

**KENT COUNTY COUNCIL  
EQUALITY ANALYSIS / IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EqIA)**

**This document is available in other formats, please contact  
16-25accommodation@Kent.gov.uk or telephone on 03000  
417039**

**Directorate: Social Care Health and Wellbeing**

**Name of policy, procedure, project or service**

Housing Related Support for Young People at Risk (including Floating Support).

**What is being assessed?**

Proposals to reconfigure and recommission Housing Related Support Service for Young People to focus current services for vulnerable young people on statutory service users and 16/17 year olds at risk of homelessness.

These changes form part of the delivery of the 16-25 Accommodation and Support for Children in Care, Care Leavers and Vulnerable Young People Commissioning Plan.

For the purpose of this document, 'vulnerable young people' are at risk of homelessness and not owed a statutory duty (not a Child in Care or a Care Leaver).

**Responsible Owner/Senior Officer**  
Karen Mills, Commissioning Manager

**Date of Initial Screening**  
28<sup>th</sup> August 2017

**Date of Full EqIA:**  
*N/A*

<b>Version</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>
D1.0	Robin Cahill	28/08/2017	First Draft
D2.0	Matthew Mallett	01/09/2017	Amendments to first draft
D3.0	Robin Cahill	07/09/2017	Further amendments
D4.0	Akua Agyepong	10/10/2017	No comment to add

## Screening Grid

Characteristic	Could this policy, procedure, project or service, or any proposed changes to it, affect this group less favourably than others in Kent? YES/NO If yes how?	Assessment of potential impact <b>HIGH/MEDIUM</b> <b>LOW/NONE</b> UNKNOWN		Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes what? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why?	Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group? YES/NO - Explain how good practice can promote equal opportunities
		Positive	Negative	Internal action must be included in Action Plan	If yes you must provide detail
<b>Age</b>	<p><b>Yes</b> – This commissioning exercise will affect 16-25 Children in Care, Care Leavers and vulnerable young people. Any changes will apply to this cohort only.</p> <p>It is possible that be increasing the number of statutory service users utilising services (and improving performance management) that the age profile of service users could decrease.</p> <p>Care Leavers will continue to be supported up to the age of 25.</p> <p>18+ vulnerable young people will no longer eligible to be supported by young people services.</p>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<p>a) <b>Yes</b> – Engage with existing providers to establish potential impact. Ensure EQIA is shared.</p> <p><b>Yes</b> – Identify 500k (£1m full year effect) young people Housing Related Support monies to contribute to funding a revised commissioned service for 18+ that will include those vulnerable people no longer eligible to be supported by young people services.</p> <p><b>Yes</b> – Work with Adult services to ensure a smooth transition between service models for 18+ vulnerable young people.</p> <p>b) <b>No</b></p>	<p><b>Yes (for all protected characteristics)</b></p> <p>These services will address identified needs on an individual basis, so all service users can be accommodated and supported in the most suitable way.</p> <p>The service will assist service users to meet the following outcomes and therefore promote equal opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• YP are accommodated in appropriate and suitable accommodation in line with Section 22 of the 1989 Children Act, Regulation 9 of the Care Leavers 2010 regulations and/or KCC Quality Framework, as appropriate.</li> <li>• YP thrives in a non-family environment.</li> <li>• YP's aspiration is independence and the YP is supported on pathway to independence including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ YP understands their rights and responsibilities as tenants and licensees.</li> <li>○ YP is financially competent.</li> <li>○ YP builds positive relationships and social networks and participates</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Disability</b>	<p><b>No</b> – It is thought that this proposal will not affect this group less favourably.</p> <p>The proposal will ensure that all eligible young people can continue</p>	<b>None</b>	<b>None</b>	<p>a) <b>No</b> – The Disabled Childrens and Adults Learning Disability and Mental Health Team will continue to accommodate and support children and young people as appropriate. (No change proposed).</p>	

	<p>to access the services that they require.</p> <p>Service users with a disability (4%) are underrepresented when compared to the wider Care Leaver population (14%). However, service users with no disability are represented in line with the Care Leaver population. This results from 'unknown disability' recorded for 14% of Service Users.</p>			<p>b) <b>No</b></p>	<p>positively in the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ YP can maintain emotional and physical health and well-being.</li> <li>○ YP is confident, has built resilience and behaves appropriately.</li> <li>○ YP is engaged with EET and is demonstrating capabilities to maintain long term independence.</li> </ul> <p>Providers are expected to evidence and demonstrate that they do not discriminate directly or indirectly against any person because of their gender, age, disability, race, ethnic origin, language, political beliefs, trade union membership (or non-membership) marital status or sexual orientation</p>
<p><b>Gender</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> – A slightly higher percentage of females (55.3%) are accessing services than males (44.7%)</p> <p>From the service users in this cohort, males are underrepresented in Kent (Male 44.7%, Kent 49%), whereas females are overrepresented (Female 55.3%, Kent 51%)<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>It is thought that given the intended increase in statutory service users accessing the services (Care Leavers and 16/17 Children in Care) that the number of males accessing the service could increase. This would be as a result of identified need and a larger proportion of males reaching social care thresholds.</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p>a) <b>Yes</b> – Engage with existing providers to establish potential impact. Ensure EQIA is shared.</p> <p>b) <b>Yes</b> – Ensure Children’s and Adults Commissioning teams develop service specifications that enable ease of access to service by teenage parents.</p>	<p>Service Providers must have an equalities and diversity policy in place for Staff and Service Users. Service Providers must make available the equalities and diversity policy to Staff and Service Users at the earliest opportunity, using whichever format is most suitable.</p> <p>Failure by Service Providers to comply with the requirements will constitute a material breach of the Service Provider’s obligations.</p> <p>KCC will monitor and review the services regularly in line with performance indicators</p>

<sup>1</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures

	<p>However, KCC currently provides five specialist Teenage Parent services. The majority of teenage parents accessing services are female, (accounting for approximately 5% of the 55% of the vulnerable young people cohort) and therefore these changes could affect this group less favourably.</p> <p>However, a larger number of teenage parents currently access non-specific services than they do specific services. From 2012-16 260 teenage parents accessed a non-specific service whereas only 59 teenage parents accessed a teenage parent specific service.</p> <p>Please see EQIA on Teenage Parent services.</p>				outlined in service specification.
<b>Gender identity</b>	<p><b>Unknown</b> – there is currently no data available to establish this.</p> <p>Although it is thought that any impact would be minimal as service delivery will not change.</p> <p>It is also understood that transgender young people are at higher risk of homelessness. Therefore changes whereby fewer vulnerable young people are supported could affect this group less favourably.</p>	Unknown	Unknown but some impact expected	<p>a) <b>Yes</b> - Suggest providers begin to capture data and include in new contract monitoring.</p> <p>b) <b>No</b></p>	

<b>Race</b>	<p><b>No</b> – White racial groups are very slightly underrepresented when compared to the wider Kent population, (Service Users 92.84%, Kent 93.7%)<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Black racial groups (Service Users 2.19%, Kent 1.11%) and Mixed (Service Users 3.78%, Kent 1.51%)<sup>3</sup> are both overrepresented when compared with the wider Kent population.</p> <p>Black racial groups and other mixed races are also over represented in the Child in Care and Care Leaver Population. It is thought that given the intended increase in statutory service users accessing the services there will be no or little adverse impact.</p>	None	None	<p>a) <b>No</b> - Service is aware of racial needs and will address them regardless of race.</p> <p>b) <b>No</b></p>
<b>Religion or belief</b>	<p><b>Unknown</b> – there is currently no data available to establish this.</p> <p>However it is thought that any impact would be minimal as service delivery will not change.</p>	Unknown	Unknown	<p>a) <b>Yes</b> - Include in new contract monitoring.</p> <p>b) <b>No</b></p>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<p><b>Unknown</b> – there is currently no data available to establish this.</p>	Unknown	Unknown	<p>a) <b>Yes</b> - Include in new contract monitoring.</p>

