

Budget Proposals 2014/15 and 2015/16: Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

Business Unit:	Supporting people	Directorate:	Adults & Resources
Date Started :	20 th August 2013	Date of current version:	6 th February 2014

The council and its partners are facing a significant challenge in the savings it needs to make over the next couple of years. This Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been developed as a tool to enable business units to fully consider the impact of their proposals on the community. As a council we need to ensure that we are able to deliver the savings that we need to make while mitigating against any negative or adverse impacts on particular groups across our communities.

This EIA will evidence that the Council have fully considered the impact of the proposed changes and has carried out appropriate consultation on those changes with the key stakeholders. This EIA and the evidence provided within it will allow Councillors to make informed decisions as part of the decision-making process regarding the council's budget.

Executive Lead / Head Sign off :

Executive Lead(s)	Cllr Christine Scouler	Executive Head:	Fran Mason
Date:	6 th February 2014	Date:	6 th February 2014

Summary from Overall Budget Proposals:

Proposals – Outline	Savings for 2014/15 and 2015/16		Implementation Cost <i>Include brief outline + year incurred</i>	Delivery <i>When will this proposal realise income / savings</i>	Risks / impact of proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Potential risks</i> • <i>Impact on community</i> • <i>Knock on impact to other agencies</i> • <i>If statutory service please state relevant legislation section and Act together with any statutory guidance issued.</i> 	Type of decision		
	Income £ 000's	Budget reduction £ 000's				Internal	Minor	Major
<p>Integrated families service: (also known as Stone Court) 14 units of accommodation based support, 14 outreach and 6 emergency units for homeless families with support needs annual. Reduce by 100% over 2 years</p> <p>Annual contract value: £126,580</p>		Reduce by 100%: 84,387 Equates to 8 months saving		Aug 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current contract expires 4 Aug 2014 • There is the potential that children may stay on child protection plans longer than anticipated. • There is the potential for increased demand on other services such as Children's Services e.g. Housing Options and health services. • Consultation and Equality Impact Assessment undertaken to assess the impact of the proposal. 			x

Section 1: Purpose of the proposal/strategy/decision

No	Question	Details
1.	<p>Clearly set out the proposal and what is the intended outcome.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Integrated Families Service (Stone Court) provides 14 units of outreach support and 14 units of Supported People supported accommodation. Outreach support is offered to families living in the community to prevent them from becoming homeless and is used to help families resettle when they move out of the supported accommodation. Supported accommodation is utilised by families who have experienced homelessness and need on-site support to learn independent living skills before moving onto live in their new homes. • There are 6 units of emergency accommodation part of the contract, these are funded by Housing Services. This part of the contract will end along with the Supporting People funded element. The mitigating action is Housing Options are commissioning a portfolio of emergency accommodation to commence in line with the overall contract end. • The current contract expires August 2014 with the option to extend for a further 2 years. • Housing Services are procuring an emergency accommodation framework to go live July 2014. Initial discussions have commenced on the viability of continuing with the emergency element within this contract. <p>This proposal is to end the Integrated Family Services contract resulting in savings of £126,580 (initial part year effect - 8 months savings = £84,387)</p>
2.	<p>Who is intended to benefit / who will be affected?</p>	<p>The Service provides supported accommodation to 14 different families at any one time and outreach support to a further 14 families at any one time. All families are at risk of homelessness, are homeless or are moving on from emergency accommodation. Each family can stay in the supported accommodation service for a maximum of 9 months and receive outreach support for a further 9 months.</p> <p>Vulnerable families will be most affected. This includes families working with Children's Services either at an early intervention or social care level (i.e. families on child protection plans and Common Assessment Framework plans). The service supports families to adhere to statutory plans and is a key partner in the safeguarding of children using the service.</p> <p>Housing Services will be affected and see an increase in assistance required for families.</p>

No	Question	Details
		<p>The service is accessed through the Safeguarding Hub Enquiry Form (SHEF) which means each referral is completed and processed via Childrens Services and referred through the allocation panel process. This means information is shared between agencies to enable the families most in need to be prioritised.</p> <p>Key stakeholders affected are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Health Partnership • Children's Services • Children's Centres • Health Visitors • Midwives • Service Provider; staff employed within the service may be subject to redundancy. • Housing Services • Homeless families & other Service Users • Community Outreach Support Service and the Social Inclusion Floating Support Service (proposal to reduce by 100%, see separate Floating Support EIA)

Section 2: Equalities, Consultation and Engagement

Torbay Council has a moral obligation as well as a duty under the Equality Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, promote good relations and advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not.

