



## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TOOL

The council has a statutory duty to consider the impact of its decisions on age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy & maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (gender) and sexual orientation.

The Council also has a duty to foster good relations between different groups of people and to promote equality of opportunity.

Completing an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is the **simplest way** to demonstrate that the Council has considered the equality impacts of its decisions and it reduces the risk of legal challenge. EIAs should be carried out at the **earliest stages** of policy development or a service review, and then updated as the policy or review develops. EIAs must be undertaken when it is possible for the findings to inform the final decision. Keep all versions of your EIA. An EIA should be finalised once a final decision is taken.

### When should you undertake an EIA?

- You are making changes that will affect front-line services
- You are reducing the budget of a service, which will affect front-line services
- You are changing the way services are funded and this may impact the quality of the service and who can access it
- You are making a decision that could have a different impact on different groups of people
- You are making internal reorganisations that will result in staff changes including Transfer of Undertakings (TUPE), redundancies, change in job roles or terms and conditions.
- EIAs also need to be undertaken on how a policy is implemented even if it has been developed by central government (for example cuts to grant funding)
- **Section 1 of the EIA Tool: Initial Screening**, will help you decide whether a full EIA is necessary

### Who should undertake the EIA?

- The person who is making the decision or advising the decision-maker

### Further Guidance

- [Step-by-Step Guidance to the questions](#)
- An EIA e-learning module is available for all Westminster staff: [www.learningpool.com/westminster/course/view.php?id=159](http://www.learningpool.com/westminster/course/view.php?id=159)

**Please contact the Equalities lead to inform them when you begin and then complete an EIA: [equalities@westminster.gov.uk](mailto:equalities@westminster.gov.uk)**

**SEB will monitor compliance with the requirement to complete EIAs.**

<b>Title of Proposal</b>
<b>Service Proposals for Westminster City Council Youth</b>
<b>Lead Officer</b>
i. Paul Williamson ii. Lead Commissioner Young People Children's Services Commissioning 07967 347643
<b>Has this project, policy or proposal had an EIA carried out on it previously? If yes, please state date of original and append to this document for information.</b>
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Date of original EIA:</b>
<b>Version number and date of update</b>
<i>You will need to update your EIA as you move through the decision-making process. Record the version number here and the date you updated the EIA. Keep all versions so you have evidence that you have considered equality throughout the process.</i>
<b>Version 1; 18<sup>th</sup> January 2016</b>

**SECTION 1: Initial screening: Do you need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)?**

*Not all proposals will require an EIA, this initial screening will help you decide if your project or policy requires a full EIA by looking at the potential impact on any equality groups.*

<b>1.1 What are you analysing?</b>
<p><b>What is the purpose of the proposal?</b></p> <p>The Council is targeting available resources at those who need support most, in line with the Early Help Strategy and to meet statutory duties.</p> <p>The proposal is to cease council funding for youth services from September 2016. Current contracts with commissioned youth providers expire in March 2016 and these will be extended until September 2016. This will allow time for providers to plan and develop sustainable service models that reflect the current funding environment.</p> <p>The youth offer in Westminster is delivered by a large number of organisations. Of these, thirteen are directly funded through the Children's Services Commissioning Directorate. The funded providers raise considerable resources from other funding streams and their reliance on council funding varies considerably. The providers are already working on the development of sustainable business models that are not reliant on council funding in future.</p> <p>Council officers are working with a range of funders, providers, and partner agencies to develop the future offer for young people. This will be achieved by setting up a Young Westminster Foundation, a new charitable body that will be well placed to maximise resources for the sector. The Foundation already has the support of a number of key local charities and will have good links to corporate donors.</p>



A charitable foundation will be able to take advantage of the unique opportunities presented in Westminster and its location within the heart of the biggest economy in the United Kingdom. It will develop the capacity of the sector providers and encourage a partnership approach between providers, funders and potential donors. It will support the sector to develop a service offer that will be more likely to result in a strong and viable offer for young people.