<sup>2</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures and SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

<sup>3</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures and SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

	<p>However, in a 2016 survey, a higher percentage of Gay/Bi-Sexual respondents (42%) and Gay/Bi-Sexual service users (43%) disagreed with a proposal to reduce the number of local services when compared with the level of disagreement amongst all respondents (23%). This suggests reducing the number of organisations delivering services could negatively impact upon Gay/Bi-Sexual individuals. Depending upon the final service model agreed this would need to be taken into consideration.</p>			b) <b>No</b>
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	<p><b>Yes</b> – KCC currently provides five specialist Teenage Parent services. However, a larger number of teenage parents currently access non-specific services than that they do specific services. From 2012-16 260 teenage parents accessed a non-specific service whereas only 59 teenage parents accessed a teenage parent specific service.</p> <p>Please see EQIA on Teenage Parent services.</p>	Low	Low	<p>a) Yes - Include in new contract monitoring</p> <p>b) Yes – See Teenage Parent Equality Impact Assessment to assess the impact of re-prioritising statutory service users within the teenage parents accommodation services.</p>
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>	N/A – only relates to employment.			
<b>Carer's responsibilities</b>	Unknown – there is currently no data available to establish this.	Unknown	Unknown	a) <b>Yes</b> - Include in new contract monitoring.

<b>ities</b>	However it is anticipated the proposal would not adversely impact this protected characteristic. Services will address needs of individual.			b) <b>No</b>	
--------------	---	--	--	--------------	--



## Part 1: INITIAL SCREENING

**Proportionality** - Based on the answers in the above screening grid what weighting would you ascribe to this function – see Risk Matrix

<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>
Low relevance or Insufficient information/evidence to make a judgement.	Medium relevance or Insufficient information/evidence to make a Judgement.	High relevance to equality, /likely to have adverse impact on protected groups

State rating & reasons

### Medium

It is considered as Medium because:

- Age - Services (and changes) relate to 16-25 year old Children in Care, Care Leavers and Vulnerable Young People only and therefore, this group are affected more than others. Given the proposed change, more statutory service users (16/17 year old Children in Care and Care Leavers) will be able to access the service, suggesting the age of service users could decrease. 18+ vulnerable young people will no longer eligible to be supported by young people services.

### Low

There is a low impact on the following:

- Race – Black racial groups (Service Users 2.19%, Kent 1.11%) and Mixed (Service Users 3.78%, Kent 1.51%)<sup>4</sup> are both overrepresented when compared with the wider Kent population. Black racial groups and other mixed races are also over represented in the Child in Care and Care Leaver Population. It is thought that given the intended increase in statutory service users accessing the services there will be no or little impact.
- Gender – Currently, more female young people are accessing the service. Given the proposed increase in statutory service users, more males could be accessing the service next year. Additionally currently provides 5 specialist Teenage Parent services. This may affect females, particularly teenage mothers, less favourably. There may be an impact on Teenage Parents who are not owed a statutory duty (see separate EQIA).
- Impact is unknown for gender identity, religion or belief, sexual orientation, carer's responsibilities. Actions will be taken to identify impact.

<sup>4</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures and SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

## Context

Current accommodation provision for 16-25 young people is complex and fragmented. Work is underway to provide a seamless pathway of accommodation and support options for young people to enable them to become independent in a timely manner.

Former Supporting People services now known as Housing Related Support (HRS) for Young People are primarily available to vulnerable service users many of which are referred / signposted by District and Borough Councils. It has been recognised that these services need to be refocused to prioritise KCC statutory service users.

Whilst homelessness is the statutory responsibility of the districts and boroughs, vulnerable people are rarely eligible for assistance other than advice and guidance. Further their complex and multiple needs can lead to pressures on the county's council's own statutory services if left unsupported. The county council's housing related support services for vulnerable homeless adults prevents this escalation.

Recognising the need for services to be more joined up, Strategic Commissioning have been asked to develop an all-age vulnerable homelessness strategy which will articulate the links between the 16-25 (Statutory Care Leavers) commissioning and the Adults homelessness commissioning.

A £1.3m saving for 2018-19 is currently required against Housing Related Support Homeless Services.

The new proposed service will be funded using part housing related supporting funding, and part Specialist Children Services monies. As a result £500k (£1m full year effect) housing related support funding currently used for young people services will transfer to Adults commissioning. This £1m will be used to contribute to fund a revised commissioned service for 18+ that will include those vulnerable people no longer eligible to be supported by young people services.

Young People's and Adult's commissioning and procurement timelines will need to be aligned, to ensure smooth transition between service models for those young people potentially displaced.

A seamless pathway will be created to support vulnerable people 18+ into new adult services when re-commissioning takes place. The new service will move away from the previous restrictive models of provision, offer more flexible and responsive community based services.

Adult Commissioning is progressing an all age vulnerable homeless commissioning strategy, working to establish budget and governance for decision making. This work is being considered in partnership with Kent Housing Group and wider stakeholders in order to maximise impact of investment and improve joint work and pathways for individuals.

## **Aims and Objectives**

It is intended that Young People's Commissioning will be working with Adult re-commissioning to ensure a smooth transition between service models for 18+ vulnerable young people. Dependent on timetabling this may require an extension to current Young People's Supporting People contracts that end in March 2018 (Adult Homeless contracted till September 2018).

## **Beneficiaries**

The beneficiaries are 16-25 year old Children in Care, Care Leavers and Vulnerable Young People.

Currently, Housing Related Support services provide support for a large cohort of Vulnerable Young People, and fewer Care Leaver and Children in Care.

The proposed change to the service will increase the number of statutory service users (16/17 year old children in care and care leavers) accessing services. Support will be refocused to ensure it is aimed at those most in need.

## Information and Data

At present there are 465 young people supported by Housing Related Support Services.

It is proposed that more Children in Care, Children on the edge of Care and Care Leavers access services and fewer vulnerable young people over 18 access services.

### Current Service Users – Young People at Risk Services (excluding TP services)

Between 2012 and 2016, the Housing Related Support Services (specifically for young people) has supported 1993 young people.<sup>5</sup>

The following data shows the number of service users supported from 2015-2016. Please note the number of young people supported is higher than the numbers of available units, as these contracts are short-term, so a unit could support more than one person in a year.

Between 2015-2016, the Housing Related Support Services supported 503 young people. Of these, 55 were care leavers (10.9%)<sup>6</sup>

### Age

Age	Actual	%
16	23	4.57%
17	74	14.71%
18	106	21.07%
19	85	16.90%
20	69	13.72%
21	58	11.53%
22	37	7.36%
23	30	5.96%
24	21	4.17%
<b>Total</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100%</b>

The Housing Related Support Services offer support for 16-25 year olds. The majority of service users are aged 17-21, making up 77.9% of the overall service users.

### Gender

Gender	Actual	%
Male	225	44.73%
Female	278	55.27%
<b>Total</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100%</b>

A slightly higher percentage of females (55.3%) are accessing services than males (44.7%)

<sup>5</sup> Supporting People Data, Cohort Review, 2012-2016

<sup>6</sup> Supporting People Data, Cohort Review, 2012-2015

From the service users in this cohort, males are underrepresented in Kent (Male 44.7%, Kent 49%), whereas females are overrepresented (Female 55.3%, Kent 51%)<sup>7</sup>.

