-2020. The outcomes that the review will focus on improving are:

- Building resilience of the most vulnerable young people
- Positive Health and Wellbeing outcomes for young people
- Readiness for Adult life
- Reducing risky behaviour
- Taking part in positive activities

- Young people have their say

An evaluation framework consisting of service user feedback, partner feedback and data analysis of the families supported is being developed and will be used to measure impact of the pilots and future service.

This Impact Assessment was updated alongside the development of the Full Business Case for the 0-19 review.

## 6. Initial Assessment of Overall Impact

Positive Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Negative Impact or Impact Not Known <sup>1</sup> <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--

## 7. Scale of Impact

Positive impact:  Minimal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x Significant <input type="checkbox"/>	Negative Impact or Impact Not Known  Minimal <input type="checkbox"/> Significant <input type="checkbox"/>	
---	--	--

## 8. Outcome

No change to decision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Adjustment needed to decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Continue with decision ( <i>despite adverse impact / missed opportunity</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/>	If significant negative impact - Stop / rethink <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	--	--

## 9. Please give a full explanation for how the initial assessment and outcome was decided.

Our proposals to change the way we organise and deliver Early Help Services is to target services to where they are most needed and to make them accessible from more locations. No services will be withdrawn and no buildings will be closed. The public consultation response was low but generally demonstrated support for our proposed approach.

It is anticipated that outcomes for families will improve and early indications are that families in early need of support are being responded to more quickly than previous and the team based approach through use of hub panels is delivering more effective packages of support.

Whilst we were not able to provide reliable sub-analysis of differences in responses from those with protected

<sup>1</sup> 'Impact Not Known' – tick this box if there is no up-to-date data or information to show the effects or outcomes of the function, policy, procedure or service on all of the equality strands.

characteristics due to small numbers, we believe that the improvements we are planning will not have a negative impact on any group with protected characteristics.

**Changes to the way in which we organise and deliver Early Help Services in Barnet**  
**Public consultation survey**  
**1 February 2018 – 27 March 2018**  
**Extract – Analysis of responses by protected characteristics**

**Responses to the On-line Questionnaire – analysis by protected characteristics**

1. The questionnaire was also made available in other formats.

A total of 153 people responded to the questionnaire. Not all respondents answered questions on protected characteristics.

- (i) Single Parents responding
  - 75 respondents
  - 16% Single parents
  - 13% prefer not to say
- (ii) Employment status
  - 75 respondents
  - 4% unemployed and available for work
  - 9% looking after the home
- (iii) Age of children in households
  - 73 respondents
  - 24% children under 5
  - 26% children age 5-11
  - 30% children age 12-16
  - 48% children over 16
- (iv) Age of respondents
  - 70 respondents
  - 2% age 14-15
  - 3% age 16-24
  - 17% age 25-34
  - 33% age 35-44
  - 35% age 44+
  - 9% prefer not to say
- (v) Children in households with long term disability
  - 58 respondents
  - 21% yes
  - 3% prefer not to say
- (vi) Respondents with long term disability
  - 70 respondents
  - 9% yes
  - 10% prefer not to say

- (vii) Ethnicity
  - 44% White British
  - 14% Prefer not to say
  - 13% White other
  - 10% Asian / Asian British – Indian
  - 6% Other
  - 1% Asian / Asian British -Pakistani
  - 1% Any other Asian Background
  - 1% Black African
  - 1% Black British
  - 1% Mixed
  - 1%White Greek / Greek Cypriot
  - 1% White Irish
  - 1% White Turkish / Turkish Cypriot
  - 1% other Arab
- (viii) Religion
  - 69 respondents
  - 39% Christian
  - 20% Prefer not to say
  - 12% No religion
  - 7% Atheist
  - 6% Hindu
  - 6% Jewish
  - 6% Agnostic
  - 1% Buddhist
- (ix) Gender
  - 72 Respondents
  - 68% female
  - 26% Male
  - 6% Prefer not to say
- (x) Pregnant / on maternity leave
  - 43 Respondents
  - 2% pregnant
  - 10% on maternity leave
- (xi) Gender reassignment
  - 67 Respondents
  - 90% gender same as assigned at birth
  - 10% Prefer not to say
- (xii) Sexual orientation
  - 67 Respondents
  - 25% Prefer not to say