Whilst there is no need for the charitable foundation to be Council-led, the Council will be a committed sponsor of the charity. Given the independent nature of a charitable foundation it will set its own criteria and priorities in partnership with funding bodies, and is likely to support both universal open access facilities and more targeted work. Targeted support for young people with higher levels of need will be supported, and in some cases delivered, by the council Early Help locality teams and other statutory bodies.

The establishment of the Foundation model will take a minimum of 10 months and there is likely to be a gap between contracts for existing providers ending and a new 'foundation' model being in place with significant levels of funding secured. The Foundation will support the wider youth offer but is unlikely to be able to sustain many of the existing funded services. Providers will need to seek funding streams and the Foundation will help to facilitate this and also secure funding on behalf of members.

Existing commissioned providers will need to adapt quickly to the new funding model and a significant number of existing services may be reduced as a consequence. It is likely that some youth providers will struggle to be sustainable, although others are in a strong position to secure alternative funding to develop a revised model.

Two clubs currently provide young people's services which contribute to meeting the council's statutory duties for young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). The council will consider options to sustain this provision until March 2017 and specialist services for these young people will continue to be supported through alternative means.

### **In what context will it operate?**

The Early Help Strategy 2014 – 2018 sets out the priority outcomes that Westminster is focused upon achieving with its children and families.

The Strategy establishes the framework through which services will be developed to deliver targeted provision. One of the Strategy's key objectives is to 'revise our service model of investment in universal services together with our key partners in line with our priority outcomes, in particular in respect of Play, Children's Centres and Youth Services.'

### **Who is intended to benefit and how?**

Existing contracts target provision for young people aged 11-19. They are likely to be young people living in areas of deprivation and needing additional support.

Existing services support hard to reach young people to access youth clubs, sports, and arts provision, and more specialist activities for young people with additional

needs.

Providers also deliver educational and employment opportunities and tackle issues such as youth violence, healthy lifestyles, and building self-confidence.

**Why is it needed?**

To deliver savings in line with the council's budget setting process. The strategy is to create a model that will secure alternative funding streams for universal and targeted services for young people in Westminster.

**1.2 From a service user and staff perspective, does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to disproportionately impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?**

	None	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Disabled people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>x</b>
Particular ethnic groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>x</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy/ maternity)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>x</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People or particular sexual orientation/s	<b>x</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	<b>x</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People on low incomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>x</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in particular age groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>x</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>x</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project, policy or proposal?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**If the answer is “negative” or “unclear” consider doing a full EIA**

<b>1.3 What do you think that the overall <b>NEGATIVE</b> impact on groups and communities will be?</b>	None / Minimal	Significant
	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><u>None or minimal impact would be where there is no negative impact identified, or where there will be no change to the services for any groups. Wherever a negative impact has been identified</u></p>	



you should consider undertaking a full EIA by completing the rest of the form.

**1.4 Using the screening and information in questions 1.2 and 1.3, should a full assessment be carried out on the project, policy or proposal?**

Yes  No

**1.5 How have you come to this decision?**

There is a diverse range of youth providers in Westminster that attract resources from a wide variety of trusts, charities, agencies such as the Big Lottery, and public bodies. Many providers are not funded by the local authority, whilst others are more reliant on council funding for their existing youth offer.

It is apparent that there are considerable opportunities for youth providers to develop their service offer to secure new funding opportunities. Within Westminster there is a range of funding sources that are under-utilised and by raising the capacity of providers there is scope to attract considerable additional resources to the youth sector.

Following the Comprehensive Spending Review in November 2015 it has become clear that significant reductions in spending on non-statutory services is required for the Council to be able to declare a balanced budget.

The decision to focus council spending on statutory and targeted services for young people with higher levels of need has resulted in the proposed reduction in funding for universal youth services from October 2016.

