EQIA Submission – ID Number
Section A

EQIA Title
Local Childrens Partnership Grant

Responsible Officer
Christine Kiely - CY EHPS

Type of Activity

Service Change
No
Service Redesign
No
Project/Programme
No
Commissioning/Procurement
Commissioning/Procurement
Strategy/Policy
No
Details of other Service Activity
No

Accountability and Responsibility

Directorate
Children Young People and Education
Responsible Service
Integrated Children's Services West Kent
Responsible Head of Service
Stuart Collins - CY EHPS (Early Help and Preventative Services)
Responsible Director
Stuart Collins - CY EHPS (Early Help and Preventative Services)

Aims and Objectives

Since 2018, the Local Children's Partnership Group (LCPG) Grants Programme has been in place to allow grassroot VCS organisations funding for projects and programmes that support children, young people and families at a community level whilst tackling local priorities set out by the Partnership Board.

The current cost of living crisis, rising inflation and shrinking budgets has required the Local Authority to look at all areas of spend. With no statutory requirement to provide these and with existing grants ending in March 2023, by ceasing these funding streams an indicative saving of £600k could be achieved for the 2023/2024 financial year. LCPGs will continue to operate as a member led interface with districts, VCS and partners to understand and promote services in their local areas, however these priorities will no longer be supported by grant funding. The cycle of meetings and priorities will remain the same, and the district local data profiles will still be available for LCPG chairs to access.

The LCPG Grants Programme is a county-wide pot of £600,000, divided between the 12 districts, to fund projects to meet local need and support the priorities set out by each of the LCPG's. Projects have been delivered by grassroot organisations that often fail to gain funding through formal procurement due to their size and capacity in putting together winning bids.

District	Total Grand Pot
Ashford Borough Council	£53,584.17
Canterbury City Council	£46,396.83

Dartford District Council	£35,153.41
Dover District Council	£56,705.69
Folkestone & Hythe	£55,839.90
Gravesham District Council	£51,889.41
Maidstone Borough Council	£57,042.90
Sevenoaks District Council	£25,420.96
Swale Borough Council	£70,383.83
Thanet District Council	£74,534.00
Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council	£45,972.98
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	£27,065.99

There are limited financial risks associated with this proposal as all existing grant provision linked to the LCPGs is due to end 31 March 2023. However, there will be an impact on small to medium VCS's who rely on this funding. The 2023/2024 round of grants have not yet commenced. The current providers are all small to medium voluntary sector organisations. The grant further supports local communities, encourages delivery though lived experience and enables a greater emphasis on social value that other funding opportunities find hard to realise.

The grants range in value from £3,900 to £15,000 and all meet one or more of the following objectives. Three of these have historically been prioritised in line with the health and wellbeing board priorities, namely adverse childhood experiences, childhood obesity and emotional health and wellbeing in children, as well as being supported by local priorities decided by the relevant LCPG chairs, including;

- Helping children to achieve potential through education
- Improving ambition with access to work, training and education
- Tackle the attainment gap of disadvantage closed
- Work to get families out of crisis and children out of care
- Getting ready for school at age 5
- Give children a safe environment to raise children and young people

Grants are awarded for 1 year only and are not continuous. As part of the application process organisations are required to demonstrate how their project for which they are seeking funding, will be sustained after the EHPS grant has ended. This detail is given careful consideration by the panel members and is significant when making decisions on grants. The proposal for cessation of EHPS grants will have low impact as organisations will have a built-in planned exit strategy.

Members of the Local Children Partnership Group remain wholly accountable to their employing organisations, and thus should be sufficiently empowered to discuss and influence the strategic direction of that organisation in a partnership context.

LCPG Chairs attend an annual county-wide LCPG Chairs' meeting to share good practice and learning, and to inform partnership action planning. The Group report at least annually to the portfolio lead for Integrated Children's Services, Sue Chandler about their success in bringing partner agencies together to improve outcomes for children and young people.

Mitigations for negative impacts are detailed below.

Central Government's framework for the Family Hubs Model: To improve access to and visibility of services, advice and guidance; connect children, families and young people with a network of services and support mechanisms; and embed ways of working, which build on the strengths of families, children and young people in support them to achieve the best start in life and positive futures.

