

# Children's Services – Budget Proposals (2015-16)

## Questions from CVS feedback session 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2014

Themes across all Children's Services Budget EIAs

- Low income families in deprived neighbourhoods – children and young people – is the service a 'mooch' away or a 'buggy push away' if not face additional barriers to accessing services
- Is equalities monitoring sufficient and consistent? – does not appear so
- Concern for safeguarding with reduction in funding for universal services –how to identify vulnerable children, young people, adults?
- Women impacted by every single proposal both as service beneficiaries/users and as service providers – majority of CVS workforce in female, majority of children services activities (in-house and external) delivered by women.
- Disability – considerable reduction in accessible youth provision – needs to be picked up by SEN review – should be subject to full EIA and have an open and transparent development process.
- Query – some budget proposals say no EIA. Query this as likely to be a significant change to the service and therefore will require an EIA.

### EIA 21

#### Impacts

1. Protected characteristics of young people affected by Youth Collective budget saving? Young people supported by youth collective are likely to have other characteristics - does the decision maker know numbers/percentage of young people who are male/female, disabled, BME, etc?
2. Socio-economic impact should be considered as the Youth Collective delivers predominantly in disadvantaged neighbourhoods.

#### Mitigating actions

1. Concern about the degree to which the third sector is being identified as a mitigating action – it will not/does not have the capacity to mitigate the anticipated impacts.
2. Query how the in-house provision will be able to reach out to disadvantaged young people without the collective as the collective currently acts as a bridge.

#### Cumulative

1. Impact of budget proposals for sports development and the reduction overall therefore of non-educational development opportunities for young peoples in the city – impact on their physical and mental well-being, general development, socialising skills etc

#### Other

1. Query the diversity of young people accessing in-house provision
2. Concern about the impact a reduced or no youth collective will have on other equality youth organisations in the city. For example Extratime, Allsorts, BMEYPP where there is a referral service for children with a protected characteristic between the two services, enabling disabled young people for example to be supported and access general youth provision and socialise with their peers.

### EIA 22

## **Impact**

1. Insufficient consideration of impact on children and families from disadvantaged neighbourhoods and low-income families – poverty/socio-economic characteristics.
2. Insufficient description of how women will be affected.
3. Insufficient description of impact on disabled children – current service very inclusive for those who find travelling difficult.
4. Impact on BME families and children. For some BME groups the play service especially the bus is considered a safe and acceptable space for women and children from particular ethnicities to attend. They are unlikely to access other children's play services.
5. Impact on men – the presence of the bus at The Level engages many fathers who traditionally are unlikely to attend more building-based activities.

## **Mitigating Actions**

1. Consider a stronger role for schools and increasing their focus on physical play from free flowing through to organised sport.
2. Appears to be no mitigating factor for impact on the travelling community?

## **Cumulative**

1. Cumulative impact on low income families and disadvantaged neighbourhoods

## **Other**

1. Has there been an alternative or mixed use of the play bus been considered?
2. Is there consistent equalities monitoring across all children services – appears patchy?
3. Have alternative service models been considered?

## **EIA 23-34**

### **Impact**

1. Impact on BME families will be greater than detailed in the EIA
2. Proposal is unclear about impact on CVS services being delivered from children's centres: Mosaic and bilingual families' project by Early Childhood project are run from children centres. Therefore changes to them will impact more on BME families.
3. Appears to be no understanding of the equality impact of the change to the speech and language therapy service. This is likely to affect children with specific protected characteristics – disability, ethnicity, socio-economic backgrounds
4. Impact of changes to respite care on fathers (gender) and grandparents (age)?
5. Impact on low-income families (poverty/socio-economic) not considered?
6. Confusion over funding or not for services to deaf children under 3 – transfer of funding to special needs and disability but then states no guarantee of alternative funding. Impact of children with disability, especially deaf children, should be more prominent in the assessment with clearer mitigating action. Appears very high risk.