This is a common issue facing local authorities at this time. Due to reductions in funding for universal youth services, Johns Lyons Charity and the City Bridge Trust have recently worked with the local authorities to establish 'Young People Foundations' in Barnet, Brent, and Harrow. The potential to raise income for young people's services from alternative sources is significant, particularly in Westminster, and the establishment of a Young Westminster Foundation will provide a mechanism to support providers to work collaboratively to attract funding.

## SECTION 2: EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### Building an Evidence Base: What do you know?

*This section will help you build your evidence base and interpret what the likely impact will be of your service. Complete this section if your proposal is service user related. If your proposal only affects staff, go to section 2.2*

#### 2.1 Build up a picture of who uses/will use your service or facility and identify who are likely to be impacted by the proposal

- If you do not formally collect data about a particular group then use the results of local surveys or consultations, census data, national trends or anecdotal evidence (indicate where this is the case). Please attempt to complete all boxes.*

##### Current service users: Annual data 2014-15

See Appendix for the following data broken down by provider;

- Young people with a Learning Difficulty or Disability
- Young people from a Black or Minority Ethnic background
- Young people by gender
- Young people living in the 20% most deprived areas

Localities	North West	North East	South
How many people use the service currently?  Currently accessed by (nos of young people 11-19):	701	845	280
Disabled people  Number of disabled children and young people 11-24 years old	52	72	40
Particular ethnic groups  % Children 11-19 years old from minority ethnic groups	88%	87%	79%
Gender  % Male % Female	64% 36%	65% 35%	75% 25%
People of particular sexual orientations	No data	No data	No data
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No data	No data	No data
People on low incomes  Target population – % 11-19 year olds living in 20% most deprived IDACI LSOAs  Children aged 11-19 living in households	71%	63%	32%



	dependent on workless benefits	No data	No data	No data
	People in particular age groups			
	Number Teenage parents	1	1	0
	Groups with particular faiths and beliefs	No data	No data	No data

This section should be completed for all proposals that will impact on staff.

**2.2** *Build up a picture of the makeup of the workforce profile in the service affected.*

The workforce is located in thirteen different third sector providers. The council funding will only directly fund entire posts within some services and there is often a variety of funding streams available to providers.

What is the workforce profile of the service? As a percentage, how does this compare to the profile of Westminster City Council workforce?

Workforce information for the third sector providers is not held centrally by the council.

Group	Service		Council	
	No	%	No	%
<b>Age</b>				
16-24				
25-29				
30-44				
45-59				
60-64				
65 +				
<b>Disability</b>				
Yes				
No				
Not Known				
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Asian/Asian				
British				
Black/Black				
British				
Mixed				
White				

		Other				
		Unknown				
		<b>Gender</b>				
		Female				
		Male				
		<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are any staff pregnant or on maternity</li> <li>• How are they affected by this change</li> </ul>				
		<b>Religion &amp; Belief</b>				
		There is insufficient data to make an assessment on this characteristic. Any issues identified as part of the consultation process will be included				
		<b>Sexual Orientation</b>				
		There is insufficient data to make an assessment on this characteristic. Any issues identified as part of the consultation process will be included				
		<b>Gender Reassignment</b>				
		Data on Gender Reassignment is currently not available but it is unlikely that this proposal will impact either positively or negatively on the protected characteristic of gender reassignment. The consultation process should identify any issues that need to be considered with regards to this protected characteristic.				
	<b>Using the information above, are any groups of staff disproportionately represented compared to the Council workforce?</b>					
	<b>Does TUPE apply to this proposal?</b>	<b>No</b>				
	<b>Will the reorganisation/restructure result in an increase or decrease in staff numbers? If so, approximately how many?</b>	<b>It is likely to result in a decrease in staff numbers. The total reduction will be dependent on the ability of providers to secure funding for new service models.</b>				
	<b>Will the reorganisation/restructure result in changes in job roles or terms and conditions for staff? If so, what changes are proposed?</b>	<b>Not known</b>				

