Equality Impact Assessment (EIA): evidencing paying due regard to protected characteristics

Reducing Looked After Children
d.5

> If you would like this information in another language or format such as Braille, large print or audio, please contact the Communications Unit on 01609 53 2013 or email communications@northyorks.gov.uk.
>
> যদি আপনি এই ডকুমেন্ট অন্য ভাষায় বা ফরমেটে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে বলুন।
>
> 如欲索取以另一語文印製或另一格式製作的資料，請與我們聯絡。
>
> اگر آپ کو معلومات کسی دیگر زبان یا دیگر شکل میں درکار ہوں تو براۓ مہربانی ہم سے پوچھئے۔

Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are public documents. EIAs accompanying reports going to County Councillors for decisions are published with the committee papers on our website and are available in hard copy at the relevant meeting. To help people to find completed EIAs we also publish them in the Equality and Diversity section of our website. This will help people to see for themselves how we have paid due regard in order to meet statutory requirements.

Name of Directorate and Service Area	CYPS, Children & Families, Reducing Looked After Children Programme
Lead Officer and contact details	Judith Hay
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the EIA	Gemma Dickinson (Programme Manager) Emma-Jane Lickiss (PMO/Project Manager) Reducing LAC Steering Group
How will you pay due regard? e.g. working group, individual officer	Via Reducing LAC Steering Group and individual Project Team Meetings within the Programme.
When did the due regard process start?	From programme 'Start Up'
Sign off by Assistant Director (or equivalent) and date	Judith Hay 22.07.15

Section 1. Please describe briefly what this EIA is about.

This EIA supports a programme of work which aims to improve outcomes for children and young people by reducing the likelihood of becoming looked after. In order to reduce the numbers of Looked After Children (LAC) the programme therefore aims to safely:

- Reduce in-house accredited Foster Care placements per year.

- Reduce pre-accredited Foster Care places per year.

- Revise the Foster Carer Framework to create 3 new levels of Foster Carer (a separate EIA exists for this element of the programme).

- Reduce Independent Fostering Agency (IFA) placements & cost of placements.

- Reduce the number of expensive External Residential EBD placements and DCS placements and decrease the number of children looked after outside North Yorkshire boundaries.

- Reduce the number of Court Ordered Secure Remands (COSR)s.

- Increase the number of Family Friend care arrangements

- Take account of any associated cost increases of reducing LAC numbers (for example, rise in costs for Post-18 Family Placements (Staying Put); supported lodgings; Residence Orders; Adoption Orders; Special Guardianship Orders etc.

The above outcomes will be met through a variety of project areas sitting beneath the programme and contributing to the same overall aims. Where appropriate, these projects will develop their own individual EIAs. This EIA covers the overall principle (aim of the programme) of reducing the numbers of Looked After Children.

Section 2. Why is this being proposed?

The programme is linked closely to the 2020 transformation agenda to improve services. The aim to reduce the numbers of LAC has been proposed for a number of reasons and gives opportunity for a number of benefits. Fundamentally, the key purpose is to improve outcomes for Children, Young People and Families through the safe reduction of LAC admissions. The programme will enable more efficient, effective and joined up provision through service transformation and innovation. As a result children and young people will be enabled to remain at home where it is safe to do so. In addition to the above non-cashable benefits, the programme will also enable cashable efficiencies to be made through the associated savings (reduction of placement costs) of reducing LAC safely (£3034k).

Section 3. What will change? What will be different for customers and/or staff?

The programme will reduce the number of looked after children and enable children and young people to remain at home where it is safe to do so. The number of foster care placements, IFA placements and residential placements and COSRs will reduce and the number of Family Friend arrangements will increase. This will create improved outcomes for this 'customer' group.

To achieve this result staff will be required to work in different ways and the programme consists of a number of projects (listed below). In some areas the culture of staff will need to change to enable the benefits to be achieved – for example, social workers and managers will be expected to take account of placement costs and be creative and innovative when identifying possible arrangements or placements (whilst keeping a clear focus on the needs of the child in question). Some of the projects also involve restructure – this may also lead to changes in job roles, potential redeployment or restructure, and potential location changes. Due to the commitment to maintaining numbers of frontline staff, those in management positions may be vulnerable (although this is yet to be determined). Those projects involving restructure or re-organisation of staff will have their own accompanying EIA to ensure due regard is paid to protected characteristics.