## Race

	Race	Actual	%
White:	White British	460	91.45%
	White Irish	1	0.20%
	Other White Background	6	1.19%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Group:	White & Asian	1	0.20%
	White & Black African	4	0.80%
	White & Black Caribbean	9	1.79%
	Other Mixed Background	5	0.99%
Asian/Asian British:	Pakistani	2	0.40%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British:	African	6	1.19%
	Caribbean	1	0.20%
	Other Black Background	4	0.80%
Other Ethnic Group:	Any other ethnic group	4	0.80%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100%</b>

The majority of young people accessing a service are White British (91.45%).

White racial groups are slightly underrepresented when compared to the wider Kent population, (Service Users 92.84%, Kent 93.7%)<sup>8</sup>

Black racial groups (Service Users 2.19%, Kent 1.11%) and Mixed (Service Users 3.78%, Kent 1.51%)<sup>9</sup> are both overrepresented when compared with the wider Kent population.

## Teenage Parent Services

As part of the Housing Related Support Service contracts, KCC offers 5 specialist **Teenage Parent Services** across Kent, providing short term accommodation and support. These are located in:

- Maidstone
- Gravesham
- Dartford x2
- Canterbury.

The 5 providers offer a total of 29 units (this is included in the above 465 for Housing Related Support Services). The services have accommodated 47 Teenage Parents between 2012 and 2015.

<sup>7</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures

<sup>8</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures and SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

<sup>9</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures and SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

There is also a larger cohort of vulnerable Teenage Parents accessing other accommodation and support services across Kent. From 2012-2015 Kent's Supporting People services have provided accommodation and support for 224 Teenage Parents.<sup>10</sup>

Demographics of <b>Teenage Parents</b> Accessing Housing-Related Accommodation in Kent by (2012-2015)				
Source: Supporting People Data 2012-2015 <sup>11</sup>				
	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	Total
Total number of individuals accessing a <i>specialised</i> teenage parents service	22	14	11	47
Total number of teenage parents (16-21 yrs) accessing <i>any</i> service	92	93	39	224

The number of teenage parents accessing a specialised teenage parent service is small, in comparison to teenage parents accessing *any* housing/support service.

### Gender

Number of Teenage Parents by <b>Gender</b> 2012-2015		
Source: Teenage Parent Data 2012-2015 <sup>12</sup>		
Gender	Actual	%
Male	0	0.00%
Female	47	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

From 2012-2015, 100% of those accessing the specialised Teenage Parent services are female, with 0 males being supported. These service users account for 5% of the 55% of the vulnerable young people cohort.

### Age

The Teenage Parent service provides accommodation and support for 16-22 year olds.

Number of <b>Teenage Parents</b> by <b>Age</b> 2012-2015		
Source: Teenage Parent Data 2012-2015 <sup>13</sup>		
Age	Actual	%
16	8	17.02%
17	10	21.28%
18	13	27.66%
19	6	12.77%
20	6	12.77%
21	3	6.38%

<sup>10</sup> Supporting People Data, 2012-2015

<sup>11</sup> Supporting People Data, 2012-2015

<sup>12</sup> Teenage Parent Data, Supporting People 2012-2015

<sup>13</sup> Teenage Parent Data, Supporting People 2012-2015

22	1	2.13%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

The majority of teenage parents accessing a specific teenage parent service between 2012 and 2015 were aged 16-18 year olds (66%).

All teenage parents accessing a service are living with a baby. Any changes to the service will also affect the babies.

## Race

### Number of Teenage Parents by **Race** 2012-2015

Source: Teenage Parent Data 2012-2015<sup>14</sup>

	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>%</b>
White:	White British	43	91.49%
	White Irish	0	0.00%
	Other White Background	1	2.13%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Group:	White & Asian	0	0.00%
	White & Black African	0	0.00%
	White & Black Caribbean	1	2.13%
	Other Mixed Background	0	0.00%
Asian/Asian British:	Pakistani	0	0.00%
	Other Asian Background	0	0.00%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British:	African	0	0.00%
	Caribbean	0	0.00%
	Other Black Background	0	0.00%
Other Ethnic Group:	Any other ethnic group	2	4.26%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

The data shows that 93.6% of the young people accessing a specialised Teenage Parent service are within the White racial groups. This is representative of the overall Kent population (93.7%).

White British make up the majority of the teenage parent population (91%), this is entirely representative of the Supporting People service users (91%).

<sup>14</sup> Teenage Parent Data, Supporting People 2012-2015

## Religion

Number of Teenage Parents by <b>Religion</b> 2012-2015		
Source: Teenage Parent Data 2012-2015 <sup>15</sup>		
<b>Religion/Belief</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>%</b>
Christian	8	17.02%
Buddhist	0	0.00%
Hindu	0	0.00%
Jewish	0	0.00%
Muslim	0	0.00%
Sikh	0	0.00%
Other religion	2	4.26%
No religion	16	34.04%
Religion not stated	21	44.68%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

At June 2011, the majority (63%) of Kent's population were Christians and 27% of the population had no religion.<sup>16</sup>

Only 17% of teenage parents accessing a specific service between 2012 and 2015 are Christians, making this cohort largely underrepresented when compared with the wider Kent population.

However, almost half of the teenage parents accessing a specific service did not state their religion, which could explain why there is a large underrepresentation of Christians.

The young person's religion will not affect the service they receive, as all service users will have fair access to services.

## Sexual Orientation

Between 2012 and 2015, 46 out of the 47 (97.8%) service users reported that they were heterosexual, with the data unknown for the other service user.<sup>17</sup>

## Gender Identity

Between 2012 and 2015, 40 teenage parents (85%) are not transgender. The remaining 7 (15%) are unknown, or data is missing.<sup>18</sup>

An Equality Impact Assessment for the withdrawal of specific support from the teenage parent service has been conducted to assess the impact.

<sup>15</sup> Teenage Parent Data, Supporting People 2012-2015

<sup>16</sup> Kent's Facts & Figures – kent.gov.uk

<sup>17</sup> Teenage Parent Data, Workbooks, Supporting People 2012-2015

<sup>18</sup> Teenage Parent Data, Workbooks, Supporting People 2012-2015



## Children in Care

The proposed change to the service will increase the number of statutory service users (16/17 year old children in care and care leavers) accessing services. Support will be refocused to ensure it is aimed at those most in need.

KCC currently has a child in care population of 2,107<sup>19</sup> (as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2016). The increase in UASC has significantly increased from 257 at July 2014 to 471 at June 2015<sup>20</sup> to 684 at November 2016<sup>21</sup>.

## **Age**

There are 707 16 and 17 year old Children in Care<sup>22</sup>. Please note, below shows only 16/17 year old Children in Care (36% of the total Children in Care).

Total Number of **Children in Care** in Kent by **Age**  
June 2015 (source SCS Performance Management Report)<sup>23</sup>

Age	Actual	%
16	315	16.17%
17	392	20.12%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1948</b>	<b>100%</b>

Kent has a significantly higher proportion of children in care aged 16 to 18, at 36% (707 16/17 year olds) than the England average which is 21% (over 16's CIC as at 31/3/15<sup>24</sup>).

Given the proposed change, it is anticipated that there will be an increase in statutory service users; therefore more 16/17 year olds may be accessing service.