The **Equalities, Consultation and Engagement** section ensures that, as a council, we take into account the Public Sector Equality Duty at an early stage and provide evidence to ensure that we fully consider the impact of our decisions/proposals on the Torbay community.

Evidence, Consultation and Engagement

No	Question	Details
3.	Have you considered the available evidence?	<p>16 families entered the service in 2012/13 (from the service start date of 7/8/12)</p> <p>18 families left the service in 2012/13 (from the service start date of 7/8/12) of whom 94% successfully moved on to independent living, or more independent living, or ended the outreach element of the service having achieved positive outcomes.</p> <p>In 2012/13, regarding clients entering short term Supporting People services (across all services):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where known, 122 were accepted as requiring secondary mental health services, and 139 were accepted as requiring Probation/Youth Offending Team services • Where known, 27.6% (293) were statutory homeless with 156 of them owed a homelessness duty, another 137 (12.9%) were not statutory homeless but considered homeless by the service • Where known, 31 were assessed as at high risk of domestic abuse and supported through the MARAC (Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference) <p>Latest figures show proportion of children in poverty in Torbay is significantly above the England average at 24%. The rate of teenage pregnancies in Torbay is significantly higher than England at 52.2 per 1000 15-17 year olds. Levels of smoking in pregnancy, breastfeeding, adult obesity, and hospital admission for alcohol related harm are worse in Torbay than England average.¹ The service can impact on these figures by supporting vulnerable families with varying needs to move on to sustainable independence and live healthy lifestyles and to make healthy and safe life choices.</p>

¹ Torbay Health Profile 2013, Public Health England, 24 September 2013, www.healthprofiles.info

No	Question	Details
4.	How have you consulted on the proposal?	<p>Providers of Supporting People funded services</p> <p>The consultation period ran from Thursday 21 November 2013 to 16 January 2014</p> <p>On 21st November Providers were sent written details outlining the proposal(s) for their service(s) and given the Consultation Summary document detailing the overall proposals for the Supporting People (SP) programme, Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) for their services and access to view the EIAs of other services online. Initial provider meetings/conversations were set up with SP Contract Managers in the week prior to the formal draft budget announcement. This was to explain the proposals and consultation process to providers and to allow the providers time to arrange meetings with their staff to take place on the day of the budget announcement (as for many services the proposals will affect staff)</p> <p>A client profile template was developed and sent to Providers to complete to identify clients in support services who were also in receipt of a statutory service. This information was used to inform the service EIAs and evidence where there might be an impact on the expenditure in other parts of the Authority.</p> <p>The Consultation Summary document and questionnaire were available on the Supporting People page of the Council's website.</p> <p>A follow up email was sent to Providers on 8th January asking if they were responding collectively, individually or both; and asking them to encourage referral agencies to respond to the consultation.</p> <p>Current and previous users of Supporting People funded services, and their carers, relatives and advocates.</p> <p>A standard letter outlining the specific proposals for each service was sent to the service provider to distribute to their service users. The letter outlined where service users could access and complete the client consultation questionnaire and explained the consultation process including the opportunity to attend focus groups or face to face interviews.</p> <p>Posters were sent to Providers to insert the details of the consultation events and promote these to service users.</p> <p>A number of focus groups proportionate to size of service were held for each of the affected services. Where services had more than 20 clients then 2 focus groups were offered, with the option for more if required, subject to the availability of resources to facilitate them. Focus groups used the same questions as the client questionnaire. However 1 focus group for clients in the supported employment service used different questions, chosen by by the external agency that facilitated this particular group.</p>