The programme will also effect some changes for Foster Carers (via the Foster Carer revised Framework, increase in short breaks provision, and reduction in placements in this area). The EIA for the Foster Carer Framework Project covers this in more detail.

ID	Task Name	Start	Finish	2014				2015				2016				2017				2018				2019	
				Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2
1	Multi-Systemic Therapy	29/06/2015	28/06/2017																						
2	Family Group Conferencing	01/12/2014	30/11/2016																						
3	No Wrong Door	01/10/2014	29/09/2017																						
4	Fostering Framework Phase 1	01/09/2014	30/09/2015																						
5	Fostering Framework Phase 2	01/05/2015	29/01/2016																						
6	Fostering Service Restructure	01/01/2015	30/10/2015																						
7	28 Day Strategy	01/09/2015	29/03/2019																						
8	Moving Referrals to the Customer Resolution Centre	01/06/2015	31/12/2015																						
9	Improving Safeguarding in Locality Hubs	01/01/2015	30/11/2015																						
10	DSG	01/09/2015	29/07/2016																						
11	Residential Review & Reorganisation (Woodleigh)	01/04/2014	27/08/2014																						
12	Managing LAC Costs	01/04/2014	31/05/2016																						
13	DCS to LAC Pathway – reduction of placement costs	01/09/2015	31/08/2016																						
14	FDAC	01/09/2015	31/08/2017																						
15	Youth Justice Reductions in COSRs	01/09/2015	31/08/2017																						

Deliverer

Enabler

Section 4. What impact will this proposal have on council resources (budgets)?
Cost neutral? N **Increased cost?** N **Reduced cost?** Y By reducing the number of children and young people that are Looked After there will be an associated cost reduction. Where children and young people need to remain looked after, the programme will aim to ensure the most cost effective placement is found (with the primary focus remaining on the needs of the child). Therefore there will be associated reduced costs for the LAC budgets.

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
Age		X	Risk 1*	**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** Looked After Children & children on the edge of care are below the age of 18 – it is likely that this programme will have a positive impact on this age group by improving their outcomes and reducing chances of becoming looked after. The programme will also create better choices of placement (for example via the new Foster Carer Framework). Some of the specific project areas target certain age ranges specifically (e.g. MST targets secondary school ages of 11-17 years and No Wrong Door targets 13-18 years) and will improve outcomes for children of those ages. Other projects target all children in care or at risk of care to ensure they remain with their families where possible and appropriate (e.g. Family Group Conferencing). **Risk 1**: There is an identified risk for the programme - if the reduction in or prevention of LAC placements is not done safely and appropriately outcomes for this age group (children and young people, but also their families) may be adversely affected. This risk will be closely monitored and mitigating actions developed.

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
	X			**Staff** There is a commitment to maintain levels of front-line staff within the 2020 Programme and no current plans that will adversely affect workers as a result. Work has been undertaken to map the equality profile of this workforce (including age) to ensure that any adverse impacts with regard to activities such as restructure are identified and can be mitigated appropriately. It will be identified whether cuts or transformational work will adversely affect people of different age groups due to the age profile of the workforce. It is recognised that some restructures may reduce 'back office' or management tiers in order to maintain appropriate levels of front line workers. The current age profile (30/06/15) is below: | Age	16-24	25-35	35-45	45-55	55-65	65+	Total
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
%	2	24	24	33	16	1	100	
	X			**Foster Carers** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of the programme. Foster carers undertake an assessment to be suitable to care based on a number of factors set out in regulations, national standards and statutory guidance. The fostering service is aware of the demographic of each approved foster carer. All foster carers are reviewed at least annually to consider on-going approval and suitability to continue.
		X	Risk 1*	**Families** No adverse impact on families due to age is anticipated as a result of the programme. No project specifically targets families due to their ages. Family Group Conferencing may improve outcomes for families by facilitating children and young people to stay at home where appropriate. All projects focus on enabling children to stay with their families or return to their families where possible and this is anticipated to make things better for families. **Risk 1:** However, it is recognised that there is a risk - if the reduction in LAC placements is not done safely and appropriately outcomes for children and young people, but also their families may be adversely affected and families may struggle to cope. There may also be a risk to other siblings. This risk will be closely monitored and mitigating actions developed.

