

Budget Savings Proposals Full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)

Section 1: General Information

1a) Name of the savings proposal

Redesign support for young people aged 13-19 to reflect need

1b) Service area

Youth & Community Learning

1c) Service Head

Dinar Hossain – Service Youth and Connexions Service

1d) Name and role of the officer/s completing the EQIA

Paul Gresty, Equality and Diversity Coordinator
Strategy and Policy

EQIA to be agreed and signed off by Mary Durkin – Service Head, Youth and Community Learning

Section 2: Information about changes to services

2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change

Figures from the Department of Education show that Tower Hamlets' budget for youth services in 2009-10, at £246 per head of population, is significantly above the national average expenditure of £39 per head of population in 2009-10. Whilst this investment has achieved significant improvements in outcomes for young people, it suggests that there is also scope for efficiencies without reducing outcomes for young people. The re-structure of Youth and Connexions Services saves money by re-aligning the targeted work (work with young people considered to be at risk of social exclusion). This re-alignment will achieve better value for money.

The re-structure does not represent a reduction in the day-to-day youth service available to young residents – the Universal Contracted Provision – nor does it represent any reduction in the response and mobile work of the service (Rapid Response Team).

The areas which yield savings are:

- Streamlining middle management.
- Merging targeted work (Youth Inclusion Programme and Connexions services) and aligning it with other targeted work, as part of a new early intervention and prevention strategy.
- Rationalisation of NEET activity

2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?

The savings will be made as part of an overall restructure, and while there will be reductions in some budgets, we are confident that a more focused and integrated approach to targeted youth support will mean that the resources available to address inequality will be maintained. The aim of the review is to refocus provision on need and make it more accessible. As part of the restructuring process, protecting front line services is key to ensuring quality front line delivery to young people 13-19 years old and 25 with Special Education Needs.

<http://www.nya.org.uk/annual-audit>; [Finance comparative table 2007-08](#)

The proposals maintain our current level of funding for the youth service contracts and direct service provision

Quarterly performance monitoring with contractors is an ongoing process. The data shows the take up in the service's provision is 51.9%. The delivery of targeted provision demonstrates we are reducing numbers going into the youth justice system. There will be no reduction to the local universal offer. The Rapid Response Team, outdoor education, and youth involvement will remain intact.

In terms of inequality, a recent review identified that significant investment made in Tower Hamlets to support young people had resulted in progress on measures such as:

- ensuring that the service now reaches over fifty percent of the teenage population;
- providing better access to girls through improved accredited focused services and the provision of girls only sessions;
- reducing the number of 16-19 year olds and not in education, employment or training. The current NEET figure is at 5.2%, one of the lowest in the country;
- driving down the number of First Time Entrants into the criminal justice system;
- significantly increasing access to drug prevention and drug treatment programmes;
- supporting young parents and delivering programmes to reduce teenage pregnancy; and
- building on the Your Welcome model to promote sexual health and wellbeing.

A new integrated service will focus on early identification and prevention. In addition to the programmes listed above, it will offer school transition support for key stages 3, 4 and 5 working with children from the age of eight (YISP). Work with under 13s will be funded through the Early Intervention Grant and YJB. The new service will be an integral part of the CSF Early Intervention Programme, covering 0-19 and parenting, managed within the Youth Service.

Integrating the Connections and Youth Inclusion Programme

The proposal merges YIP and targeted Connexions work. This means that advice and guidance given to vulnerable groups will be provided by one team of workers rather than two, improving efficiency, removing duplication and also improving access to the service. Two teams, the targeted Connexions team and YIP caseworkers, will become one team of 'transition support workers.' This reduces the risk of vulnerable young people 'falling between the gaps' between two teams and therefore ensures we can continue to target work with vulnerable groups. New Start will continue as it is currently. We are also reshaping the management team to create one 'targeted support manager' who will oversee all targeted work with young people. This will ensure that there is enhanced strategic oversight and that the service can be better focussed to meet the needs of young people.

