

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

1. Topic of assessment

EIA title	Children, Schools and Families Commissioning Plan – Family Services
------------------	---

EIA author	Flora Wilkie
-------------------	--------------

2. Approval

	Name	Date approved
Approved by	Ben Byrne	16/05/2017

3. Quality control

Version number	0.9	EIA completed	April 2017
Date saved	28/2/17	EIA published	

4. EIA team

Name	Job title	Organisation	Team role
Flora Wilkie	Strategy and Policy Development Officer	Surrey County Council	Author
Ginni Smedley	Strategy and Policy Development Management	Surrey County Council	Contributor
Juliet Neill-Hall	Practice Development and Quality Assurance Manager	Surrey County Council	Service lead
Chris Tisdall	Senior Commissioning Manager	Surrey County Council	Contributor

5. Explaining the matter being assessed

What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?

This EIA concentrates on the Early Help Operating Model - Family Services that is being proposed to improve our early help offer and streamline services from the evidence put forward in the Children, Schools and Families Commissioning Plan. The plan aims to improve outcomes of our most vulnerable children and young people by addressing inequality and improving access to services. The plan also outlines what we know about the needs of children and young people in Surrey. It describes what we do and intend to do to support them. The commissioning plan is relevant to *all council commissioned* services that contribute to the care of children and young people, especially early help services.

This definition includes;

- Universal services
- Targeted services
- Specialist

The Children, Schools and Families (CSF) directorate needs to take action not only due to the inequality in outcomes for some of our most vulnerable young people but also due to the substantial budget reductions across the council. The current Medium Term Financial Plan sets out a further £70m of savings to be made by CSF by the end of 2020/21.

The evidence put forward in the Commissioning Plan and national best practice reports have shown that one method of improving outcomes whilst meeting the ongoing financial pressure is to re-organise existing statutory and voluntary provision to form locality Family services in the form of Family Hubs. The Children's Commissioner's Office has recommended Family Hubs as an effective way to provide co-ordinated multi-agency services earlier for children, young people and their families. This will prevent needs

What proposals are you assessing?	<p>escalating and ensure a “one stop shop” for families to get the help in a timely and appropriate way.</p> <p>Also outlined in the CSF commissioning plan is another way to improve outcomes for vulnerable children and young people by market management. Market management covers a range of activities including the co-design of new commissions with key stakeholders, managing inflationary uplifts, developing purchasing frameworks to reduce spot purchases and developing regional networks to increase purchasing power. This is being looked at in a separate EIA.</p> <p>The CSF Commissioning Plan sets out the direction of travel for managing the market and improving outcomes for our most vulnerable children. This means allocating the available resources to the children and families who most need it through re-commissioning, de-commissioning and changing current available services. It also means changes to staff and service location, changes to culture, attitudes and ways of working.</p> <p>This EIA looks specifically at working with partners on co-design and co-production and a review of existing services/functions, their remit and location to develop a new Early Help operating model. Although specific details haven't yet been developed, this is expected to strengthen whole family support but may reduce services to those who are in areas that are not perceived to be in areas of less need.</p>
--	---

Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?	<p>In the implementation of the commissioning plan, children, young people and their families who currently access all our children's services, specifically early help, will be affected.</p> <p>We expect those to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Children and young people who receive Free School Meals- Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children and young people- Children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities- Children in need- Looked after children and young people and care leavers- Young carers- Teenage parents- Children and young people experiencing domestic abuse- Children and young people who experience multiple disadvantages <p>Other stakeholders affected would be Council staff and staff employed in public, private and voluntary sector organisations delivering services to children and families, particularly, staff from organisations that we procure services from.</p>
---	--

6. Sources of information

Engagement carried out

To date, the potential Family Hub model has been based on feedback from service users on the need for better integrated working between services and earlier help. This comes from various sources including:

- the Sexual Health Needs Assessment, Surrey 2015
- Children's community health services in Surrey 2016 engagement
- Healthwatch Surrey - Our Health matters: The views of young people in Surrey November 2014
- Customer Experience and Journey - Case Study Analysis of 2020 SEND programme, 2016
- Family Voice satisfaction Survey, 2015
- Family Voice Surrey and Surrey County Council Shaping Surrey Short breaks service review, 2016
- What young people think about raising participation age and future training - Focus groups: Views of young people who are not in education, employment or training (NEET), and young people at risk of becoming NEET (RONI).
- Childcare Sufficiency Assessment (2013-14)
- The Big Survey
- An analysis of the child's voice in our work; A view on current performance April –July 2016
- Access to services for young people; Surrey's Youth Collective Insight Feedback – Access to Services Campaign
- Needs analysis for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children and young people in 2013

The Family Hub model as a possible model for co-design and co-production by partners is being tested and engaged on by practitioners and representatives from a range of local partner services including schools, health, district and boroughs,

voluntary providers and across Surrey County Council senior management and council members.