<b>2.3 Summary (to be completed following analysis of the evidence above)</b>					
		<b>None</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
	Does the project, policy or proposal have the potential to have a <u>disproportionate</u> impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the				



	impact positive or negative?				
	<b>Disabled people</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Particular ethnic groups</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>People of particular sexual orientations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>People on low incomes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>People in particular age groups</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>Are there any other groups that you think this proposal may affect negatively or positively?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### SECTION 3: Assessing Impact

***In order to be able to identify ways to mitigate any potential impact it is essential that we know what those potential impacts might be.***

#### 3.1 Consultation Information

*This section should record the consultation activity undertaken in relation to this project, policy or proposal*

The current consultation relating to these proposals finishes on the 31<sup>st</sup> January 2016 and uses an online survey to gauge opinion. Commissioners also attended a meeting of the Westminster youth council to discuss proposals.

The following consultation activity was undertaken in January 2015 to inform a service commissioning strategy.

##### Survey

An online survey of young people's views on the key issues affecting them and how and where they preferred to receive information and support was held in December 2014 and January 2015. 28 young people responded. 11 young people with learning difficulties and disabilities completed an adapted version of the survey. When asked about the relative importance of different places in their community, 82% said that youth clubs or projects were most important. The survey then focused on the issues which young people most wanted support with under the headings of staying safe; school, work or college; relationships; health and wellbeing. Youth clubs and projects were cited as the preferred location at which young people would like to receive support for a number of particular issues. A summary report of the findings of the survey is available.

#### Young People's focus groups – Jan 2015

Focus groups of young people were facilitated in youth clubs across the borough. There were a total of 10 different sessions involving 70 young people. They provided views on activities they enjoyed, advice and support they needed and how they preferred to receive this. Focus groups were also held with young people with disabilities. A detailed summary of all youth provision engagement activity is available.

#### Meetings with service providers – Jan 2015

These took place in each locality and were attended by 30 people in total:

North East Locality: 5 participants

South Locality: 13 participants

North East: 12 participants

Key themes for discussion included Flexible models; Targeting; Outcomes for young people; Working with partners; Quality of service.

A consistent and clear message from the locality meetings involving stakeholders was that the service should be based on and be responsive to young people's needs. There was a feeling that the age at which young people can use youth services might be lowered while it was felt that support was needed for older young people to move on to other services when they reached 19.

It was raised that many young people often will not want to travel far to provision for reasons relating to safety and cost. There was overwhelming agreement that youth services should maintain a balance between universal and targeted provision while young people should not 'feel' like they are being targeted. Budgets should be divided between universal and targeted provision with commissioned providers sharing resources better and communicating more effectively with locality teams and a wide network of other services and providers.

There was agreement that there should be an agreed and consistent method for monitoring and evaluating outcomes although outcomes monitoring should also be proportionate to the resource available i.e. level of funding. Quality marks were seen as positive with quality also ensured through contract management and better evidencing of impact. Participants felt that longer contracts (3 years minimum) would enable development of longer term strategies and therefore better quality and sustainability of delivery.

There was a very strong feeling across the workshops that youth services should not become part of locality Early Help teams and also that they should also remain separate from schools. The value and different dynamic of youth work should be recognised and developed.

### **3.2 What might the potential impact on individuals, groups or staff be?**

*Consider disability, race, gender, sexual orientation, transgender, age, faith or belief and those on low incomes and other excluded individuals or groups*



### **Particular age groups**

Services are funded for young people aged 11-19, young people attending youth services will be negatively impacted by a reduction in service.

### **Young people with a learning difficulty and/or disability (LDD)**

Young people from this group are overrepresented in the monitoring information when compared to the borough population. There are however differences in the definition of disability and recording methods which should be borne in mind.