### **Mitigating Actions**

1. Concern about reliance on overstretched CVS as a mitigating action.
2. No mitigating impact for the change of speech and language therapy funding?
3. Concern about relying on take up of free child care as a mitigating factor for impact of budget proposals on BME families if the settings are not culturally appropriate or fit for purpose for supporting diversity.
4. Concern about reliance on healthy child programme (as a mitigating action) combined with decrease in home visits which will impact more adversely on BME families.

### **Other**

1. How did Children Services decide which children centres are no longer statutory?

## **EIA 25**

### **Mitigating Action**

1. Concern about take up by BME families of alternative offer?
2. Need reassurance that the review will use city and neighbourhood as well as individuals settings equalities data to inform their decisions.

### **Cumulative**

1. Women predominate as users and service providers in this proposal so therefore there will be a disproportionate impact on them. There is an inherent gender inequality in this and all the children services' proposals.

## **EIA 26**

### **Impact**

1. Impact on disabled children and families if support to child minders providing for disabled children is reduced? And impact on quality of provision?
2. Men – employment of men in this field is already low and likely to become lower with this proposal. There have been efforts to diversify the workforce, but this proposal would counter this.

### **Mitigating Actions**

1. Query if pupil premium can be used as flexible as described in the mitigating actions?
2. Disabled children need higher staff ratio in all settings. Has this been factored in? Will this reduce the choice, accessibility and quality of out of school provision for disabled children?
3. Is the inclusion fund sufficient with the right criteria to be a mitigating action?

### **Cumulative**

1. Impact on BME families within this proposal but also across the preceding proposals

## **EIA 27**

### **Impact**

1. Has sufficient thought been given to the increasing number of children going into care at an older age that have SEN?
2. Do we know the characteristics of hard to place children and have these been taken into consideration in the proposal? Additional support maybe required for families fostering/adopting children with a protected characteristic, for example, disability.

### **Mitigating Action**

1. Need to state that as part of developing an alternative model of support to foster carers an EIA will be carried out.

### **Cumulative**

1. Women are majority of foster carers – disproportionate impact?

## **EIA 28**

### **Impact**

1. Impacts on young people need to be explored.
2. Families and disabled children – may be a need for greater travel and therefore difficult circumstances are made more challenging

3. Socio-economic – cost of travelling across the city to a different venue.
4. Impacts on women need to be explored.

### **Mitigating Action**

1. Assess the suitability of other venues – safe space, welcoming, supportive, culturally appropriate, accessible as a physical building but also to travel to by public transport.

## **EIA 29**

### **Impact**

1. Disproportionate impact on disabled children as main users of service.
2. Do we fully understand the impact on BME families – number/%, cultural/religious sensitivities?
3. Women – access to employment becomes more difficult when managing getting children long distance to school with getting to work on time.
4. Does the service understand breakdown of different protected characteristics within the families affected by the proposal?

### **Mitigating Action**

1. Ensure families with disabled children involved in contract review.
2. Work with individual families on the impact of the review on them. Also involve CVS organisations in the review, in particular when working with families to help minimise and manage the impact of the changes

### **Cumulative**

1. Women – affected in every proposal.

### **Other**

1. There was a full EIA done on last year's proposal for this service. Was this completed? What impact did it have? How did it and its mitigating actions inform this year's proposal?

## **EIA 30**

### **Impact**

1. Loss of community learning hubs has a direct impact on socio-economic/low-income families, disadvantaged neighbourhoods.

### **Mitigating Actions**

1. Will a centralised provider be able to maintain diversity – outreach to different communities of geography, interest and identity?

### **Cumulative Impact**

1. Low income families and disadvantaged neighbourhoods – in most proposals

## **EIA 31**

### **Impact**

1. Impacts on people with SEN need to be explored.
2. Impacts on people in relation to ethnicity need to be explored.

### **Mitigating Actions**

1. Criteria for subsidy should include those most impacted by the proposal