The development of an Early Help model was contributed to by a series of local community stakeholder groups with relevant representatives from local early help groups.

In advance of, and following Cabinet approval of proposed strategic direction, there will be further engagement on the specific proposals of the Commissioning Plan. This engagement will aim to engage with children, young people and families, service providers and Surrey County Council staff across the county to understand their thoughts on a Family Hub model; where hubs would be best placed and how services could be re-configured to provide the best support. It is key that the Early Help model is co-produced by partners which will build on the co-design within local communities to date.

Data used

CSF Commissioning Plan, 2017-2022.

Report: Demographic Growth 2015-20125. School Organisation Plan 2013/14 – 2022/23 and updated information from the Edge-ucate system (appendix 1)

Surrey County Council (2016), [The Health and Wellbeing of Children and Young People in Surrey: The Independent Annual Report of the Director of Public Health Surrey County Council 2015-2016](#)

Surrey's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment: Children living in poverty

Surreyi data – census 2011

SFR03_2017 – GCSE and equivalent entries and achievements of pupils at the end of key stage 4 by gender for each local authority and region

7. Impact of the new/amended policy, service or function

7a. Impact of the proposals on residents and service users with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<p>Age</p>	<p>The Family Hub model will provide services for all age-ranges from one building with capacity to refer to other services if necessary. The expectation is that services for the whole family are strengthened.</p> <p>Children in Need are currently over-represented in the 11-15 age range and targeted support from the family service aims to reduce the number of children needing support and therefore becoming children in need.</p> <p>Our current provision is reported to be inaccessible by local transport which is also too expensive and this is a problem for young people who cannot drive. Effort</p>	<p>The current Medium Term Financial Plan plans for a further £70m of savings to be made by CSF by the end of 2020/21. This may mean there is a lower level of funding to be available to meet universal needs.</p> <p>Although the detail of any changes to location has not yet been developed, it is likely that moving to an integrated family hub model will reduce the number of access points to services for those from particular age groups in some communities where there is a relatively lesser level of need. This is expected to specifically impact community based services for young people.</p>	<p>The Family Hub model is expected to improve outcomes for children and young people across our protected cohorts, which span all age ranges. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Children and young people who receive Free School Meals - Gypsy, Roma Traveller children and young people - Children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities - Children in need - Looked after children and young people and care leavers - Young carers - Teenage parents - Children and young people experiencing domestic abuse - Children and young people who experience multiple disadvantages <p>Some cohorts are more likely at different age ranges or over-represent the population. For example, 28% of Children in Need were aged 11.15% although this age group only makes 19% of the general population.</p>

	<p>needs to be made to ensure new provision is more accessible via public transport and is affordable for young people to use and this will be part of the co-design with early help stakeholder groups and other relevant parties.</p> <p>Engagement with service users will take place to hear their views about what services are missing in their area or are most needed. This should maximise opportunities to have a positive impact on children and young people of all ages.</p>	<p>As part of the conversations taking place at the community stakeholder early help groups, the location of services has been discussed. This means provision may be located in other areas to where they are currently and may also be dependent on the availability of assets that are appropriate in the area.</p>	<p>There are gaps in early help for approximately 8,800 children aged 5-11 (based on 10% of the age group); effective parenting support and family support for children with SEND.</p> <p>Overall, there is projected growth in total numbers of 16 to 18 year olds in Surrey of 3,990 between September 2015 and 2025, which represents an increase of just under 10%. The expectation is that the growth in year 12 learners will be 2,631 across the county, with the largest growth being in Reigate and Banstead, Runnymede, Elmbridge and Wokingⁱ.</p>
<p>Disability</p>	<p>There is a strong correlation between disability and poverty. The Hubs and satellites will be placed in areas of highest need and therefore likely to be close to children with disabilities.</p> <p>Our current provision is reported to be inaccessible by local transport which is also too expensive and this is a problem for young people</p>	<p>As part of the conversations taking place at the community stakeholder early help groups, the location of services has been discussed. This means provision may be located in other areas to where they are currently and may also be dependent on the availability of assets that are appropriate in the area.</p>	<p>Of Surrey's 287,600 children, 10% on average live in poverty. In 2015/16, 20,500 were in receipt of free school meals (FSM) and the council supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4,251 CiN • 714 looked after children¹ • 330 care leavers² • 5,751 Children with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) <p>Children in need, who are on free school meals and/or have special educational needs and disabilities currently have around 30% to 65% lower GCSE attainment than their average peers in Surrey.</p>