Youth clubs record learning difficulty and/or disability and is self-reported ie. the young person indicates whether or not they consider themselves to have a LDD. Overall 164 young people with a LDD attended a youth club during 2014-15, representing approximately 10% of all young people attending youth clubs. Proportions vary across providers with 100% of young people attending one of the two specialist disability providers having a LDD. In addition proportions of young people with LDD were higher than 10% at five other youth clubs. See Table 1 in appendix for more detail.

Approx 350 children and young people are known to the borough children with disabilities team or are receiving short breaks services. This cohort represents children and young people with a high level of need and is approximately 2% of the borough children and young people population. The actual borough population figure for young people with a LDD is likely to be higher.

The two clubs currently provide specialist youth club provision for disabled young people and are at risk. These clubs also contribute towards the council's statutory duties for SEND young people through the provision of short breaks/respice.

### **Young People from a Black or Minority Ethnic (BME) background**

Overall, the majority (87%) of young people attending borough funded youth clubs are from a BME background and are over represented in the monitoring information compared to the borough BME population (38%).

The proportion of young people from a BME background varies from provider to provider, between 68% and 97%. See table 2 in appendix for more detail.

Young people are also overrepresented in the monitoring information in the wards with the highest proportions of young people from BME backgrounds; Church St 58%, Harrow Rd 58% and Queens Park 56%.

If available services reduce or close young people from a BME background would be negatively impacted.

Young men from the Bangladeshi community would be negatively impacted in the Church Street area if the Marylebone Bangladeshi Society (MBS) has to reduce or stop providing services.

Other clubs that work predominately with young people from BME backgrounds are the Avenues Youth Club, Stowe Youth Club, Amberley Youth Club and Fourth Feathers Youth Club. Young people attending these clubs would be negatively impacted by any reduction in services.

## **Gender**

Compared to the borough population of 52% young males are over represented in the monitoring information, 69% of the overall youth club cohort are male. The proportion of young men attending differs across youth clubs with young men making up over 70% of attendees at seven youth clubs. See table 3 in appendix for more detail.

Girls and young women make up 31% of attendances at youth provision and are underrepresented in the monitoring information.

Young men attending MBS and targeted projects provided by Working with Men would also be negatively impacted by any reduction in service.

## **Deprivation**

Overall, 62% of young people attending youth clubs live in a 20% most deprived Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) Lower Super-Output Areas, compared to the borough figure of 37%, young people are therefore considerably over represented in the monitoring information. Particularly so at youth clubs located on housing estates where the figure rises to above 60% at six clubs. See table 4 in appendix for more detail.

Approximately 1,100 young people attending council funded youth clubs live in the areas of highest deprivation in Westminster. These young people would be negatively impacted by a reduction in service.

## **Young people with particular faiths and beliefs**

Faith and belief data is not routinely collected at youth services and as such the number of young people of particular faiths and beliefs that are over represented in youth club attendance is unknown.

However, one provider, Marylebone Bangladesh Society, predominately works with young Muslim men. In this case young people from this particularly faith would be over represented compared to the overall borough population of 18% and therefore negatively impacted by the proposals.

## **Young people of particular sexual orientations**

Youth services do not collect data for people of particular sexual orientations and there are no specialist providers commissioned, therefore it is assumed that this equality group are not over represented compared to the borough population. No impact anticipated.

## **Teenage parents**

There are only two teenage parents recorded as attending a youth club and are therefore not over represented in the monitoring information. No impact anticipated.

## **SECTION 4: Reducing & Mitigating Impact**



As a result of what you have learned, what can you do to minimise the impact of the proposed changes on equality groups and other excluded / vulnerable groups, as outlined above?