## **Gender**

Number of **Children in Care** by **Gender**  
June 2015 (source SCS Performance Management Report)<sup>25</sup>

Gender	Total	%
Male	1255	64.43
Female	693	35.57
<b>Total</b>	<b>1948</b>	<b>100</b>

The majority of children in care are male (64%). Only 35% of the children in care population are female.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>19</sup> SCS quarterly performance report November 2016

<sup>20</sup> SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

<sup>21</sup> SCS quarterly performance report November 2016

<sup>22</sup> SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

<sup>23</sup> SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

<sup>24</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures and SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

<sup>25</sup> SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

<sup>26</sup> SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

Male children in care are overrepresented in Kent (Male 65%, Kent 49%). Whereas, female children in care and female service users are underrepresented (Female 35%, Kent 51%)<sup>27</sup>

## Race

Total Number of **Children in Care** in Kent by **Race**  
June 2015 (source SCS Performance Management Report)

28

Race	Actual	%
White	1376	70.64%
Mixed	89	4.57%
Asian	22	1.13%
Black	146	7.49%
Other	315	16.17%
Not Known	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1948</b>	<b>100</b>

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS FOR ALL CHILDREN IN CARE AND NOT JUST 16 to 17 YEAR OLDS.

Mixed (CIC 4.6%, Kent 1.51%), Black (CIC 7.5%, Kent 1.11%) and other (CIC 16.2%, Kent 0.46%) are overrepresented in the children in care cohort in Kent. White (CIC 70.6%, Kent 93.7%) and Asian (CIC 1.13%, Kent 3.25%) are underrepresented in the children in care cohort in Kent.<sup>29</sup>

## Care Leavers

### Age

Total Number of **Care Leavers** in Kent by **Age**  
June 2015 (source SCS Performance Management Report)<sup>30</sup>

Age	Actual	%
16	14	1.47%
17	26	2.72%
18	308	32.25%
19	248	25.97%
20	251	26.28%
21	61	6.39%
22	23	2.41%

<sup>27</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures

<sup>28</sup> SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

<sup>29</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures and SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

<sup>30</sup> SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

23	24	2.51%
24	0	0.00%
25	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>100%</b>

At June 2015, the average age of care leavers in Kent is between 18 and 20, making up 84.5% of the entire care leavers population.

## Gender

Number of **Care Leavers** by **Gender**  
June 2015 (source SCS Performance Management Report)<sup>31</sup>

Gender	Total	%
Male	637	66.70
Female	318	33.30
<b>Total</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>100</b>

Kent has a significantly higher percentage of male Care Leavers (66.7%) than female Care Leavers (33.3%).

Male Care Leavers are overrepresented in Kent (Male 61%, Kent 49%). Whereas, female Care Leavers are underrepresented (Female 26%, Kent 51%)<sup>32</sup>

## Ethnicity

Total Number of **Care Leavers** in Kent by **Ethnicity**  
June 2015 (source SCS Performance Management Report)<sup>33</sup>

	Ethnicity	Actual	%
White:	White British	517	54.14%
	White Irish	1	0.10%
	Any other white background	35	3.66%
	Traveller of Irish heritage	0	0.00%
	Gypsy/Roma	1	0.10%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups:	White and Black Caribbean	15	1.57%
	White and Black African	6	0.63%
	White and Asian	0	0.00%
	Any other mixed background	16	1.68%
Asian/Asian British:	Indian	4	0.42%
	Pakistani	1	0.10%
	Chinese	0	0.00%
	Any other Asian background	11	1.15%

<sup>31</sup> SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

<sup>32</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures

<sup>33</sup> SCS quarterly performance report July 2015

## Appendix 1

Black/African/Caribbean/Black British:	Caribbean	1	0.10%
	African	121	12.67%
	Any other back background	3	0.31%
Other ethnic group:	Any other ethnic group	223	23.35%
	Refused	0	0.00%
	Information not yet obtained	0	0.00%
	Not recorded	0	0.00%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>100%</b>

The majority of Care Leavers in Kent are White British (54%). However, White British are underrepresented when compared to Kent 89%.<sup>34</sup>

Other ethnic groups (CL 23.4%, Kent 0.46%) and Black African (CL 12.7%, Kent 0.79%) are largely overrepresented in the care leaver's population.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures

<sup>35</sup> Kent.gov.uk Facts & Figures

## **Involvement and Engagement**

A 16-25 Accommodation Working Group was established in March 2015 to support the delivery of the 16 to 25 Accommodation and Support Programme. This group met bi-monthly and had key stakeholders on its membership. A copy of the Terms of Reference is available on request.

KCC has already completed the following engagement activities with key stakeholders:

### **Young People/Service Users:**

- Sufficiency Participation Events (Nov 14 & Apr 15)
- Your Voice Matters Survey (July 2014)
- Care/ Pathway Plan including Pathway Project and IRO report (March 15)
- National Research – CYP views (March 15)
- Care Leaver Apprentices attended Working Group to support communication, engagement and consultation (September 2015)
- Teenage Parent Service User views gathered (October 2015)
- Workshop with the Young Adults Council (October 2015)

### **The Market:**

- Market Engagement Survey (April 15)
- Engagement on Commissioning Intentions (August 15)
- Information Sharing with Current Providers (Ongoing)
- Site Visits to Current Services (Ongoing)
- Meet the Market Events (20<sup>th</sup> October and 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2015)

### **Partners and Practitioners:**

- Meetings with 12 DC/BC Housing Officers (April 15)
- Engagement on Commissioning Intentions (August 15)
- Care Leaver Pathway Project (Ongoing)
- Joint Planning & Policy Board and Kent Housing Options Group (October 2015 - Ongoing)
- 16-17 year old Homelessness Protocol Workshop (October 2015 & March 2017)

KCC has also undertaken a Public consultation “Proposed changes to Kent’s Supported Accommodation and Floating Support Services” between Monday 30<sup>th</sup> November 2015 and Monday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2016. Notification of the consultation launch was sent to approximately 1,500 stakeholders. 209 responses were received to the public consultation. Public Consultation Activity included;

- 6 focus groups with service users to further support the consultation and to support identification of any potential impact on users. In total, KCC engaged with 52 young people in this way.
- Engagement with service users accessing the 5 Teenage Parent services. In total, KCC engaged with 20 young people in this way.
- Engagement with the 5 Teenage Parent providers to discuss the service they provide and their views on moving towards a generic service.

- Engagement with all 13 Supporting People providers to discuss the proposals in the Public Consultation document and the potential impact. Feedback was submitted via the Public Consultation questionnaire.
- Engagement with the Housing Options Group to discuss the proposals and Individual engagement meetings with 10 District/Borough Councils were also held throughout December 2015 and January 2016.
- Contact with 6 charities that work with LGBT, Transgender and Young Carers. The charities were asked for their views regarding the proposed changes and whether they felt the changes would negatively impact upon their client groups. The charities were also asked to share the document with any young people they work with.

The table below summaries the views of key Stakeholders, including: Service Users; The Market; Partners and Practitioners.