¹ Not including Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children

² Not including Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children

	<p>who cannot drive. Effort needs to be made to ensure new provision is more accessible via public transport and is affordable for young people to use and this will be part of the co-design with early help stakeholder groups and other relevant parties. Engagement with service users will take place to hear their views about what services are missing in their area or are most needed.</p> <p>Family Services will provide more than one type of support and this will enable easier access to support and more joined up provision. This is anticipated to reduce existing inequality in outcomes for our disadvantaged groups.</p>	<p>The correlation between poverty and disability also creates barriers for families affected by the high cost of transport in Surrey.</p> <p>Engagement activity should help to identify the best location for services that will mitigate this.</p> <p>Although the detail of any changes to location has not yet been developed, it is likely that moving to an integrated family hub model will reduce the number of access points to services for those from particular age groups in some communities where there is a relatively lesser level of need. This is expected to specifically impact community based services for young people.</p>	<p>Deprivation increases the likelihood of childhood obesity,ⁱⁱ whilst disadvantaged children and young people are at higher risk of developing poor mental health.ⁱⁱⁱ</p>
<p>Gender reassignment</p>	<p>None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement</p>	<p>If services are reduced or relocated, this may result in reduced entry points for young people who aren't identified as high need in the commissioning plan, such as those who are experiencing gender reassignment. Further investigation needs to be under taken throughout engagement to mitigate the</p>	

		<p>potential for a reduced access point. None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement</p>	
<p>Pregnancy and maternity</p>	<p>The Family Services model will provide support to families before, during and after pregnancy. There will also be an emphasis on parenting support.</p> <p>Engagement with service users will take place to hear their views about what services are missing in their area or are most needed.</p>	<p>As part of the conversations taking place at the community stakeholder early help groups, the location of services has been discussed. This means provision may be located in other areas to where they are currently.</p> <p>Although the detail of any changes to location has not yet been developed, it is likely that moving to an integrated family hub model will reduce the number of access points to services for those from particular age groups in some communities where there is a relatively lesser level of need. This is expected to specifically impact community based services for young people.</p> <p>Engagement activity and co-design with early help stakeholder groups and other relevant parties is going to take place to identify the best location for services that will mitigate this.</p>	<p>There is an estimated 500 mothers under 20 years old in Surrey and 200 babies are born to teenagers every year.</p> <p>Teenage parents come from all social classes, religious backgrounds and ethnic groups. However, rates of teenage pregnancy are highest among deprived communities, so the negative consequences of teenage pregnancy are disproportionately concentrated among those who are already disadvantaged.</p> <p>There are six geographic areas where current provision will not be able to meet future demand for early education and childcare.</p>

<p>Race</p>	<p>The Family Hub model will provide services for all children and young people from one building with capacity to refer to other services if necessary. However, further engagement needs to be done to identify what services are required by the different cohorts of children and young people and how to make the Hubs appealing for all young people</p>	<p>Further engagement needs to take place to ensure that the Hubs are located and set up in a way that is appealing to all families, including those who may experience our services as hard to reach, for example, such as Gypsies, Roma and Travellers. Otherwise there may be a continuing negative impact for these groups.</p>	<p>65% (27) of our care leavers in spot placements were UASC</p> <p>There are approximately 1,400 children and young people in Surrey schools who are GRT but due to drop out rates and lack of self-ascription it may be much higher. There are 10,000-12,000 Gypsies and travellers in Surrey.</p>
<p>Religion and belief</p>	<p>Family Services will be carefully tailored to the local area using local knowledge and engagement and working closely to co-produce the idea with local groups. Therefore in areas where there are higher proportions of faith groups and the appropriate building to provide services from e.g. a church, there is an opportunity for the church to be used as an asset through the satellite and hub model</p>	<p>People who do not don't share a particular religion or belief system may feel excluded or unwilling to ask for help and support if it is delivered from a facility associate with religion, e.g. a church. Further investigation needs to be taken during engagement, especially through the early help stakeholder locality groups who understand the local areas, to recognise the best location for a Hub.</p>	<p>According to the 2011 Census, 62.7% of Surrey is Christian, 0.5% Buddhist, 1.3% Hindu, 0.3% Jewish, 2.2% Muslim, 0.3% Sikh and 24.7% no religion. There is a 4% difference between the percentages of people who identify as Christian in rural areas (66.2%) versus the percentage who identify in urban areas (62.3%).</p>