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
Disability		X	Risk 2*	**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** Although Disabled Children are supported via the Disabled Children Team, as part of this programme one of the project areas will increase the capacity for short-break respite Foster Carers. This will improve outcomes for Disabled Children and their families by providing more individual and flexible placement opportunities. The project team for the individual project will carry out an EIA and will closely monitor the impact of any changes on Disabled Children and their families. This is particularly important as the 'Growing Up in North Yorkshire 2014' survey showed that Children with Disabilities or long term illness are more likely to have been bullied at or near school last year (34% reported this compared with the full cohort which reported this as 17%). **Risk 2**: The aim of this project is to improve outcomes but there is a recognised risk that these placements may not meet the need of disabled children in the same way as the current arrangements. For example, the facilities available via Foster Carers will need to be closely reviewed to ensure they are appropriate. These placements may also be further away from home when disabled children are attending short breaks, therefore increasing travel time etc.
	X		Risk 3*	Another area of this programme will look at reducing high cost external placements for disabled children and preventing new high cost placements being agreed where they are not necessary. **Risk 3**: Whilst the aim for this is to ensure the same outcomes are met for the child or young person in question, there is a risk that reducing the cost of care packages may have an adverse impact. This risk will be closely monitored and mitigating actions developed.
	X			**Staff** No adverse impact anticipated. As an organisation NYCC will continue to meet the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 which obligates us to make reasonable adjustments to accommodate disabled individuals as employees or service users. The workforce disability status is below (30/06/15):

Disability	Yes	No	Blank	Total
%	1.4	69.0	29.7	100.0

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
	X			**Foster Carers** No adverse impact anticipated. Foster carers homes are assessed as part of their suitability and can be considered for adaptations if/when considering taking a looked after child with physical needs. Foster caring is not a protected characteristic - individuals need to demonstrate they are able to meet the needs of children.
		X	Risk 2*	**Families** By increasing the capacity for short-break Foster Carers, outcomes will be improved for Disabled Children and their families by providing more individual and flexible placement opportunities. This may mean children can be placed nearer home in more bespoke placements for their needs. **Risk 2**: The aim of this project is to improve outcomes but there is a recognised risk that these placements may not meet the need of families in the same way as the current arrangements. For example, these placements may be further away from home, therefore increasing travel time etc for families.
	X		Risk 4*	Reducing high cost placements should have no adverse impacts for families as placements will aim to meet the same outcomes. **Risk 3**: There is a risk that reducing the cost of care packages may have an adverse impact and may not be a satisfactory alternative for families. For example, families may feel change to be detrimental and there may be changes the family has to make to accommodate new or different placements. This risk will be closely monitored and mitigating actions developed.
Sex (Gender)	X		Risk 5*	**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of gender. Data from 1st April 2015 showed 58% of LAC are male and 42% female but none of the specific projects within this programme target gender when looking to reduce or prevent LAC. **Risk 5**: There is a risk that changes to staffing structures may further sway the gender profile of the workforce (see below under 'staff') making it less representative of the LAC population. Currently although 58% of LAC are male, only 20.9% of the workforce are male. This risk will be closely monitored and mitigating actions developed.

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
	X	X	Risk 6*	**Staff** Work has been undertaken to map the equality profile of this workforce (including gender) to ensure that any adverse impacts with regard to activities such as restructure are identified and can be mitigated appropriately. It will be identified whether cuts or transformational work will adversely affect people of different genders due to the gender profile of the workforce. The gender profile of the workforce is below: **Gender table below** This shows the workforce is predominantly female so cuts and transformational work are more likely to impact females than males. Individual projects will pick up specific impacts in their own EIAs but from a programme level it is recognised that there may greater impacts depending on gender. Most of the identified restructure areas (e.g. for the Fostering Service and the Social Work teams) are not cost-saving exercises and therefore the impact should still be neutral or positive. **Risk 6**: There is a risk that if future transformational work creates reduced structures or impacts certain levels such as management, there may be a higher impact for females given the gender profile of the workforce. Equally, there is a risk that changes may further sway the profile of the workforce making it less representative of the LAC population. This risk will be closely monitored and mitigating actions developed.
	X	X		**Foster Carers** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of gender. Further work is underway to map the gender profile of foster carers to ensure that any adverse impacts are identified and can be mitigated appropriately. However, the fostering service confirms that the majority of main foster carers are female, with very few males fostering on their own. There is a possibility for positive impact to increase the number of male foster carers when recruiting. This will be picked up in more detail within individual project areas.

