

## **Kent County Council**

### **Equality Analysis/ Impact Assessment (EqIA)**

**Directorate/ Service:** Children, Young People and Education (CYPE)

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

Review of CYPE Cabinet Committee agreement from January 2018 to bring four externally commissioned Children's centres into in-house provision as part of the wider Early Help and Preventative Services children's centre offer.

**Responsible Owner/ Senior Officer:**

Stuart Collins – Director of Integrated Children's Services West Kent (EHPS Lead)

**Version: 1**

**Author:**

Helen Cook, Senior Commissioner - STSC

**Pathway of Equality Analysis:**

Agreement to bring the services in house made at the Children's Young People and Education Cabinet Committee in January 2018.

**Summary and recommendations of equality analysis/impact assessment.**

- **Context**

At the time of the CYPE Cabinet Committee decision in January 2018, four children's centres across Folkstone and Hythe (Hythe Bay, Folkestone Early Years centre, The Village) and Canterbury (Riverside) were externally commissioned and run by four separate organisations.

Performance was poor, costs were inequitably high, and the offer was not co-ordinated or joined up with the rest of the EHPS offer across the whole district. The decision to bring the provision in house was endorsed by the Members of the Committee.

- **Aims and Objectives**

To improve the quality, reach and level of the individual and district wide offer and improve integration of services across the district.

- **Summary of equality impact**

As the CYPE Cabinet Committee report which accompanies this EqIA attests, parents and users have commented positively on the new offer, performance across the new offer has improved, reach and registration has grown, cost has been reduced and services are delivered from the same venues.

**Adverse Equality Impact Rating** **Low**

**Attestation**

I have read and paid due regard to the Equality Analysis/Impact Assessment concerning the decision to bring 4 commissioned children's centres under in-house provision. I agree with risk rating and the actions to mitigate any adverse impact(s) that has /have been identified.

**Head of Service**



Signed:

Name: Karen Sharp

Job Title: Head of Children's Commissioning Portfolio

Date: 6<sup>th</sup> September 2018

**DMT Member**



Signed:

Name: Stuart Collins

Job Title: Director of Integrated Children's Services West Kent (EHPS Lead)

Date: 6<sup>th</sup> September 2018

**Part 1 Screening**

Could this policy, procedure, project or service, or any proposed changes to it, affect any Protected Group (listed below) less favourably (negatively) than others in Kent?

Protected Group	Please provide a <u>brief</u> commentary on your findings. Fuller analysis should be undertaken in Part 2.			
	High negative impact EqIA	Medium negative impact Screen	Low negative impact Evidence	High/Medium/ Low Positive Impact Evidence
<b>Age</b>			The Children's Centre service offer did not change as a result of this decision, therefore there is no impact to this protected group.	
<b>Disability</b>			The Children's Centre service offer did not change as a result of this decision, therefore there is no impact to this protected group.	
<b>Gender</b>			The Children's Centre service offer did not change as a result of this decision, therefore there is no impact to this protected group.	
<b>Gender identity/ Transgender</b>			The Children's Centre service offer did not change as a result of this decision, therefore there is no impact to this protected group.	
<b>Race</b>			The Children's Centre service offer did not change as a result of this decision, therefore there is no impact to this protected group.	
<b>Religion and</b>			The Children's Centre service offer did not change as a	

Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group?

<b>Belief</b>			result of this decision, therefore there is no impact to this protected group.	
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>			The Children's Centre service offer did not change as a result of this decision, therefore there is no impact to this protected group.	
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>			The Children's Centre service offer did not change as a result of this decision, therefore there is no impact to this protected group. Midwifery services continue to be delivered within all three Centres. However, following a decision made by the Public Health Service regarding the development of baby hubs, the Health Clinic at Hythe has not been continued. Families affected by this decision have been made aware that they can access Health Clinics at six other Centres within the District or through a Health Helpline.	
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>			The Children's Centre service offer did not change as a result of this decision, therefore there is no impact to this protected group.	
<b>Carer's Responsibilities</b>			The Children's Centre service offer did not change as a result of this decision, therefore there is no impact to this protected group.	

## **Part 2**

### **Equality Analysis /Impact Assessment**

#### **Protected groups**

(Who will be directly or indirectly negatively affected by the changes?)

#### **Information and Data used to carry out your assessment**

(Please list your data source and if you have it provide a link to source. Please highlight any gaps)

#### **Who have you involved consulted and engaged?**

(Please list stakeholders)

#### **Analysis**

(What have you found out and what does it tell you about the impacted protected groups? What did you stakeholders, including protected groups tell you?)

#### **Adverse Impact,**

(What is the effect on the protected group? Please state mitigation in the action plan)

#### **Positive Impact:**

(Please highlight any positive impacts in relation to protected groups)

### **JUDGEMENT**

Set out below the implications you have found from your assessment for the relevant protected group(s). If any negative impacts can be justified please clearly explain why. Identify the option to address the impact. There are four possible options:

- **No major change** - no potential for discrimination and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken
- **Adjust and continue** - adjust to remove barriers or better promote equality
- **Continue the policy** - despite potential for adverse impact or missed opportunity. Set out the justifications: there is no justification for direct discrimination; and indirect discrimination will need to be justified according to the legal requirements.
- **Stop and remove the policy** – policy shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination it must be stopped and removed or changed

#### **Internal Action Required                      YES/NO**

There is potential for adverse impact on particular groups and we have found scope to improve the proposal...

*(Complete the Action Plan- please include dates for monitoring and review)*

**Equality Impact Analysis/Assessment Action Plan**

Protected Characteristic	Issues identified	Action to be taken	Expected outcomes	Owner	Timescale	Cost implications

**Have the actions been included in your business/ service plan? (If no please state how the actions will be monitored)**

Yes/No

Appendix

Please include relevant data sets

June 2017

Please forward a final signed electronic copy and Word version to the Equality Team by emailing [diversityinfo@kent.gov.uk](mailto:diversityinfo@kent.gov.uk)

If the activity will be subject to a Cabinet decision, the EqIA must be submitted to committee services along with the relevant Cabinet report. Your EqIA should also be published .

The original signed hard copy and electronic copy should be kept with your team for audit purposes.