The work of the Connexions team has been augmented by additional WNF funds for the Youth Engagement Programme, Transition Mentors and Advanced Skills PAs. In the absence of this funding, we must adapt the work of the core Connexions team to achieve effective streamlined early intervention. We need more community based initiatives and more evening and week-end work. Partnership work with schools will support the early identification of young people who are likely to be at risk. Transition Support Workers will focus on early identification and prevention strategy. This will include work with young people who are/or at risk of becoming NEET.

New Start will continue to offer centrally targeted support for the most vulnerable young people in the borough, taking referrals (Tier 3) from statutory provisions, SIP/PRU and NEET as well as the unknown cohort. It will retain a team leader and a co-ordinator post and one training co-ordinator post to focus on organising Personal Development Programmes, short courses, tailor made opportunities and group activities. Targeted work will be enhanced by more focused work with specific groups. We will maintain in house a capacity to provide targeted support for vulnerable young people through the successful New Start programme.

The proposal will ensure that resources are effectively directed to need, and that services are provided in accessible locations. This will help to sustain improvements in performance in relation to measures such as youth offending and the NEET rate at a lower cost, measured by relevant performance indicators. Schools will deliver the service, one in each LAP.

The change does not alter the eligibility criteria.

There is a reduction of up to 9 posts and this affects middle management posts.

The Connexions commissioned activities are 'doorknocking'- ie outreach work to engage difficult to reach young people. We will continue to provide these services, but they will become part of the work of the transition support team.

There is going to be a change to job descriptions to more accurately reflect the needs of the service. Consultation is being undertaken with staff affected in line with the organisational change procedure. All necessary considerations will be given around reasonable adjustments. By changing the job description of personal advisers to transition workers we can more accurately target the service and meet the needs of young people. Posts will be more flexible and therefore more targeted to need and priorities. For example, personal advisers will have caseloads and will be able to offer support or act as mentors for young people.

Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

<p>Race</p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the policy on different racial groups.</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on specific ethnic groups? yes/no Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>No impact. Targeted work around ethnicity remains a priority in the YS contract. This will not be altered.</p>																									
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">Ethnicity</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">2009/10 (Apr'09 - Mar '10)</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">2010/11 (Apr '10 - Dec'10)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Asian/Asian British</td> <td>69.4%</td> <td>59.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black/Black British</td> <td>7.8%</td> <td>10.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mixed/Dual Heritage</td> <td>2.5%</td> <td>3.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>9.1%</td> <td>14.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>1.5%</td> <td>2.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Decline to say</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>0.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unconfirmed</td> <td>7.6%</td> <td>8.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Ethnicity	2009/10 (Apr'09 - Mar '10)	2010/11 (Apr '10 - Dec'10)	Asian/Asian British	69.4%	59.0%	Black/Black British	7.8%	10.4%	Mixed/Dual Heritage	2.5%	3.1%	White	9.1%	14.5%	Other	1.5%	2.6%	Decline to say	0.2%	0.1%	Unconfirmed	7.6%
Ethnicity	2009/10 (Apr'09 - Mar '10)	2010/11 (Apr '10 - Dec'10)																								
Asian/Asian British	69.4%	59.0%																								
Black/Black British	7.8%	10.4%																								
Mixed/Dual Heritage	2.5%	3.1%																								
White	9.1%	14.5%																								
Other	1.5%	2.6%																								
Decline to say	0.2%	0.1%																								
Unconfirmed	7.6%	8.3%																								

Disability

Identify the effect of the policy on different disability groups

Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on disabled people? **yes/no**
Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.

No impact. Disability monitoring will remain in the contract.

The data reflects the actual level young people with SEN contact

Disability	2009/10 (Apr'09 - Mar '10)	2010/11 (Apr '10 - Dec'10)
Y	14.0%	15.0%
N	86.0%	85.0%

Gender

Identify the effect of the policy on different gender groups (inc Trans) groups

Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on men or women? yes/**no**
Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.

No impact. Monitoring Gender will remain in the contract.