In the future families will be able to access services through the Kent Family Hub network, which will host a

range of services offering universal and early help services for children 0-19 (25) and families.

The expansion of the digital offer to facilitate and host live or recorded sessions, for children, young people, parents and carers to access online from home or a place that is convenient for them.

MASHs - KCC centres for disabled children and their families. A one stop shop where disabled children, young people and their families are able to attend appointments with different services in the same place on the same day.
Families have access digital local SEND offer https://www.kent.gov.uk/education-and-children/special-educational-needs

The Family Hubs Model will offer coproduction opportunities for service users and residents to provide feedback, which will be used to inform continuous service development and improvement, including considering how services meet the needs of specific cohort. Parents panel will be central for the function of Family Hubs.

Section B – Evidence

Do you have data related to the protected groups of the people impacted by this activity?

Yes

It is possible to get the data in a timely and cost effective way?

Yes

Is there national evidence/data that you can use?

Yes

Have you consulted with stakeholders?

No

Who have you involved, consulted and engaged with?

No formal public consultation has been undertaken; however, a stakeholder consultation will begin as part of the budget discussions. The removal of the LCPG Grants will have limited impact, however as this funding stream is short term and not guaranteed year to year it has not become fully embedded into business as usual for some of those organisations.

Has there been a previous Equality Analysis (EQIA) in the last 3 years?

No

Do you have evidence that can help you understand the potential impact of your activity?

Yes

Section C – Impact

Who may be impacted by the activity?

Service Users/clients
Service users/clients

Staff
No

Residents/Communities/Citizens
No

Are there any positive impacts for all or any of the protected groups as a result of the activity that you are doing?

No

Details of Positive Impacts

Not Applicable

Negative impacts and Mitigating Actions

19.Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Age

Are there negative impacts for age?

No
Details of negative impacts for Age
Not Applicable
Mitigating Actions for Age
Not Applicable
Responsible Officer for Mitigating Actions – Age
Not Applicable
20. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Disability
Are there negative impacts for Disability?
Yes
Details of Negative Impacts for Disability
This cohort could have less choice in where to take-up local services where voluntary organisations no longer offer provision. Travel to alternative providers and venues may be prohibitive for some families resulting in decrease in take up of services.
Mitigating actions for Disability
N/A
Responsible Officer for Disability
N/A
21. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Sex
Are there negative impacts for Sex
No
Details of negative impacts for Sex
Not Applicable
Mitigating actions for Sex
Not Applicable
Responsible Officer for Sex
Not Applicable
22. Negative Impacts and Mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender
Are there negative impacts for Gender identity/transgender
No
Negative impacts for Gender identity/transgender
Not Applicable
Mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender
Not Applicable
Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Gender identity/transgender
Not Applicable
23. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Race
Are there negative impacts for Race
No
Negative impacts for Race
Not Applicable
Mitigating actions for Race
Not Applicable
Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Race
Not Applicable
24. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Religion and belief
Are there negative impacts for Religion and belief
No

Negative impacts for Religion and belief
Not Applicable
Mitigating actions for Religion and belief
Not Applicable
Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Religion and Belief
Not Applicable
25. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation
Are there negative impacts for Sexual Orientation
No
Negative impacts for Sexual Orientation
Not Applicable
Mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation
Not Applicable
Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Sexual Orientation
Not Applicable
26. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity
Are there negative impacts for Pregnancy and Maternity
No
Negative impacts for Pregnancy and Maternity
Not Applicable
Mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity
Not Applicable
Responsible Officer for mitigating actions for Pregnancy and Maternity
Not Applicable
27. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Marriage and Civil Partnerships
Are there negative impacts for Marriage and Civil Partnerships
No
Negative impacts for Marriage and Civil Partnerships
Not Applicable
Mitigating actions for Marriage and Civil Partnerships
Not Applicable
Responsible Officer for Marriage and Civil Partnerships
Not Applicable
28. Negative impacts and Mitigating actions for Carer's responsibilities
Are there negative impacts for Carer's responsibilities
No
Negative impacts for Carer's responsibilities
Not Applicable
Mitigating actions for Carer's responsibilities
Not Applicable
Responsible Officer for Carer's responsibilities
Not Applicable