Gender table:

Gender	M	F	Blank	Total
%	20.9	79.1	0.0	**100.0**

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
	X			**Families** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of gender. No project specifically targets families due to their ages. The gender profile of the families of Looked After Children, CIN/CP/children on the edge of care has not been identified (for example single parent families) and therefore the gender impact of returning children home or reducing the likelihood of entering care is unclear. Further work has been identified to map the families of Looked After Children and also CIN/CP/children on the edge of care to identify any trends with regard to the gender profile of families. This will enable further project work to be progressed to improve outcomes further.
Race	X		Risk 7*	**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of race. Data from 30th June 2015 shows 94% of LAC are classed as 'A1: White - British' but none of the specific projects within this programme target race when looking to reduce LAC. The data on race for Looked After Children (30/06/15) is below:

Race / Ethnicity LAC	%
A1 - White - British	93.9%
A2 - White - Irish	0.2%
A3 - Any other White Background	1.8%
B1 - Mixed - White and Black Caribbean	0.4%
B2 - Mixed - White and Black African	0.4%
B3 - Mixed - White and Asian	2.6%
B4 - Mixed - Any Other Mixed Background	0.4%
D2 - Black/Black British - African	0.2%
Grand Total	100.0%

It is recognised that work is required to ensure that all areas, but especially minority areas, do not experience any unanticipated difficulties as a result of this programme. For example, it may be more difficult to find appropriate host families for certain groups and the Fostering Service report that placing young people with carers of the same race can be challenging. It is also recognised that individual projects will need to ensure that new processes do not adversely impact looked after children and young people, or that language barriers associated with race are not created. The latter two points will be picked up in individual project EIAs. |

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
				The 'Growing Up in North Yorkshire 2014' survey showed that 17% of Year 10 pupils identified as being in an ethnic minority report levels of worry about being different (higher than the full survey cohort (6%). Appendix B provides more information in this area, and these impacts will be considered throughout the Reducing LAC Programme. **Risk 7**: There is an overall programme risk that if, through project transformations, the race profile of staff and foster carers becomes significantly different from LAC and Families (including children on the edge of care), appropriate placements may be difficult to find. This is mitigated by the continual search for creative placements, focus on securing positive outcomes, and determination to enable children to stay or return to their families where-ever it is possible and appropriate to do so.
	X			**Staff** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of race. Work has been undertake to map the equality profile of this workforce (including race) to ensure that any adverse impacts with regard to activities such as restructure are identified and can be mitigated appropriately. It will be identified whether cuts or transformational work will adversely affect people of different races due to the gender profile of the workforce. The race profile of the workforce is below:

Ethnic Origin	%
Blank	11.3
Any Other Black Background	0.3
Any Other Ethnic Group	0.2
Caribbean	0.2
English	0.3
Indian	0.2
Irish	1.5
Not Notified – Form not returned	2.2
Pakistani	0.2
Prefer not to say	0.5
Scottish	0.3
White - Any other	0.2
White - English/Welsh/ Scottish/ N Irish	0.7
White & Black Caribbean	0.3
White British	79.8
White Other	1.0
White: British	0.5
White: Other	0.2
Total	100

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
	X			**Foster Carers** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of race. Data from 30th June 2015 shows 97.7% of Foster Carers on the register are classed as 'A1: White - British' but none of the specific projects within this programme target race when looking to reduce LAC. The data on race for Foster Carers (30/06/15) is below: This shows that the % of A1 Foster Carers is higher than the % of A1 LAC and the race profile of Foster Carers doesn't precisely match that of LAC. It is recognised however that the LAC profile and Foster Carer profile is constantly evolving and new and creative placements are sought by the fostering team to ensure appropriate matches for LAC in this regard.
	X			**Families** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of race. Through some of the projects there may be a greater reliance on extended family to support the immediate family and child or young person in question. Some races are more likely to have wider groups of extended family and friends and this may be positive in terms of enabling the young person to stay at home. There is little date on this area so the Programme will continue to monitor this.

Within the Foster Carers cell, the following table appears:

Race / Ethnicity Foster Carers	%
A1 - White - British	97.7%
A2 - White - Irish	0.0%
A3 - Any other White Background	1.4%
B1 - Mixed - White and Black Caribbean	0.0%
B2 - Mixed - White and Black African	0.0%
B3 - Mixed - White and Asian	0.2%
B4 - Mixed - Any Other Mixed Background	0.0%
D1 - Black/Black British Caribbean	0.5%
D2 - Black/Black British - African	0.0%
E2 - Any other Ethnic Group	0.2%
Grand Total	100.0%