Profile of those responding to the consultation

Protected characteristic	Consultation Responses (relates to those who responded to the 'About you' questions)	Comparison to Kent Population	Comparison to Service User Population
<b>Age</b>	<p><b>All Respondents</b> 70 respondents indicated that they were 16-24 (33%). 104 respondents indicated that they were aged 25-59 (50%). 16 respondents indicated that they were aged 60+ (8%).</p>	16-24 year olds responding to the consultation are overrepresented when compared with the wider Kent population (33% Respondents, Kent 11.5%)	
<b>Disability</b>	<p><b>All Respondents</b> 28 respondents indicated that they had a disability (13%). 160 respondents did not consider themselves to have a disability (77%).</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 18 service users indicated that they had a disability (26%). 48 service users did not consider themselves to have a disability (69%).</p>	Amongst the respondents, individuals with a disability are underrepresented (13% Respondents, 17.6% Kent). Please note: the 17.6% is the percentage of Kent residents with a 'long-term health problem or disability'.	Data not available.
<b>Gender</b>	<p><b>All Respondents</b> 123 respondents indicated that they were female (59%). 67 respondents indicated that they were male (33%).</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 33 service users indicated that they were female (47%). 34 service users indicated that they were male (49%).</p>	Male respondents are underrepresented when compared to Kent (Male 33%, Kent 49%). Whereas, female respondents are slightly overrepresented (Female 59%, Kent 51%)	Male service users who responded to the consultation are slightly underrepresented when compared to all service users (Male 49%, All 60%). Whereas, female service users who responded to the consultation are slightly overrepresented (Female 47%, All 40%)
<b>Race</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 169 respondents indicated that they were White British (81%). 4 respondents indicated that they belonged to a Black ethnic group (2%). 4 respondents indicated that they were White Gypsy/Roma (2%).</p>	Amongst the respondents, White British are slightly underrepresented (81% Respondents, 89% Kent).  Those indicating they belong to a	Amongst the service users who responded, White British are underrepresented (91% Respondents, 70% All).

	<p>4 respondents indicated that they were White Irish (2%). 3 respondents indicated that they were Asian (1%).</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 64 service users indicated that they were White British (91%). 3 indicated that they were White Gypsy/Roma (4%).</p>	<p>Black ethnic group are slightly overrepresented (2% Respondents, 1.1% Kent).</p> <p>White Gypsy/Roma individuals are overrepresented when compared to Kent (2% Respondents, 0.3% Kent).</p> <p>White Irish respondents are overrepresented when compared to Kent (2% Respondents, 0.7% Kent).</p> <p>Asian respondents are underrepresented (1% Respondents, 3.25% Kent).</p>	<p>Those indicating they belong to a White Gypsy/Roma group are overrepresented when compared to the wider Service User population (4% Respondents, 0.3% All)</p>
<b>Religion or belief</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 49 respondents indicated that they were Christian (23%). 129 respondents indicated that they had no religion (62%).</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 7 service users indicated that they were Christian (10%). 55 service users indicated that they had no religion (79%).</p>	<p>Amongst the respondents, Christians are underrepresented when compared with the wider Kent population (23% Respondents, Kent 62%). Those indicating that they have no religion are overrepresented (62% Respondents, 27% Kent).</p>	<p>Amongst the service users who responded, Christian are underrepresented when compared to the wider service user population (10% Service users, 19% All).</p>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 168 respondents indicated that they were Heterosexual (80%). 12 respondents indicated that they were Gay/Bi-Sexual (6%).</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 43 service users indicated that they were Heterosexual (61%). 7 service users indicated that they were Gay/Bi-Sexual (10%).</p>	<p>Data not available.</p>	<p>Data not available.</p>



## Feedback on the Proposals

## Proposal A – Who will use these services

<b>Options</b>	<b>Option 2</b> - Prioritise young people who are owed a statutory duty or who may need some support to prevent them coming into Care (children in care, care leavers and 16-17 year olds at risk of homelessness)	<b>Option 3</b> - Limiting services to those who are owed a statutory duty only; young people over 18, whom the council does not have a statutory duty to support, will not be supported.
<b>General Feedback:</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 46% disagree to some extent with Option 2 41% agree to some extent with Option 2</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 52% disagree to some extent with Option 2 31% agree to some extent with Option 2</p> <p>Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11% respondents felt that Option 2 would lead to an increase in homelessness or anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>39% commented that over 18s are not ready for independent living and that there is no alternative provision available to them.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 79% disagree to some extent with Option 3 14% agree to some extent with Option 3</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 90% disagree to some extent with Option 3 5% agree to some extent with Option 3</p> <p>Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>34% felt that over 18s needed support and were not ready for independent living; the needs of over 18 are no different to the needs of under 18s</li> <li>7% felt that access to services should be based on individual need not legal status.</li> </ul>
<b>Age</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 46% disagree to some extent with Option 2 <b>16-24 year olds</b> 51% of 16-24 year old respondents disagree to some extent with Option 2</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 52% of 16-24 year old service users disagree to some extent with Option 2</p> <p>Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Everybody deserves and should be entitled to support. We are all people and suffering is suffering regardless of age or family</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 79% disagree to some extent with Option 3 <b>16-24 year olds</b> 87% of 16-24 year old respondents disagree to some extent with Option 3</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 90% of 16-24 year old service users disagree to some extent with Option 3</p> <p>Comments included:</p>

	<p><i>situation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Everyone that is on the streets is a priority as it’s no fun and very dangerous.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal A, Option 2 would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Everyone gets treated the same regardless of age, colour, size etc.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Only one person in xxxxx is under 18, the rest would have been rough sleeping. I’m a young girl; I would survive day by day whatever means even if it means prostitution.”</i></li> </ul> <p>A higher percentage of 16-24 year olds (87%) have disagreed with Proposal A, Option 3 when compared with the level of disagreement amongst all respondents (79%). This suggests Proposal A, Option 3 could negatively impact upon 16-24 year olds.</p>
<p><b>Gender</b></p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b>            46% of all respondents disagree to some extent with Option 2  <b>Male</b> - 48% of male respondents disagreed to some extent with Option 2  <b>Female</b> - 41% of female respondents disagree to some extent with Option 2</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b>            52% of all service users responding disagree to some extent with Option 2  <b>Male</b> - 53% of male service users disagreed to some extent with Option 2  <b>Female</b> - 48% of female service users disagreed to some extent with Option 2</p> <p>Amongst the Males disagreeing, comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“The need is real for 18+ as well and a huge section of the public will be at risk without these services.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal A, Option 2 would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b>            79% of all respondents disagree to some extent with Option 3  <b>Male</b>- 81% of male respondents disagreed to some extent with Option 3  <b>Female</b> - 76% of female respondents disagreed to some extent with Option 3</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b>            90% of all service users responding disagree to some extent with Option 3  <b>Male</b> - 91% of male service users disagreed to some extent with Option 3  <b>Female</b>            85% of female service users disagreed to some extent with Option 3</p> <p>Amongst the Males who disagreed, comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Having left the Army at 21, if support wasn’t available, I would still be on the streets. Not everyone who needs help is under 18.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal A, Option 3 would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>

<b>Disability</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 46% disagree to some extent with Option 2 <b>Disability</b> - 54% of respondents with a disability disagree to some extent with Option 2. <b>No Disability</b> - 42% of respondents without a disability disagree to some extent with Option 2.</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 52% disagree to some extent with Option 2 <b>Disability</b> - 50% of service users with a disability disagree to some extent with Option 2 <b>No Disability</b> - 48% of service users without a disability disagree to some extent with Option 2.</p> <p>Comments from service users with a disability included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“All I can say is that I am 19 and if it wasn't for [provider] I wouldn't be here today.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>A higher percentage of disabled respondents (54%) have disagreed with Proposal A, Option 2 when compared with the level of disagreement amongst all respondents (46%). However the level of disagreement is not higher amongst respondents who are service users with a disability.</b></p>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 79% disagree to some extent with Option 3 <b>Disability</b> - 82% of respondents with a disability disagree to some extent with Option 3 <b>No Disability</b> - 76% of respondents without a disability disagree to some extent with Option 3</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 90% disagree to some extent with Option 3 <b>Disability</b> 89% of service users with a disability disagree to some extent with Option 3. <b>No Disability</b> 88% of service users without a disability disagree to some extent with Option 3.</p> <p>Comments from service users with a disability included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“xxxx has helped me, they took me off the streets. I dread to think what would happen to me and my mental health if I had to leave at 18.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal A, Option 3 would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 46% disagree to some extent with Option 2 <b>Heterosexual</b> - 44% of heterosexual respondents disagree to some extent with Option 2. <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b> - 58% of gay/bi-sexual respondents disagree to some extent with Option 2.</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 52% disagree to some extent with Option 3</p>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 79% disagree to some extent with Option 3 <b>Heterosexual</b> - 76% of heterosexual respondents disagree to some extent with Option 3 <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b> - 83% of gay/bi-sexual respondents disagree to some extent with Option 3.</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 90% disagree to some extent with Option 3</p>