No	Question	Details
		<p>Focus groups were facilitated by representatives from Torbay Voice with a member of the SP team present to record comments. Where a focus group was organised but there were no attendees, the focus group has not been counted.</p> <p>Face to face interviews (with Torbay Voice representatives) or telephone interviews were offered to those choosing not to or unable to attend focus groups using the same questions.</p> <p>There may be a small duplication of respondents as some may have completed a questionnaire as well as attended a focus group</p> <p>Providers were encouraged to undertake their own consultations using the same questions, and some providers issued the questionnaires to their clients.</p> <p>The client questionnaire was available on the SP page of the Council's website and providers advised of this so that they could direct service users to it, or support service users to complete it themselves.</p> <p>Individual written submissions (email and letter) were received from service users, relatives, and family members.</p> <p>Stakeholders including statutory partners, referral agencies, local and national partner organisations An email was sent to all stakeholders attaching the SP Consultation Summary document and stakeholder questionnaire, a summary of SP services and a link to the EIAs for each service. Stakeholders were also encouraged to respond to the overall Council budget proposals and a link to the wider Council budget consultation was included in the email.</p> <p>Stakeholders included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Torbay and Southern Devon Health and Care NHS Trust • Devon Partnership Trust • Devon and Cornwall Probation Trust • South Devon Clinical Commissioning Group • Torbay Council Housing Services • Torbay Council Children's Services • Police

No	Question	Details
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referral agencies such as: Community Mental Health Teams, Disability Information Service, Housing Options team, Torbay Hospital <p>Other local and national partners such as: British Association of Supported Employment, Shelter, The Alzheimers Society, MIND and Mencap.</p> <p>See Appendix 1 for consultation results</p> <p>Other including members of the public/non service users A general questionnaire was placed on the Council’s website by the Council’s Policy and Performance Team asking about all of the Council budget proposals including a section on Supporting People. The SP section contained a link to the SP consultation documentation on the specific budget proposals for SP services.</p> <p>Further representations were made in writing (via letter, email and petition) by organisations and members of the public.</p> <p>A total of 285 representations were received, as well as 21 focus groups that were facilitated for clients and carers, where 160 people attended.</p>
5.	Outline the key findings	<p>There were 4 responses received which referred to this proposal. There was also 1 focus group held for clients where 6 people attended.</p> <p>Impact on the Health, Wellbeing and Quality of Life of Existing and Potential Clients</p> <p>It was felt that the service helps in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to address domestic abuse • Support to attend meetings for child protection • Parenting Support • Budgeting/dealing with debt • Engagement with health services

No	Question	Details
		<p>Concerns were raised that the 100% reduction in funding for the Integrated Families Service will create a risk to children, whose vulnerability could potentially missed without the skilled staff in this service.</p> <p>Financially it was felt that without this preventative service there was an increasing likelihood of children requiring intervention from statutory Children's Services."</p> <p>"The resource's closure would have a major impact on people's lives who are already marginalised, excluded and sometimes feared by society and children could be placed in very dangerous, inappropriate and unsafe conditions."</p> <p>It is felt that the suggested cuts in funding would result in a service that had too high a risk of failure and would therefore be unviable.</p>
6.	<p>What amendments may be required as a result of the consultation?</p>	<p>Potential mitigating action: Negotiation with provider and Housing options on change of use to emergency accommodation for homeless families with support.</p> <p>Provider organisation and Police, probation and health services request a delay in implementation of the proposals so that alternative sources of funding can be investigated.</p>

Positive and Negative Equality Impacts

No	Question	Details		
7.	Identify the potential positive and negative impacts on specific groups			
		Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Neutral Impact
	Older or younger people			No differential impact
	People with caring responsibilities		All households in this Service have dependent children. Specific information is not available for this service.	
	People with a disability			No differential impact
	Women or men		68% of the people leaving the service in 2012/13 were female. Cutting this service will have a detrimental impact on homeless families, some of whom are single mothers, and their ability to develop parenting skills and avoid second unplanned pregnancies.	
	People who are black or from a minority ethnic background (BME)			No differential impact
	Religion or belief (including lack of belief)			No differential impact
	People who are lesbian, gay or bisexual			No differential impact
	People who are transgendered			No differential impact
	People who are in a marriage or civil partnership			No differential impact
	Women who are pregnant /		Rate of teenage pregnancies	

