



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

www.lancashire.gov.uk

	Contents	Page
1	CYP001b – SCAYT+	3
2	CYP015 - YOT	17
3	CMTY024 – COMMUNITY TRANSPORT	30
4	CMTY026b – DISCRETIONARY CONCESSIONARY TRAVEL	57
5	PH012 – CRIME AND DISORDER	68
6	PH015 – CHILDREN AND FAMILY WELLBEING SERVICE	81

**CYP001b – SUPPORTING CARERS OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE
LOOKED AFTER TOGETHER (SCAYT+)**

Service Name:		SCAYT+	
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21		2018/19	
Gross budget 2017/18		£0.638m	
Income 2017/18		£0.000m	
Net budget 2017/18		£0.638m	
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
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
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Agree to redirect 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. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children who are on a placement order and are placed with their adoptive parents. • Children who are subject to a Special Guardianship Order and who were looked after prior to the making of the order. <p>Please note this could potentially be a 2 year saving unless the adoption support fund is extended. At this stage it has been assumed that this saving is recurrent.</p>		
Impact upon service	<p>SCAYT+ currently provides support to carers and parents of looked after children and adopted children to help them understand the reason for the child/young person's behaviours and give them tools to help manage those behaviours. The service also provides direct therapeutic support to some of the more damaged looked after children.</p> <p>SCAYT+ does receive some funding from the National Adoption Support Fund (ASF) for specific work with adopted children. If the work that SCAYT+ undertook focused more upon the therapeutic work with children who would attract funding from the ASF this would release some pressure on the budget whilst maintaining</p>		

	<p>a service to looked after children, albeit this service would be reduced.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The predicted impact will be:</p> <p>Positive Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Negative Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future costs to adult services as young people enter adulthood with unmet emotional and mental health needs.
<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Delivery of service under this eligibility criteria only has funding until 2020 if this is not extended then the funding would cease.</p>
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Impact on children and young people currently in care</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible increase in placement breakdowns. • Possible unmet emotional and mental health needs. <p>The above will be mitigated to a degree by targeting Family Support placements where risk of breakdown is identified.</p>

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

CYP001b: SCAYT+ income generation
For Decision Making Items

January 2018

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.

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 and 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	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£3.405m		
Income 2017/18	£2.062m		
Net budget 2017/18	£1.343m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
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
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Youth Offending Team functions are statutory and 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 likely to be greater.</p>		
Impact upon service	<p>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</p>		

	<p>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.</p> <p>The table below shows the partner contributions and how it would look if they were to reduce by 25%:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="587 495 1386 804"> <thead> <tr> <th>Partner</th> <th>Contribution 2017/18</th> <th>25% reduction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Youth Justice Board</td> <td>£1,356,763</td> <td>£1,017,572</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health</td> <td>£218,112</td> <td>£163,584</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bail Support</td> <td>£144,500</td> <td>£108,375</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Police</td> <td>£155,100</td> <td>£116,325</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>£1,874,475</td> <td>£1,405,856</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>To achieve the savings outlined above a full service 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.</p> <p>A further restructure will impact on service and staff morale and compulsory redundancy is likely.</p> <p>Service delivery may be impacted upon during the period of restructure and increase risk if inspected.</p> <p>If offending rates do increase the service may not be able to fulfil its statutory functions.</p>	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
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																	
<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<p>The Youth Offending Team is joint funded by LCC and 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.</p>																		
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>																		

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

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

CYP015: Budget savings to YOT
For Decision Making Items

January 2018

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.