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
Gender reassignment	X			**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of gender reassignment and none of the specific projects within this programme target gender re-assignment when looking to reduce LAC. Following on from assessment against the Stonewall Equality Index (see 'sexual orientation' below) guidance has been developed to support schools/professionals that may be working with transgender pupils. The programme will continue to monitor this area to ensure active engagement where appropriate and any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way.
	X			**Staff** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of gender reassignment and none of the specific projects within this programme target gender re-assignment when looking to reduce LAC. The programme will continue to monitor this area to ensure active engagement where appropriate and any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way.
	X			**Foster Carers** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of gender reassignment and none of the specific projects within this programme target gender re-assignment when looking to reduce LAC. The programme will continue to monitor this area to ensure active engagement where appropriate and any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way.
	X			**Families** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of gender reassignment and none of the specific projects within this programme target gender re-assignment when looking to reduce LAC. The programme will continue to monitor this area to ensure active engagement where appropriate and any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way.

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
Sexual orientation	X			**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of sexual orientation and none of the projects in this programme specifically target this area. Although there is not a break-down for LAC by sexual orientation specifically, the 'Growing Up in North Yorkshire 2014' survey showed that 41% of Year 10 pupils identifying as Lesbian, Gay or Bi-Sexual (LGB) had been bullied at or near school in the last year (much higher than the year 10 cohort as a whole which scored 17%). Levels of wellbeing and resilience for this group were lower than the full cohort, and levels of worry about being different much higher. The LGB group are also more likely to engage in risky behaviour (smoking, drinking alcohol, drug-taking, sexually active etc). Appendix B provides more information in this area, and these impacts will be considered throughout the Reducing LAC Programme. It is also recognised that work is underway to improve North Yorkshire's performance in celebrating difference and preventing and tackling homophobic bullying for young people across the county. As a result North Yorkshire's score on the Stonewall Education Equality index has risen from 52% in 2011 to 86% in 2014 (where North Yorkshire came 14th out of 45 local authorities). The resulting action plan aims to continue this progress, including areas such as providing guidance for schools, other professionals and the community.
	X			**Staff** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of sexual orientation. The programme will continue to monitor this area to ensure active engagement where appropriate and any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way.
	X			**Foster Carers** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of sexual orientation. The programme will continue to monitor this area to ensure active engagement where appropriate and any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way.
				Families No adverse impact anticipated as a result of sexual orientation. The programme will continue to monitor this area to ensure active engagement where appropriate and any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way.

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
Religion or belief	X			**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of religion or belief and none of the projects in this programme specifically target this area. This is not a category that LAC must share with NYCC, but this programme remains mindful of the need to be sensitive to any adverse impacts due to religion or belief. Nevertheless, the table below shows the religion/belief data for LAC (30/06/15). Religion/belief table for LAC This shows that the majority of LAC (50.2%) are non-religious but a significant minority (38.6% not including those not stated) recognise a religion or belief. The programme and individual projects will be mindful of this when identifying ways in which to reduce LAC to ensure detrimental impacts are identified, minimised and mitigated.
	X			**Staff** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of religion or belief and none of the projects in this programme specifically target this area. As an organisation, NYCC will continue to make efforts to accommodate the needs of individuals in terms of religion or belief. Individual project teams will liaise where appropriate with the Property Rationalisation Project Manager and will adhere to provide appropriate accommodation when looking to relocate staff from locality/ office base.
	X			**Foster Carers** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of religion or belief and none of the projects in this programme specifically target this area. This is not a category that Foster Carers must share with NYCC, but this programme remains mindful of the need to be sensitive to any adverse impacts due to religion or belief.

The religion/belief data table for LAC (30/06/15) referenced above:

Religion LAC	%
Agnostic	0.4%
Atheist	0.4%
Christianity	3.7%
Islam	0.2%
Jehovah's Witness	0.9%
Methodist Church	0.7%
Mormons	0.2%
Non-Conformist	0.4%
Non-Religious	50.2%
Not Stated	11.2%
Other	0.7%
Roman Catholicism	3.5%
The Church of England	27.4%
Grand Total	100.0%