<b>4.1 Where you have identified an impact, what can be done to reduce or mitigate the impact?</b> <i>(Remember to think about the Council as a whole, another service area may already be providing services which can help to deal with any negative impact).</i>	
<b>Impact 1: Impact on disabled young people</b>	<p>Children’s Services officers have identified this as a key issue for the strategic review of services for young people with SEND. This statutory provision will continue to be made and alternative funding and services will be sought to support these young people.</p>
<b>Impact 2: Impact on young people aged 11-19</b>	<p>This response addresses impact areas 1-6</p> <p>In the first instance, by working in close partnership with the voluntary sector providers, officers will seek to mitigate service closures and provide advice on other funding streams. There is likely to be a reduction in some existing services.</p> <p>Over time, the Young Westminster Foundation will mitigate against any further impact by providing and securing alternative funding for services. The Foundation will have equality of opportunity at its core which will inform all funding decisions.</p>
<b>Impact 3: Impact on young people from a BME background</b>	<p>The new charitable foundation will build the capacity of the sector to secure alternative funding for the youth offer. Providers will need to respond to the expectations of funders and the council will only be one of the sponsors. The foundation model is designed to raise the capacity of providers, share and enhance resources, attract new streams of funding from a variety of sources, and develop a more responsive and collaborative youth offer that involved a wide range of stakeholders.</p>
<b>Impact 4: Impact on young men</b>	<p>There will, however, be a gap between council funding ending and the Foundation being established and developed to the point that it is able to secure resources to sustain services. The length of this gap will be kept to a minimum, but could be several months.</p>
<b>Impact 5: Impact on young people living in areas of deprivation</b>	<p>The level of the universal youth offer for young people will be dependent on the ability of the voluntary sector to develop and sustain provision.</p> <p>The Early Help service will seek to support the needs of</p>

	<b>Impact 6: Impact on young people from particular faiths and beliefs</b>	<p>young people through the effective provision of services for young people with additional needs. This will include health services, key worker support, links to employment services, and family support. Much of this support will be targeted at the equality groups identified in this assessment.</p> <p>There is likely to be a short-term reduction in the level of services for young people and this will impact on the identified groups.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**4.2 Now that you have considered the potential or actual effect on equality, what action are you taking?**

No major change (no impacts identified)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adjust the policy/proposal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Continue the policy/proposal (impacts identified)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Stop and remove the policy/proposal	<input type="checkbox"/>

**4.3 Please document the reasons for your decision**

	<p>The principal reason for the decision is to enable the council to focus limited funding on young people with higher levels of need and to set a balanced budget. Other reasons include empowering the youth sector to become part of a Young People’s Foundation that will have the capacity to raise funds for youth providers and attract funding to the sector.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**4.4 How will the impact of the project, policy or proposal and any changes made to reduce the impact be monitored?**

	<p>The impact will be monitored through the Early Help service of the local authority. The data analysis team measure levels of engagement of young people at risk of negative outcomes. NEET (not in employment, education or training) figures are regularly measured by our data contractor.</p> <p>Public Health outcomes are measured by health professionals and youth offending and anti-social behaviour by Community Safety Teams. Other data relating to young people is monitored through the Commissioning Directorate to inform Commissioning approaches.</p> <p>Services for Children with LDD needs will be supported by the Special Educational Needs Team, Localities, and the Commissioning Directorate. These will be kept under review to ensure that young people with LDD continue to access appropriate services.</p> <p>The Westminster Youth Council will be engaged and consultation will be undertaken with young people. This will identify young people’s needs and measure the impact of any changes to services. It will inform the priorities of agencies and funders that will continue to support the youth offer.</p> <p>The Young Westminster Foundation will measure the impact of its work and collate data relating to funded projects. The impact of the Foundation will be monitored by trustees and information will be shared with the local authority.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



## 4.5 Conclusion

*This section should record the overall impact, who will be impacted upon and the steps being taken to reduce/mitigate impact*

The proposal is to cease council funding for universal youth services from September 2016. This will impact on services provided by up to 13 youth providers, although some providers will be better placed to sustain existing provision and/or attract funding to alternative service models.

The impact will be on the six equalities groups listed in Section 4.1 of this report. It is difficult to measure the full impact for two main reasons;

- Providers have capacity to secure alternative sources of income or develop new service models.
- Services are already in receipt of a variety of funding streams and the impact on services will be variable.