No	Question	Details	
	on maternity leave		<p>significantly higher than England.¹ This service can help prevent unplanned pregnancies and break the cycle of teenage pregnancy</p>
	Socio-economic impacts (Including impact on child poverty issues and deprivation)		<p>In 2012/13, where economic status is known, 56% of people who entered short term Supporting People services (across all services) had a status that meant they were eligible for welfare benefits</p> <p>Impact could be increase or continue child poverty- Latest figures show proportion of children in poverty is significantly above England average.¹ Service supports families (mostly of a low income) to live sustainable independent lives and to identify and gain employment opportunities. There may also be an increase in homelessness applications, increased use of temporary accommodation and possibly family break-up, and a possible increase on hospital admissions, all of which will result in higher costs to the Authority National costs are: temporary accommodation: £336 a week</p>
	Public Health impacts (How will your proposal impact on the general health of the population of Torbay)		<p>Indicators show that levels of smoking in pregnancy, breastfeeding, adult obesity, hospital admission for alcohol related harm are worse in Torbay than England average.¹ The service supports</p>

No	Question	Details	
			families to live healthy lifestyles and engage in positive parenting. The effect of the withdrawal of this service may impact on the differential healthy life expectancy between communities.
8a.	Cumulative Impacts – Council wide (proposed changes elsewhere which might worsen the impacts identified above)	The proposed 100% reduction to SP floating support services means there will no alternative supporting people support available to mitigate these impacts.	
8b.	Cumulative Impacts – Other public services (proposed changes elsewhere which might worsen the impacts identified above)		

Section 3: Mitigating action

No	Action	Details
9.	Summarise any negative impacts and how these will be managed?	Negative impacts as outlined in section 7 above: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All households in this Service have dependent children, therefore people with caring responsibilities will be disproportionately affected by this proposal. • 68% of the people leaving the service in 2012/13 were female, therefore females will be disproportionately affected by this proposal. • In 2012/13, where economic status is known, 56% of people who entered short term Supporting People services (across all services) had a status that meant they were eligible for welfare benefits, Therefore people on welfare

		<p>benefits will be proportionately affected by the proposed change.</p> <p>It will be very difficult to minimise negative impacts due to the cumulative effect of the overall reduction in Supporting People services, meaning that there are no alternative services to refer people to. We will monitor the impacts as set out in section 10 below on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>Other mitigating actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Support to families with children on child protection plan will be reduced, resulting in longer time on Child Protection plans or increase in children looked after.</u> - this will be managed through the decommissioning process for existing clients to share information with social care staff about on-going support needs for families. • <u>Increase in number of families presenting to Housing Options for accommodation, advice and assistance</u> - this will be managed through the decommissioning process for existing clients to share information with Housing Options. The on-going risk will be managed by the Housing Options service who plan to commission a portfolio of emergency accommodation; this will meet the immediate housing need of families who are homeless. • <u>Increase demand on health visiting service to support clients</u> - this will be managed through the decommissioning process for existing clients to identify families with additional support needs that can be met through health visiting service.
--	--	--

Section 4: Monitoring

No	Action	Details
10.	Outline plans to monitor the actual impact of your proposals	<p>The following impacts will be monitored and reported to Commissioning for Independence Board, Chaired by the Director of Adult Services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor for increase in number of families requiring homeless assessments and reasons • Monitor for increase in numbers of families accepted as statutorily homeless by Housing Options requiring emergency accommodation • Monitor for increase in numbers of families seeking advice and assistance from Housing Options and type

		<p>of advice/assistance required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor waiting times for families seeking supported or other accommodation • Monitor number of safeguarding incidents
--	--	--