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
	X			**Families** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of religion or belief and none of the projects in this programme specifically target this area. This is not a category that families must share with NYCC, but this programme remains mindful of the need to be sensitive to any adverse impacts due to religion or belief and to ensure detrimental impacts are identified, minimised and mitigated.
Pregnancy or maternity	X			**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of pregnancy or maternity. Equality data has been analysed and this shows that as of 30th June 2015 very low numbers of LAC are mothers. Due regard will be paid to this category to ensure that any unanticipated impacts are identified and mitigated as early as possible. This is especially important given that LAC are more likely at Year 10 to be sexually active (see Appendix B). Further work is identified to look at the numbers of children on the edge of care who are either pregnant or parents.
	X			**Staff** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of pregnancy or maternity and none of the specific projects within this programme target this group when looking to reduce LAC. The programme will continue to monitor this area to ensure active engagement where appropriate and any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way. As of 30th June 2015 1.9% of the workforce are on maternity leave and this group will be engaged should any changes that may affect them be identified.
	X			**Foster Carers** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of pregnancy or maternity and none of the specific projects within this programme target this group when looking to reduce LAC. The programme will continue to monitor this area to ensure active engagement where appropriate and any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way. If a foster carer becomes pregnant when a child or young person is in placement with them any impact the pregnancy might have on the fostered child will be carefully considered and if necessary a risk assessment completed. The same exercise will also apply to ensure any risks to the pregnant female carer are considered.

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
	X		Risk 8*	**Families** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of pregnancy or maternity and none of the specific projects within this programme target this group when looking to reduce LAC. The programme will continue to monitor this area to ensure active engagement where appropriate and any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way. Despite the view that there wouldn't be an adverse impact for families, a study of completed cases 2007–2013[1], showed nearly 30% of cases before family courts in England involved women who have been in care proceedings before – validating concerns that young birth mothers are appearing as 'repeat clients'[2]. Proceedings, often followed in quick succession and most commonly prompted by the birth of another baby, led researchers to infer that mothers were pregnant again during the first care proceedings or very shortly afterwards. This raises a number of risks. **Risk 8**: There is a risk to the looked after child that, where the mother is pregnant during care proceedings or gives birth to another infant shortly after care proceedings, there may be little opportunity for vulnerable birth mothers to effect change or exit the cycle of multiple episodes of care proceedings. Therefore, pregnancy may limit the ability of the family to change quickly or effectively enough to safely return the looked after child to home. This will be closely monitored under the prevention work streams to ensure support is provided where necessary.
			Risk 9*	**Risk 9**: There is a risk that, where the mother is pregnant during care proceedings or gives birth to another infant shortly after care proceedings, there may be little opportunity for vulnerable birth mothers to effect change or exit the cycle of multiple episodes of care proceedings. Therefore, there is a risk that the unborn baby may also require statutory intervention at birth, thus increasing the numbers of Looked After Children. This will be closely monitored under the prevention work streams to ensure support is provided where necessary.

[1] Broadhurst, K., Harwin, J., Shaw, M. and Alrouh, B. (2014) 'Capturing the scale and pattern of recurrent care proceedings: initial observations from a feasibility study', *Family Law*, http://www.familylaw.co.uk/news_and_comment/capturing-the-scale-and-pattern-of-recurrent-care-proceedings-initial-observations-from-a-feasibility-study#.VaPh_8vbLcv, accessed 13/07/15 at 17.00.
[2] See http://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/jun/23/mothers-multiple-children-care, accessed 13/07/15 at 17.00.

Section 5. Will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? State any evidence you have for your thinking.
			Risk 10*	**Risk 10**: There is a risk to the family, where a member of the close family is pregnant, that returning a child home from care without careful consideration may adversely impact the ability of the mother to ensure the health and wellbeing of the unborn child. This is very much dependent on the circumstances around and reasons for the child becoming looked after and the specific circumstances of the family. However there is a risk of further family breakdown as the result of inappropriately returning a child home. This will be closely monitored under the prevention work streams to ensure support is provided where necessary.
Marriage or civil partnership	X			**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of marriage or civil partnership and none of the specific projects within this programme target this group when looking to reduce LAC. Further work will be undertaken to identify if any LAC are married or in civil partnership to ensure any adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way.
	X			**Staff** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of marriage or civil partnership and none of the specific projects within this programme target this group when looking to reduce LAC.
	X			**Foster Carers** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of marriage or civil partnership and none of the specific projects within this programme target this group when looking to reduce LAC.
	X			**Families** No adverse impact anticipated as a result of marriage or civil partnership and none of the specific projects within this programme target this group when looking to reduce LAC.

*See Appendix A.