The council will invest in the new Young Westminster Foundation. The formation of a Young Westminster Foundation, in partnership with key sponsors from the public, charitable, and corporate sectors, will generate new resources for the future youth offer. This model is being developed in neighbouring London Boroughs and is likely to support a strong range of good quality youth services in the future.

To mitigate against risk the local authority will;

Continue to monitor outcomes and indicators for young people, alongside key partners, such as Public Health, Community Safety, employment agencies, local providers, the Young Westminster Foundation, and service users.

The Children with Disabilities Review will consider how to ensure continuing provision for young people with LDD needs that would otherwise suffer a loss of services as a result of this decision.

## SECTION 5: Next Steps

5.1 Action Plan						
Complete the action plan if you need to reduce or remove the negative impacts you have identified, take steps to foster good relations or fill data gaps.						
NB. Add any additional rows, if required.						
Action Required	Equality Groups Targeted	Intended Outcome	Resources Needed	Name of Lead, Unit & Contact Details	Completion Date (DD/MM/YY)	RAG
Continue statutory provision for young people with SEND	Disabled young people	Positive activities Health and Well-being Employability Personal Development	Solution to emerge from the SEN and Children With Disabilities strategic reviews.  Spot purchase funding for disabled young people.	Lesley Hill, Children's Services Commissioning. Mandy Lawson, Children with disabilities	31/3/2016	
Support providers to develop sustainable business models	All	A strong sustainable future youth offer which meets the needs of young people.  Provide support and training to existing providers.	Regular meetings with providers.  Capacity building support.	Paul Williamson, Children's Services Commissioning.	31/7/2016	
Review the impact on specific minority ethnic groups and provide	Specific ethnic/faith groups	Continued services for minority ethnic groups.	Analysis by the Commissioning Directorate.	Ed Knowles, Children's Services Commissioning	31/7/2016	



					Support from WCC Communications Team to produce good information.	Paul Williamson, Children's Services Commissioning.		
information on available services	Ensure Young Westminster Foundation model targets low income areas and key equalities groups	Low income/deprivation	Retain services which are targeted at low income young people and their families.  Council is a co-sponsor of the proposed Young Westminster Foundation.	Officer support for the creation of the foundation model.	Officer support for the creation of the foundation model.	Paul Williamson, Children's Services Commissioning.	31/7/2016	
	Engage new funders, charities, trusts, CiL/Section 106, corporate CSR budgets, foundations, and key agencies in the foundation to maximise investment in young people's services.	All	Engagement with a wide variety of potential sponsors.  Resource mapping	Officer support  Commitment of key stakeholders	Officer support  Commitment of key stakeholders	Paul Williamson, Children's Services Commissioning.	31/7/2016	


## 5.2 Risk Table

Ref	Risk	Impact	Actions in place to mitigate the risk	Current risk score	Further actions to be developed
R1.1	Capacity of the voluntary sector to continue to provide services after council funding stops in September.	Youth services close, reduced level of services	Officers to work with the sector to quantify risk, develop business models and provide support to access other funding available	BII	
R2.1	Unknown/long timescale between council funding stopping and the foundation being able to fund services.	Increased likelihood of youth services closing or providing a reduced level of services	To be addressed in the planning and implementation of the foundation. Gaining approval for the setting up of the foundation is a priority.	All	
R3.1	Unknown priorities of the foundation	Foundation model does not mitigate against impact to identified groups.	The council to be a committed sponsor of the foundation and influence foundation principles and priorities	DI	





**THIS SECTION TO BE COMPLETED BY THE RELEVANT SERVICE MANAGER**

Signature: .....  ..... 04.02.16 .

Full Name: .....Paul Williamson

Unit: .....Children's Services Commissioning.....

Email & Telephone Ext: ...paul.williamson@rbkc.gov.uk 07967 347643.....