Gender	2009/10 (Apr'09 - Mar '10)	2010/11 (Apr '10 - Dec'10)
Male	62.3%	65.0%
Female	33.6%	32.1%
Decline to say	0.0%	0.0%
Unconfirmed	4.0%	2.9%

<p>Sexual Orientation</p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the policy on members of the LGB community</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on lesbian, gay or bisexual people? yes/no Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>No data on sexual orientation but is not envisaged that there will be any negative impact</p>
<p>Religion and Belief</p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the policy on different religious and faith groups</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on people who practice a religion or belief? yes/no Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>No data on Religion and Belief. No adverse impact envisaged</p>

<p>Age</p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the policy on different age groups using the prompts above</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on specific age groups? yes/no Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>No data on Religion and Belief. No adverse impact envisaged.</p> <p>NB: The age categories are broken down into 11-12, 13-19 and 20-25</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="394 539 1196 746"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="394 539 696 611">Age</th> <th data-bbox="703 539 949 611">2009/10 (Apr'09 - Mar '10)</th> <th data-bbox="956 539 1196 611">2010/11 (Apr '10 - Dec'10)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="394 616 696 643">11-12</td> <td data-bbox="703 616 949 643">10.9%</td> <td data-bbox="956 616 1196 643">8.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="394 647 696 675">13-19</td> <td data-bbox="703 647 949 675">77.2%</td> <td data-bbox="956 647 1196 675">76.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="394 679 696 707">20-25</td> <td data-bbox="703 679 949 707">10.0%</td> <td data-bbox="956 679 1196 707">9.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="394 711 696 738">Other</td> <td data-bbox="703 711 949 738">1.9%</td> <td data-bbox="956 711 1196 738">5.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age	2009/10 (Apr'09 - Mar '10)	2010/11 (Apr '10 - Dec'10)	11-12	10.9%	8.2%	13-19	77.2%	76.5%	20-25	10.0%	9.7%	Other	1.9%	5.6%
Age	2009/10 (Apr'09 - Mar '10)	2010/11 (Apr '10 - Dec'10)														
11-12	10.9%	8.2%														
13-19	77.2%	76.5%														
20-25	10.0%	9.7%														
Other	1.9%	5.6%														
<p>Socio-economic</p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the policy in relation to socio-economic inequalities</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on people with low incomes? yes/no Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>The savings proposal has no impact on people of low socio-economic status</p>															

<p>Other</p> <p><i>Identify if there are groups, other than those already considered, that may be adversely affected by the policy?</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on any other people (e.g. carers)? yes/no Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>No other identified impacts</p>
--	---

<p>Staff</p> <p><i>Identify if there are any staff groups,, that may be adversely affected by the policy?</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on staff? yes/no Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>Covered above</p>
--	--

Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Adverse impact	Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact
	No different or adverse impacts were identified.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring

The EQIA is a live document and as such it will be added to as the savings proposal progresses. This will enable us to identify any potential negative impacts

APPENDIX A: Equality Impact Assessment Test of Relevance (customer point of view)

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES PLEASE BRIEFLY EXPLAIN.....
<p>Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?</p>	<p>NO</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What outcome did the previous intervention seek to achieve? KPI's 4 year trend • What evidence do you have about how effective the previous intervention was?
<p>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</p>		
<p>Does the change alter access to the service?</p>	<p>NO</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence that access will be more difficult or costly for some people? <p>The contracts are not affected</p>
<p>Does the change involve revenue raising?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence do we have about who will pay? This will come from existing revenue funds • What impact will this have on the income available for these people? This will not affect front line services and young people will not lose out on services offered.
<p>Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?</p>	<p>NO</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence do we have about who will no longer be eligible for the service? • Is this likely to lead to poorer outcomes for those who cannot access the service?

Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence do we have on who has benefits from these transfers? • What is the likely impact of the removal of the income to current beneficiaries?
Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a need to include promotion of equality in the new contract arrangements?
CHANGES TO STAFFING		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence do we have about the composition of the current workforce? • Are there some groups who are likely to be disproportionately affected by the proposed reduction?
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence is there that this could have an impact on equal pay? Middle management has been streamlined to create one layer of management directly reporting to Head of Service which will result in a fairer distribution of responsibility and equal pay however some aspects of the roles. • Does the change reduce the ability of staff to work flexibly? NO, flexible working hours will still continue to be offered as normal