Section 5: Recommended course of action –

No	Action	Outcome	Tick ✓	Reasons/justification for recommended action
11.	<p>State a recommended course of action Clearly identify an option and justify reasons for this decision. The following four outcomes are possible from an assessment (and more than one may apply to a single proposal). Please select from the 4 outcomes and justify the reasons for your decision</p>	<p>Outcome 1: No major change required - EIA <i>has not identified any potential for adverse impact in relation to equalities and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken</i></p>		
		<p>Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers – <i>Action to remove the barriers identified in relation to equalities have been taken or actions identified to better promote equality</i></p>		
		<p>Outcome 3: Continue with proposal - Despite <i>having identified some <u>potential</u> for adverse impact / missed opportunities in relation to equalities or to promote equality. Full justification required, especially in relation to equalities, in line with the duty to have ‘due regard’.</i></p>	X	<p>The purpose of this proposal is not to discriminate directly or indirectly, and does not amount to unlawful discrimination. The Council has to deliver significant savings, and in doing so has to prioritise its statutory responsibilities. Whilst the consultation has highlighted the benefits derived from the service together with the impact upon those who currently receive the service, this service is not statutory. The Council will endeavour, with its partners and the community, to mitigate against any adverse impacts. If any individual affected by the decision meets the FACS criteria, they will receive a service to meet their needs from Torbay & Southern Devon Health & Care Trust.</p> <p>In light of the views expressed in the consultation that if</p>

				given additional time there may be opportunities to access different funding streams to enable the service to continue, the Council is now proposing the establishment of a one off transitional fund in the value of £78,700, which will be provided to the service in 2014/15. This transitional fund is designed to provide the service with sufficient time to explore opportunities to enable the service to continue for a future without Council funding.
		Outcome 4: Stop and rethink – EIA has identified actual or potential unlawful discrimination in relation to equalities or adverse impact has been identified		

Appendix 1

Consultation Results: Integrated Families Service (also known as Stone Court) - Reduce by 100%

There were 4 responses received which referred to this proposal. There was also 1 focus group held for clients where 6 people attended.

The service is provided by Independent Futures.

Category	Examples of comments
Impact on the Health, Wellbeing and Quality of Life of Existing and Potential Clients	<p>The provider has submitted a number of case studies which demonstrate the impact the service has on the health, wellbeing and quality of life of existing and potential clients. The type of support provided which impacts on health etc. have been summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to address domestic abuse • Support to attend meetings for child protection

Category	Examples of comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parenting Support • Budgeting/dealing with debt • Engagement with health services <p>One focus group was held with service users of the Integrated Families Service. In their feedback they commented on the empowering, supportive nature of the service and how it keeps families together. Service users highlighted the help they had received in accessing parenting skills and college courses, counselling and mental health services. They also mentioned support with finance and budgeting.</p>
Quality of Service	<p>“Stone Court offers a valuable and experienced staffing who instil self worth, determination, confidence and safeguarding to very vulnerable children and adults.”</p> <p>“Stone Court work collaboratively with other agencies in a very professional manner and often are excellent mediums of communication at times of great stress and fear to the families involved.”</p> <p>“Our greatest concern is that vulnerability in a child may be missed if we cannot provide a service with sufficiently experienced and skilled staff to pick up on safeguarding concerns.”</p>
Impact on Statutory Services and National Priorities	<p>“The 100% reduction in funding for the Integrated Families Service will create a risk to children, increasing the likelihood of children requiring intervention from statutory Children’s Services.”</p> <p>“The resource’s closure would have a major impact on people’s lives who are already marginalised, excluded and sometimes feared by society and children could be placed in very dangerous, inappropriate and unsafe conditions.”</p>

Category	Examples of comments
Financial Impact of the Proposals	<p>“The current services have been specifically designed by both commissioners and providers to provide early intervention and prevention functions for some of the most vulnerable people in our communities. The proposed cuts will almost certainly increase costs in the medium to long term as clients without a preventative support service start to use more intensive, high cost statutory services.”</p>
Impact on the Service / Provider	<p>“We will have to take a balanced view based on risks to clients, staff, property and the local community. We will not be prepared to continue to try and run a service with unreasonable risks. We believe that the current proposal is too risky and we will need to identify funding for a support service of sufficient quality to be able to deal with the issues presented by homeless families, for example, child protection, mental health, domestic violence, drug and alcohol issues to be continued within the project before we can confirm what the future use of the project is.”</p>
Opportunities to Discuss Alternative Options / Source Other Funding	<p>“We want to be able to continue to provide services that are safe, appropriate and affordable for these two vulnerable client groups. We want to continue to discuss what options there may be with commissioners.”</p>