Date of Completion (DD/MM/YY): .....19/1/16.....

**WHAT NEXT?**

Please email your completed EIA to the Equalities Lead: [equalities@westminster.gov.uk](mailto:equalities@westminster.gov.uk)

## Appendix – Service user data by provider

Table 1: Young people with a LDD by provider

Youth Provider	Total Children & Young people	Young people with a LDD aged 11-24	
		No.	%
Avenues Youth Project	245	12	5%
Caxton Youth Organisation	24	24	100%
City West Homes Youth (Churchill Gardens, Lillington & Ebury)	201	12	6%
Crypt Youth Club	60	2	3%
DreamArts	93	3	3%
Four Feathers Association	349	37	11%
London Tigers (WECH youth club)	57	10	18%
Marylebone Bangladesh Society (MBS) Youth Club	234	28	12%
North Paddington Youth Club	69	10	14%
Stowe Youth Club	182	23	13%
Westminster Society for People with Learning Disabilities	26	26	100%
Amberley Youth Club (Working with Men)	199	17	9%
St Andrews Youth Club (holiday only**)	191		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1930</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>11%</b>
* Learning Difficulty and/or Disability			
** No other demographic data provided			



**Table 2: BME young people by provider**

Youth Provider	Total Young people aged 11-19	Young people from minority ethnic groups	
		No.	%
Avenues Youth Project	245	225	92%
Caxton Youth Organisation	24	17	69%
City West Homes Youth (Churchill Gardens, Lillington & Ebury)	201	152	76%
Crypt Youth Club	60	41	69%
DreamArts	93	80	86%
Four Feathers Association	349	306	88%
London Tigers (WECH youth club)	57	52	91%
Marylebone Bangladesh Society (MBS) Youth Club	234	226	97%
North Paddington Youth Club	69	47	68%
Stowe Youth Club	182	159	87%
Westminster Society for People with Learning Disabilities	26	24	92%
Amberley Youth Club (Working with Men)	199	184	93%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1512</b>	<b>87%</b>

**Table 3: Young people by gender and provider**

Youth Provider	Total Young people aged 11-19	Male		Female	
		No.	%	No.	%
Avenues Youth Project	245	129	53%	116	47%
Caxton Youth Organisation	24	15	64%	9	36%
City West Homes Youth (Churchill Gardens, Lillington & Ebury)	201	149	74%	52	26%
Crypt Youth Club	60	36	59%	24	41%
DreamArts	93	22	23%	71	77%
Four Feathers Association	349	250	72%	98	28%
London Tigers (WECH youth club)	57	52	91%	4	7%
Marylebone Bangladesh Society (MBS) Youth Club	234	207	88%	27	12%
North Paddington Youth Club	69	52	75%	17	25%
Stowe Youth Club	182	111	61%	71	39%
Westminster Society for People with Learning Disabilities	26	21	81%	5	19%
Amberley Youth Club (Working with Men)	199	154	78%	45	22%
St Andrews Youth Club					
<b>Total</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>31%</b>

**Table 4: Young people living in the 20% most deprived areas by provider**

Youth Provider	Total Young people aged 11-19	Young people living on 20% most deprived areas*	
		No.	%
Avenues Youth Project	245	173	71%
Caxton Youth Organisation	24	9	36%
City West Homes Youth (Churchill Gardens, Lillington & Ebury)	201	47	23%
Crypt Youth Club	60	16	27%
DreamArts	93	46	49%
Four Feathers Association	349	242	69%
London Tigers (WECH youth club)	57	48	85%
Marylebone Bangladesh Society (MBS) Youth Club	234	193	82%
North Paddington Youth Club	69	33	48%
Stowe Youth Club	182	129	71%
Westminster Society for People with Learning Disabilities	26	14	54%
Amberley Youth Club (Working with Men)	199	134	67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1084</b>	<b>62%</b>

\* 20% most deprived Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) according to Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)