	<p><b>Heterosexual</b> - 51% of heterosexual service users disagree to some extent with Option 2  <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b> - 50% of gay/bi-sexual service users disagree to some extent with Option 2.</p> <p>Comments from these service users included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“To not support anyone over 18 would be a massive shame and a large amount of our population left with nothing at all. The percentage of homelessness would rise dramatically.”</li> </ul> <p><b>A higher percentage of gay or bi-sexual respondents (58%) have disagreed with Proposal A, Option 2 when compared with the level of disagreement amongst all respondents (46%). However the level of disagreement is not higher amongst respondents who are gay or bi-sexual service users.</b></p>	<p><b>Heterosexual</b> - 86% of heterosexual service users disagree to some extent with Option 3  <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b> - 83% of gay/bi-sexual service users disagree to some extent with Option 3.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal A, Option 3 would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
<b>Race</b>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b>  46% disagree to some extent with Option 2  <b>White British</b> - 48% of White British respondents disagree to some extent with Option 2.</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b>  52% disagree to some extent with Option 2  <b>White British</b> - 53% of White British service users disagree to some extent with Option 2</p> <p>The level of responses amongst other racial groups was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal A would have no negative impact on White British.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b>  79% disagree to some extent with Option 3  <b>White British</b> - 79% of White British respondents disagree to some extent with Option 3</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b>  90% disagree to some extent with Option 3  <b>White British</b> - 81% of White British service users disagree to some extent with Option 3.</p> <p>The level of responses amongst other racial groups was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal A, Option 3 would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
<b>Religion</b>	<b><u>Respondents</u></b>	<b><u>Respondents</u></b>

	<p>46% disagree to some extent with Option 2  <b>Christian</b> -35% of Christian respondents disagree to some extent with Option 2.  <b>Other</b> – 33% of ‘Other’ respondents disagree to some extent with Option 2</p> <p><b>Service Users</b>  52% disagree to some extent with Option 3  <b>Christian</b> - 43% of Christian service users disagree to some extent with Option 2</p> <p>The level of responses amongst other religions was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal A, Option 2 would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>	<p>79% disagree to some extent with Option 3  <b>Christian</b>- 76% of Christian respondents disagree to some extent with Option 3  Other – 67% (2 responses) of ‘Other’ respondents disagree to some extent with Option 2</p> <p><b>Service Users</b>  90% disagree to some extent with Option 3  <b>Christian</b> - 86% of Christian service users disagree to some extent with Option 3.</p> <p>The level of responses amongst other religions was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal A, Option 3 would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
--	---	--

**Proposal B – Reviewing the Service Offer**

	<p><b>Proposal B</b> - Providing a generic offer; this would mean that all services would be able to cater for the needs of all service user groups and there would be no separate targeted services.</p>	
<p><b>General Feedback:</b></p>	<p><b>Respondents</b>  34% disagree to some extent with Proposal B  52% agree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p><b>Service Users</b>  27% disagree to some extent with Proposal B  34% agree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p>Comments included:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teenage parents and babies should be separate and babies could be at risk (16%)</li> <li>• Specialist services are better/one size does not fit all (22%)</li> <li>• No one would feel labelled or singled out (4%)</li> </ul>
<b>Age</b>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b> 34% disagree to some extent with Proposal B <b>16-24 year olds</b> - 29% of 16-24 year old respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 27% disagree to some extent with Proposal B <b>16-24 year olds</b> - 30% of 16-24 year old service users disagree to some extent with Proposal B.</p> <p>Comments from 16-24 year olds included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“I think certain services should stay separate as there are different needs for some people like offenders and young mums”</i></li> <li>• <i>“People go through different things together and different groups can’t understand each other. People support each other (peer groups)”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal B would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
<b>Gender</b>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b> 34% disagree to some extent with Proposal B <b>Male</b> - 31% of male respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal B <b>Female</b> - 33% of female respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 27% disagree to some extent with Proposal B <b>Male</b> - 29% of male service users disagree to some extent with Proposal B. <b>Female</b> - 27% of female service users disagree to some extent with Proposal B.</p> <p>Comments amongst those disagreeing included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Being separated from groups means that you don’t get the same support.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Because it wouldn’t work with young teens and mothers and babies.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal B would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>

<b>Disability</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b>  34% disagree to some extent with Proposal B  <b>Disability</b> - 11% of respondents with a disability disagree to some extent with Proposal B  <b>No Disability</b> - 34% of respondents with no disability disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p><b>Service Users</b>  27% disagree to some extent with Proposal B  <b>Disability</b> - 6% of service users with a disability disagree to some extent with Proposal B.  <b>No Disability</b> - 33% of service users without a disability disagree to some extent with Proposal B.</p> <p>This analysis suggests that Proposal B may have a <u>positive</u> impact on this protected characteristic. A lower percentage of disabled respondents (11%) including disabled service users (6%) disagreed with Proposal B when compared with the level of disagreement amongst all respondents (34%).</p>
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b>  34% disagree to some extent with Proposal B  <b>Heterosexual</b> - 32% of heterosexual respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal B  <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b> - 28% of gay/bi-sexual respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p><b>Service Users</b>  27% disagree to some extent with Proposal B  <b>Heterosexual</b>- 28% of heterosexual service users disagree to some extent with Proposal B  <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b>- 29% of gay/bi-sexual service users disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p>Comments from gay/bi-sexual individuals who disagreed included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Individuals have individual need and therefore each case must be considered separately and on its own merits; these are real people we are thinking about, not boxes breakfast cereals sitting on a supermarket shelf!”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal B would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
<b>Race</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b>  34% disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p>

	<p><b>White British-</b> 31% of White British respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 27% disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p><b>White British</b> - 25% of White British service users disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p>Amongst those White British individuals disagreeing, comments included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Equality and diversity celebrates the differences between us how can we support young vulnerable adults if we say they are all the same.”</i></li> </ul> <p>The level of responses amongst other racial groups was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal B would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
<b>Religion</b>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b> 34% disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p><b>Christian</b> - 29% of Christian respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 27% disagree to some extent with Proposal B</p> <p><b>Christian</b> - 14% of Christian service users disagree to some extent with Proposal B (only one service user)</p> <p>The level of responses amongst other religions was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal B would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>



### Proposal C - Joining up accommodation based support and floating support services

	<p><b>Proposal C:</b> Joining up accommodation based support and floating support services to create a seamless service that is able to deliver a range of accommodation and personalised support.</p>
<b>General Feedback:</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 11% disagree to some extent with Proposal C 75% agree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 9% disagree to some extent with Proposal C 73% agree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p>Comments included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It depends on the individual young person - young people need differing levels of support (16%)</li> </ul>
<b>Age</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 11% disagree to some extent with Proposal C <b>16-24 year olds</b> - 9% of 16-24 year old respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 9% disagree to some extent with Proposal C <b>16-24 year olds</b> - 7% of 16-24 year old service users disagree to some extent with Proposal C.</p> <p>Comments from 16-24 year olds who disagreed included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“I think it should be optional because although we are learning to live independently when we move out from here, we should be ready to live fully independently.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal C would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
<b>Gender</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 11% disagree to some extent with Proposal C <b>Male</b> - 16% of male respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p>