Section 6. Would this proposal affect people for the following reasons?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Give any evidence you have.
Live in a rural area		X		**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** By enabling children to remain at home, where safe to do so, children will remain links with their local areas and support systems.
		X	Risk11*	**Risk 11**: The April 2015 statistics show that 32% (12 out of 37) placements with a family or friend are outside the local authority area). Dependent on the circumstance of the child, an increase in these placements may make things better (by distancing the child from a dangerous situation). There is a risk that the situation could be made worse (by cutting a child of from existing support systems). However, all risks are logged and will be monitored closely. Mitigating actions will be put in place.
	X			**Staff** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of living in a rural area. Any restructures that impact on travel time/mileage etc will consider impact in an individual project EIA.
	X			**Foster Carers** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of living in a rural area for the overall principle of reducing the numbers of Looked After Children. There may be some specific areas within the individual EIA for the Foster Carer Framework which impact on Foster Carers living in rural areas, for example, impacts on distance to travel for contact and reviews etc.
				Families No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of living in a rural area for the overall principle of reducing the numbers of Looked After Children (rather the risk to families in rural areas is more around contact when a child is in care and potential impact on distance to travel).
Have a low income	X			**Looked After Children & Children on the Edge of Care** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of having a low income.
	X			**Staff** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of having a low income.

Section 6. Would this proposal affect people for the following reasons?	No impact	Make things better	Make things worse	Why will it have this effect? Give any evidence you have.
	X			**Foster Carers** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of having a low income for the overall principle of reducing the numbers of Looked After Children. There may be some specific areas within the individual EIA for the Foster Carer Framework which impacts on Foster Carers on low incomes. For example, the new framework is intended to allow all foster carer a clear opportunity to progress through a structure subject to their own development and vacancy (offering opportunity for those on lower incomes to progress).
	X			**Families** No adverse impact is anticipated as a result of having a low income for the overall principle of reducing the numbers of Looked After Children. However, families on lower incomes may require further support for the child to return home (for example in cases of neglect etc families with lower incomes may find it more difficult to adequately provide for their children).

*See Appendix A.

d.5

Section 7. Will the proposal affect anyone more because of a combination of protected characteristics? (e.g. older women or young gay men?) **State where this is likely to happen and explain what you think the effect will be and why giving any evidence you have.**

N/A. The proposal is not expected to have an adverse effect on any of the recognised protected characteristics (for LAC, staff or Foster Carers) and is envisaged will improve outcomes for children and young people. Consideration of unanticipated combinations suggests that there may be potential combinations of protected characteristics for disability and living in a rural area (in terms of access and availability of support) for example, but such combinations are not expected. All risks will be closely monitored and mitigating actions put into place.

Section 8. Only complete this section if the proposal will make things worse for some people. Remember that we have an anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments so that disabled people can access services and work for us.

Can we change our proposal to reduce or remove these adverse impacts?

The overall aim for this programme is to make things better and improve outcomes for children, young people and their families. It is not anticipated that the programme will have adverse impacts on any group. However, this EIA has identified 11 key areas of risk where, if not managed effectively, the programme may have adverse impact. These are only risks and the programme will keep and regularly monitor its own risk log. Mitigating actions will be developed to minimise further both the likelihood and impact of these risks.

Ultimately the decision may be made to under-achieve on the programme aim to reduce LAC to ensure positive outcomes for children and young people and ensure their equality and diversity needs are met and to avoid the risks becoming adverse impacts.

Can we achieve our aim in another way which will not make things worse for people?

All risks will have mitigating actions linked to them which will identify potential options for alternative delivery.

If we need to achieve our aim and can't remove or reduce the adverse impacts get advice from legal services. Summarise the advice here. Make sure the advice is passed on to decision makers if the proposal proceeds.

 NA

Section 9. If the proposal is implemented how will you find out how it is really affecting people? (How will you monitor and review the changes?)

The programme steering group will meet regularly (every 4-6 weeks) to review and monitor the changes and the impact of these changes. Individual projects will review equalities in the most appropriate way and that will feed into the programme EIA.