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:	Community Transport		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£1.003m		
Income 2017/18	£0.307m		
Net budget 2017/18	£0.696m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.254	-0.087	-0.050	-0.391
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Renegotiate the contract with the Community Transport consortium and revise the in-house Dial-a-Ride provision to provide a reduced service.</p> <p>Cease provision of the Burnley Employment Shuttle Transit (BEST - £0.031m). BEST is a dedicated, subsidised, taxi service connecting local people to employment where it has been assessed that there is no alternative public transport provision available. (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.</p>		
Impact upon service	<p>Journeys for those who rely on door to door Dial-a-Ride services will be reduced.</p> <p>The viability of Community Transport may be put at risk resulting in additional services offered by the operators being lost.</p> <p>Eleven workers living in Burnley will no longer be able to access employment using the Burnley BEST service.</p>		
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation followed by service notice on community transport operators. • Consultation with LCC drivers on reduced working hours. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burnley BEST contract not retendered.
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>If the Lancashire County Council funding were to be reduced, the financial viability of the Community Transport operators could be compromised.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Employees currently relying on Burnley BEST may no longer be able to access their jobs.</p>

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

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.

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 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 self-worth. 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
Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

**CMTY024 (2 of 2): Burnley BEST Dial-A-
Ride Taxi Service**

For Decision Making Items

January 2018

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

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.)

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.

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 BEST self-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 from 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	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£26.349m		
Income 2017/18	£7.769m		
Net budget 2017/18	£18.580m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.043	-0.044	0.000	-0.087
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree to Increase the charge made to disabled NoWcard holders for travel before 0930 Monday to Friday from 50p to £1.00.		
Impact upon service	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 savings	<p>Full consultation with disability groups on the increase and include seeking views on coinage usability.</p> <p>Communication plan for bus operator driver awareness.</p> <p>Concessionary Travel scheme will need amendment, although as it is a discretionary element it can be introduced at a suitable time during the lifespan of the current scheme.</p>		
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	Groups representing disabled people are likely to object to this proposal however the 50p charge has not been increased for over 10 years.		

	Blackpool 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

**CMTYo26b: Discretionary Concessionary
Travel – Increase charges before 9.30am
For Decision Making Items**

January 2018

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.

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 Disabled 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 retain 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	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£0.319m		
Income 2017/18	£0.000m		
Net budget 2017/18	£0.319m		
Savings Target and 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
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Agree to cease funding for Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) posts currently part funded by Lancashire County Council (LCC).		
Impact upon service	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	<p>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.</p> <p>A minimum of four months' notice to Lancashire Constabulary is required.</p>		
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	<p>If funding is removed 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in youth offending criminal behaviours 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>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.</p> <p>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, managed 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>LCC will also continue to work strategically with partners to reduce crime and disorder in the County.</p>
--	---

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

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.

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, managed 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 relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21		2018/19	
Gross budget 2017/18		£20.881m	
Income 2017/18		£6.185m	
Net budget 2017/18		£14.696m	
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
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
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings		<p>Agree to reduce the non-staffing budget by £0.750m. This will reduce the resource made available to each district to deliver the core offer of the service i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical resources and equipment Funding of group activity delivered by 3rd party partners i.e. parenting courses, employability courses for parents <p>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.</p> <p>Agree to convert some of the current vacancy capacity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convert 8.19 FTE posts at Grade 6 to create 6 new additional FTE Grade 8 posts as Family Group Conference (FGC) 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 Children's Social Care. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). <p>Agree to reconfigure remaining current staffing structure to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>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.</p>
<p>Impact upon service</p>	<p>Based on the current number of vacancies implementing this budget option in 2018 would have the following impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

	<p>and key performance indicators which may be at risk within the Ofsted inspection framework</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Mitigated by revising the current service offer in line with reduced resource capacity i.e. scale back group based activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Mitigated by prioritising case holding to families that meet the TFU criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reduction of service provision within local communities is likely to attract unwanted attention. <p>Mitigated by consultation with all key stakeholders and an effective communication plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
--	---

	<p>Mitigated through appropriate change of use and would only reach that level if all current designated children's centres were closed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Mitigated by consulting with partners and agreeing how we could continue to work alongside partners in the settings that were to be retained.</p>
--	--

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 well-being 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

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

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	Chinese	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	Chinese	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
% 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 Registered
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 Registered
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 - % Attended
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 % Attended
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	% Registered	Number Attended	Of those with SEN % Attended
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?

Budget option for Children and Family Wellbeing Service

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