	<p><b>Female</b> - 8% of female respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 9% disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>Male</b> - 9% of male service users disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>Female</b> - 6% of female service users disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p>Comment included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Support in accommodation services is vastly different to floating support services and vice versa. Client situation is vastly different. Support contract times different.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal C would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
<b>Disability</b>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b> 11% disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>Disability</b> - 7% of respondents with a disability disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>No Disability</b> - 12% of respondents with no disability disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 9% disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>Disability</b> - 0% of service users with a disability disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>No Disability</b> - 10% of service users without a disability disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p>This analysis suggests that Proposal C may have a <u>positive</u> impact on this protected characteristic. A lower percentage of disabled respondents (7%) including 0% of disabled service users, disagreed with Proposal C when compared with the level of disagreement amongst all respondents (11%).</p>
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b> 11% disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>Heterosexual</b> - 12% of heterosexual respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b> - 0% of gay/bi-sexual respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b></p>

	<p>9% disagree to some extent with Proposal C  <b>Heterosexual</b> -7% of heterosexual service users disagree to some extent with Proposal C  <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b> - 0% of gay/bi-sexual service users disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal C may have a <u>positive</u> impact on this protected characteristic. A lower percentage of gay and bi-sexual respondents (0%) including gay and bi-sexual service user respondents (0%) disagreed with Proposal C when compared with the level of disagreement amongst all respondents (11%).</b></p>
<b>Race</b>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b>  11% disagree to some extent with Proposal C  <b>White British</b>- 12% of White British respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b>  9% disagree to some extent with Proposal C  <b>White British</b> - 9% of White British service users disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p>Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“I think that is going to stop more one to one sessions, and may stop the amount of time I get to see my support worker”</i></li> </ul> <p>The level of responses amongst other racial groups was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal C would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
<b>Religion</b>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b>  11% disagree to some extent with Proposal C  <b>Christian</b> - 14% of Christian respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal C</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b>  9% disagree to some extent with Proposal C  <b>Christian</b> - 0% of Christian service users disagree to some extent with Proposal C (only seven Christian service users)</p> <p>The level of responses amongst other religions was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal C would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>

### Proposal D – Lining up services with areas of the County

	<b>Proposal D</b> - Reducing the number of organisations delivering services	<b>Preferred Option</b> (this was not presented as a Proposal, instead respondents were asked to give their preferred option) – <b>Option 1:</b> Current Model <b>Option 2:</b> Countywide Model <b>Option 3:</b> 4 Area Based Model
<b>General Feedback:</b>	<p><b>Respondents</b>  23% disagree to some extent with Proposal D  54% agree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p><b>Service Users</b>  26% disagree to some extent with Proposal D  43% agree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p>Comments included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“There seems to be too many people/organisations doing completely different things.”</li> </ul>	<p><b>Respondents</b>  <b>Option 1: Current Model</b>  12% of all respondents preferred the current model  <b>Option 2: Countywide</b>  25% of all respondents preferred a Countywide model  <b>Option 3: 4 Area Based Services</b>  48% of all respondents preferred an Area Based model</p> <p><b>Service Users</b>  <b>Option 1: Current Model</b>  17% of all service users preferred the current model  <b>Option 2: Countywide</b>  30% of all service users preferred a Countywide model  <b>Option 3: 4 Area Based Services</b>  34% of all service users preferred an Area Based model</p> <p>Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young people should be able to maintain a local connection (10%)</li> <li>More choice of accommodation is important (6%).</li> </ul>
<b>Age</b>	<b>Respondents</b> 23% disagree to some extent with Proposal D	<b>Respondents</b> 48% preferred Option 3, whereas 37% preferred either Option 1 or 2.

	<p><b>16-24 year olds</b>- 24% of 16-24 year old respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 26% disagree to some extent with Proposal D <b>16-24 year olds</b> - 25% of 16-24 year old service users disagree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal D would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>	<p><b>16-24 year olds</b> – 34% of 16-24 year old respondents preferred Option 3. 47% preferred either Option 1 or 2.</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 34% preferred Option 3, whereas 47% preferred either Option 1 or 2. <b>16-24 year olds</b> - 33% of 16-24 year old service users preferred Option 3. 46% preferred either Option 1 or 2.</p> <p>Comments included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“County wide would secure support in all areas of Kent which would mean no one in need of the service(s) would have difficulty getting them.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Overall, a lower percentage of 16-24 year olds have preferred Option 3 (34%) than the percentage of all respondents (48%).</b></p> <p><b>However the percentage preferring Option 3 is not lower amongst respondents who are service users aged 16-24.</b></p>
<p><b>Gender</b></p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b> 23% disagree to some extent with Proposal D <b>Male</b> - 27% of male respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal D <b>Female</b> - 23% of female respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 26% disagree to some extent with Proposal D <b>Male</b> - 21% of male service users disagree to some extent with Proposal D <b>Female</b> - 27% of female service users disagree to some extent with Proposal D</p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b> 48% preferred Option 3, whereas 37% preferred either Option 1 or 2. <b>Male</b> - 36% of male respondents preferred Option 3. 48% of male respondents preferred either Option 1 or 2. <b>Female</b> 51% of female respondents preferred Option 3. 37% of female respondents preferred either Option 1 or 2.</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 34% preferred Option 3, whereas 47% preferred either Option 1 or 2. <b>Male</b> 26% of male service users preferred Option 3. 50% of male service users preferred either Option 1 or 2. <b>Female</b></p>

	<p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal D would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>	<p>45% of female service users preferred Option 3. 39% of female service users preferred Option 1 or 2.</p> <p>Comment included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“I feel that the services for young people (16-24 yr olds) should not be a postcode lottery and every young person (16-24) deserves to have the opportunity to access the same service.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Fewer male respondents preferred Option 3 (36%) including male service users (26%) when compared with the percentage of all respondent who preferred Option 3 (48%).</b></p> <p><b>This suggests that implementing a 4 area based model could negatively impact upon Males.</b></p>
<p><b>Disability</b></p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b>  23% disagree to some extent with Proposal D  <b>Disability</b> - 25% of respondents with a disability disagree to some extent with Proposal D  <b>No Disability</b> - 24% of respondents with no disability disagree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b>  26% disagree to some extent with Proposal D  <b>Disability</b> - 16% of service users with a disability disagree to some extent with Proposal D  <b>No Disability</b> - 27% of service users with no disability disagree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal D may have a <u>positive</u> impact on this protected characteristic. A lower percentage of disabled service users (16%) disagreed with Proposal D when compared with the level of disagreement amongst all service</b></p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b>  48% preferred Option 3, whereas 37% preferred either Option 1 or 2.  <b>Disability</b>  39% of respondents with a disability preferred Option 3, whereas 50% preferred either Option 1 or 2.  <b>No Disability</b>  47% of respondents with no disability preferred Option 3, whereas 38% preferred either Option 1 or 2.</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b>  34% preferred Option 3, whereas 47% preferred either Option 1 or 2.  <b>Disability</b>  28% of service users with a disability preferred Option 3, whereas 56% preferred either Option 1 or 2.  <b>No Disability</b>  38% of service users with no disability preferred Option 3, whereas 44% preferred either Option 1 or 2.</p>