<p>Sex</p>	<p>Educational outcomes are significantly less good for boys than girls, targeted provision may reduce this inequality in outcome.</p>	<p>None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement</p>	<p>Average attainment 8 score per pupil 2015/16 – GCSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Girls: 55.2 - Boys: 50.6
<p>Sexual orientation</p>	<p>None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement</p>	<p>If services are reduced or relocated, this may result in reduced entry points for children and young people that aren't identified as a high need cohort. Further investigation needs to be under taken throughout engagement to mitigate the potential for a reduced access point. None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement</p>	
<p>Marriage and civil partnerships</p>	<p>None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement</p>	<p>None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement</p>	
<p>Carers (protected by association)</p>	<p>Young carers have been identified in the Commissioning Plan as a high need cohort for support. It is anticipated that improved join-up between services and agencies and earlier intervention will enable better identification and support for young carers' needs.</p>	<p>If services are reduced or relocated, this may result in reduced entry points for young carers. Further investigation needs to be under taken throughout engagement to mitigate the potential for a reduced access point.</p>	<p>Young carers receive worse outcomes compared to their peers.</p> <p>There are approx. 2,100 number of young carers in Surrey according to the Surrey Young Carers Trust</p>

7b. Impact of the proposals on staff with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
Age	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	<p>Staff may be required to co-locate with partner agencies, which may result in changes to working locations. Flexible working will be taken into account where possible. This may impact on staff with protected characteristics within Surrey County Council, organisations that we procure services from and partner agencies.</p> <p>Provision may be located in other areas to where it is currently. Our current provision is reported to be inaccessible by local transport. Effort needs to be made to ensure new provision is more accessible via public transport. Engagement activity is going to take place to identify the best location for services that will mitigate this.</p>
Disability	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	Possible negative impact if services are re-located, requiring different methods of transport.	See above
Gender reassignment	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	See above

Pregnancy and maternity	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	Women away on maternity leave may return to work untrained and unprepared for the new way of working. Possible negative impact if services are re-located, making it more difficult to combine parenting with work.	See above
Race	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	See above
Religion and belief	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	See above
Sex	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	See above
Sexual orientation	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	See above
Marriage and civil partnerships	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	See above
Carers (protected by association)	None identified – further investigation needs to be taken during engagement	Possible negative impact if services are re-located, making it more difficult to combine caring responsibilities and work.	See above

8. Amendments to the proposals

Change	Reason for change

9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
Change to location of provision and therefore a reduction in access points to services in some areas that have relatively less need.	Ensure flexible working policies are adhered to within SCC, and encourage partner organisations to adopt similar practices.	April 2018	All managers of provision
	Engagement is undertaken to ensure service delivery in places of greatest need and accessible to population.	May 2017	Juliet Neill-Hall
	Co-design services and location with early help stakeholder groups and other relevant parties.		
Services jointly provided	Engagement to understand what services are needed and where.	May 2017	Juliet Neill-Hall
Anticipated improvement in outcomes for children and young people within high need cohorts and across some groups with protected characteristics.	Co-design services to ensure maximum benefit to local communities.	April 2018	Juliet Neill-Hall

10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

Potential negative impact	Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected
Change to location of provision	Carers, race, gender re-assignment, pregnancy and maternity

11. Summary of key impacts and actions

<p>Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis</p>	<p>Further engagement to be taken following a Cabinet sign off of direction in April.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Sexual Health Needs Assessment, Surrey 2015 • Children’s community health services in Surrey 2016 engagement • Healthwatch Surrey - Our Health matters: The views of young people in Surrey November 2014 • Customer Experience and Journey - Case Study Analysis of 2020 SEND programme, 2016 • Family Voice satisfaction Survey, 2015 • Family Voice Surrey and Surrey County Council Shaping Surrey Short breaks service review, 2016 • What young people think about raising participation age and future training - Focus groups: Views of young people who are not in education, employment or training (NEET), and young people at risk of becoming NEET (RONI). • Childcare Sufficiency Assessment (2013-14) • The Big Survey • An analysis of the child’s voice in our work; A view on current performance April –July 2016 • Access to services for young people; Surrey’s Youth Collective Insight Feedback – Access to Services Campaign • SEND Commissioning plan workshops 2017 • Needs Analysis for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children and young people 2013
<p>Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipated improvement in outcomes for children and young people within high need cohorts and across some groups with protected characteristics. • Change of location to provision should have positive impacts for most children, young people and families but may result in a reduction in access points to services in some areas that have less need.
<p>Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective engagement and co-design to develop local Family Services • Adoption of flexible working practices for staff where possible

Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

- Changes to location of provision may have negative impacts that cannot be mitigated for some staff with protected characteristics
- Reduction in access points to services in some areas that have less need.

ⁱ Report: Demographic Growth 2015-20125. School Organisation Plan 2013/14 – 2022/23 and updated information from the Edge-ucate system (appendix 1)

ⁱⁱ Surrey County Council (2016), [The Health and Wellbeing of Children and Young People in Surrey: The Independent Annual Report of the Director of Public Health Surrey County Council 2015-2016](#)

ⁱⁱⁱ Surrey's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment: Children living in poverty