	<p><b>users responding (26%).</b></p>	<p>Comments included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Everyone should have same no matter where you live.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>A lower percentage (39%) of respondents with a disability including disabled service users (28%) preferred Option 3 when compared with all respondents (48%).</b></p> <p><b>This suggests that implementing Option 3 could have a negative impact upon individuals with a disability.</b></p>
<p><b>Sexual Orientation</b></p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b>  23% disagree to some extent with Proposal D  <b>Heterosexual</b> - 21% of heterosexual respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal D  <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b> - 42% of gay/bi-sexual respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b>  26% disagree to some extent with Proposal D, Question 1  <b>Heterosexual</b> - 19% of heterosexual service users disagree to some extent with Proposal D  <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b> - 43% of gay/bi-sexual service users disagree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p>Comments from gay/bi-sexual individuals who disagreed included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Smaller independent / private providers can often offer better responses and more direct and effective interventions than large ‘mega-organisations’. It is never wise to place all your eggs in one basket!”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>A higher percentage of Gay/Bi-Sexual respondents (42%) and Gay/Bi-Sexual service users (43%) have disagreed with Proposal D when compared with the level of disagreement amongst all</b></p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b>  48% preferred Option 3, whereas 37% preferred either Option 1 or 2.  <b>Heterosexual</b>  46% of heterosexual respondents preferred Option 3, whereas 38% preferred either Option 1 or 2.  <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b>  25% of gay/bi-sexual respondents preferred Option 3, whereas 67% preferred either Option 1 or 2.</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b>  34% preferred Option 3, whereas 47% preferred either Option 1 or 2.  <b>Heterosexual</b>  35% of heterosexual service users preferred Option 3, whereas 35% of preferred either Option 1 or 2.  <b>Gay/Bi-Sexual</b>  0% of gay/bi-sexual service users preferred Option 3, whereas 86% preferred Option 1 or 2.</p> <p>Comments included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“I would like to feel that whatever area I lived in in Kent, I would be able to reach or be referred to any service appropriate.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>A lower percentage (25%) of gay/bi-sexual respondents, including</b></p>

	<p>respondents (23%).</p> <p><b>This suggests reducing the number of organisations delivering services could negatively impact upon Gay/Bi-Sexual individuals.</b></p>	<p><b>0% of the gay/bi-sexual service users preferred Option 3 compared with the percentage of all respondents who preferred Option 3 (48%).</b></p> <p><b>This suggests that implementing a 4 area model could have a negative impact upon gay/bi-sexual individuals.</b></p>
Race	<p><b>Respondents</b> 23% disagree to some extent with Proposal D, Question 1 <b>White British</b> - 25% of White British respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 26% disagree to some extent with Proposal D, Question 1 <b>White British</b> - 27% of White British service users disagree to some extent with Proposal D</p> <p>The level of responses amongst other racial groups was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal D would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>	<p><b>Respondents</b> 48% preferred Option 3, whereas 37% preferred either Option 1 or 2. <b>White British</b> 44% of White British respondents preferred Option 3, whereas 28% preferred either Option 1 or 2.</p> <p><b>Service Users</b> 34% preferred Option 3, whereas 47% preferred either Option 1 or 2. <b>White British</b> 34% of White British service users preferred Option 3, whereas 28% of preferred either Option 1 or 2.</p> <p>Comments included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Countywide would secure support in all areas of Kent which would mean no one in need of the service(s) would have difficulty getting them.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“I would like to feel that whatever area I lived in in Kent, I would be able to reach or be referred to any service appropriate.”</i></li> </ul> <p>Other race groups were not captured, or the level of responses was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that a 4 area model would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>



<p><b>Religion</b></p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b> 23% disagree to some extent with Proposal D, Question 1 <b>Christian</b> - 24% of Christian respondents disagree to some extent with Proposal D, Question 1</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 26% disagree to some extent with Proposal D, Question 1 <b>Christian</b> - 29% of Christian service users disagree to some extent with Proposal D, Question 1</p> <p>The level of responses amongst other religions was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that Proposal D would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Respondents</u></b> 48% preferred Option 3, whereas 37% preferred either Option 1 or 2. <b>Christian</b> 49% of Christian respondents preferred Option 3, whereas 38% preferred either Option 1 or 2.</p> <p><b><u>Service Users</u></b> 34% preferred Option 3, whereas 47% preferred either Option 1 or 2. <b>Christian</b> 57% of Christian service users preferred Option 3, whereas 43% of preferred either Option 1 or 2.</p> <p>Other religious groups were not captured, or the level of responses was too low to give a proportionate representation of disagreement.</p> <p><b>This analysis suggests that a 4 area model would have no negative impact upon this protected characteristic.</b></p>
------------------------	--	--

## **Potential Impact**

Age, Gender and Pregnancy and Maternity.

Impact is none or unknown for race, religion or belief, disability, gender identity, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership, carer's responsibilities. Young People services will continue to support Care Leavers up to the age of 25.

### **Adverse Impact:**

- Age - Services relate to 16-25 year old Children in Care and Care Leavers and Vulnerable Young People only and therefore this group are affected more than others. Given the proposed change, more statutory service users (16/17 year old children in care and care leavers) will be able to access the service, suggesting the age of service users could decrease.
- Gender – Given the proposed increase in statutory service users, more males could be accessing the new service. This may affect females, particularly teenage mothers, less favourably.
- Pregnancy & Maternity – KCC currently provides 5 specialist Teenage Parent services. There may be an impact on Teenage Parents who are not owed a statutory duty (see separate EQIA).

### **Positive Impact:**

Overall, the proposed remodelling of the services will ensure that:

- Statutory service users are prioritised;
- Service User's individual needs are met;
- There is a consistent service offer; and
- More young people are placed in their 'ideal accommodation' (as identified by practitioners).

**JUDGEMENT**

Option 1 – Screening Sufficient	<b>YES</b>
Option 2 – Internal Action Required	<b>YES</b>
Option 3 – Full Impact Assessment	<b>NO</b>

**Action Plan**

The action plan below will be delivered over the forthcoming months. When developing the service specification and undertaking the procurement the action plan will need to be carefully considered to ensure any adverse effects on protected characteristic groups are minimised.

**Monitoring and Review**

The action plan will be reviewed on a monthly basis post consultation and until the procurement exercises have taken place, the new contract is in place, and that KCC is satisfied all protected characteristics have been adequately considered with negative impacts minimised.

**Sign Off**

I have noted the content of the equality impact assessment and agree the actions to mitigate the adverse impact(s) that have been identified.

**Senior Officer**

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Name:</b>
<b>Job Title:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

**DMT Member**

<b>Signed:</b>	<b>Name:</b>
<b>Job Title:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

### Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Protected Characteristic	Issues identified	Action to be taken	Expected outcomes	Owner	Timescale
Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation, Carers' Responsibilities, Marriage and Civil Partnerships and Religion,	There is no data relating to these groups – potential impact is unknown	Providers to begin capturing this data  Include in new contract monitoring	This will assist in identifying any impact this programme may have on each protected characteristic and if there is action can be taken to prevent any adverse impact.  The new service will assist in delivering services that meet this group's needs.	RC/KM	September 2018
Age, and Gender	Potential impact	Engage with existing providers. Ensure EQIA is shared.	Establish potential impact and put in place actions to mitigate.	RC/KM	September 2018
Pregnancy & Maternity	Ensure Teenage Parents continue to be able to access the services in the newly commissioned service.	Providers to capture this data as part of performance review.  Engagement with service users – visits.	This will assist in identifying any impact the newly commissioned service may have on Teenage Parents accessing services.	RC/KM	Ongoing
All	Transition	Ensure exit and transition arrangements are incorporated within Single source contract and continue to work with current providers to ensure individual needs are identified and addressed.	Service users are accommodated in line with their individual needs	Current Providers, Procurement, Strategic Commissioning, Accommodation Support Advisors, Social Workers and Personal Advisors.	Ongoing