Section 10. List any actions you need to take which have been identified in this EIA

Action	Lead	By when	Progress
Ensure the items above marked as 'risk' are included in the Programme Risk Log and mitigating actions assigned.	GD	13/08/15	
Ensure regular monitoring & review of the Programme Risk Log.	GD	On-going	
Ensure all projects within this programme clearly map the criteria for intervention so that targeted cohorts of children can be identified to ascertain potential positive impacts for protected characteristics.	GD & project sponsors	13/08/15	
Ensure all project areas have their own EIA where applicable and that this feeds into the overall programme monitoring.	GD	On-going	
Undertake further work to identify if any LAC are married or in civil partnership to ensure any adverse impacts are identified and mitigated in a timely way.	GD & service area	On-going	
Undertake mapping work for LAC and also children on the edge of care to identify any trends with regard to the protected characteristics. For example identifying the gender profile of families; if any LAC are married or in civil partnership; numbers who are pregnant or parents etc. This will enable further project work to be progressed to improve outcomes further, and any additional risks to be identified, monitored and mitigated.	GD & service area	On-going	
The programme EIA will be owned and updated throughout the lifecycle of the programme where appropriate by the Programme Board and individual service managers.	JH	On-going	

Appendix A: Risks Identified via this EIA

NB. Like the EIA, these risks will feed into the Programme Risk Log which continues to be updated regularly to ensure risks and mitigating actions are monitored and managed appropriately. The Programme Risk Log also contains wider risks to the programme including risks around working to pre-agreed targets etc.

Risk 1: if the reduction in, or prevention of LAC placements is not done safely and appropriately outcomes for this age group (children and young people, but also their families) may be adversely affected. There may also be a risk to other siblings. This risk will be closely monitored and mitigating actions developed.

Risk 2: The aim of this project is to improve outcomes but there is a recognised risk that these placements may not meet the need of disabled children in the same way as the current arrangements. For example, the facilities available via Foster Carers will need to be closely reviewed to ensure they are appropriate. These placements may also be further away from home when disabled children are attending short breaks, therefore increasing travel time etc.

Risk 3: Whilst the aim for this is to ensure the same outcomes are met for the child or young person in question, there is a risk that reducing the cost of care packages may have an adverse impact. This risk will be closely monitored and mitigating actions developed.

Risk 4: There is a risk that reducing the cost of care packages may have an adverse impact and may not be a satisfactory alternative for families. For example, families may feel change to be detrimental and there may be changes the family has to make to accommodate new or different placements. This risk will be closely monitored and mitigating actions developed.

Risk 5: There is a risk that if future transformational work creates reduced structures or impacts certain levels such as management, there may be a higher impact for females given the gender profile of the workforce. Equally, there is a risk that changes may further sway the profile of the workforce making it less representative of the LAC population. Currently although 58% of LAC are male, only 20.9% of the workforce are male.

Risk 6: There is a risk that if future transformational work creates reduced structures or impacts certain levels such as management, there may be a higher impact for females given the gender profile of the workforce. Equally, there is a risk that changes may further sway the profile of the workforce making it less representative of the LAC population.

Risk 7: There is an overall programme risk that if, through project transformations, the race profile of staff and foster carers becomes significantly different from Looked After Children and Families (including children on the edge of care), appropriate placements may be difficult to find. This is mitigated by the continual search for creative placements, focus on securing positive outcomes for children, young people and families, and determination to enable children to stay or return to their families where-ever it is possible and appropriate to do so.

Risk 8: There is a risk that, where the mother is pregnant during care proceedings or gives birth to another infant shortly after care proceedings, there is little opportunity for vulnerable birth mothers to effect change or exit the cycle of multiple episodes of care proceedings. Therefore, pregnancy may limit the ability of the family to change quickly or effectively enough to safely return the looked after child to home.

Risk 9: There is a risk that, where the mother is pregnant during care proceedings or gives birth to another infant shortly after care proceedings, there may be little opportunity for vulnerable birth mothers to effect change or exit the cycle of multiple episodes of care proceedings. Therefore, there is a risk that the unborn baby may also require statutory intervention at birth, thus increasing the numbers of Looked After Children.

Risk 10: There is a risk to the family, where a member of the close family is pregnant, that returning a child home from care without careful consideration may adversely impact the ability of the mother to ensure the health and wellbeing of the unborn child. This is very much dependent on the circumstances around and reasons for the child becoming looked after and the specific circumstances of the family. However there is a risk of further family breakdown as the result of inappropriately returning a child home.

Risk 11: The April 2015 LAC statistics show that 32% (12 out of 37) placements with a family or friend are outside the local authority area. There is a risk that by placing a child in this way their situation could be made worse by cutting a child of from existing support systems.

Growing Up in North Yorkshire 2014 – Equalities monitoring in North Yorkshire

Year 10 percentage data

	Yr 10	LGB	Ethnic minority	Young carers	Children in care	One parent family	Not in own home	SEN	Disability /long term illness	FSM	Armed forces family
Actual number of pupils	3529	180	261	117	23	616	65	243	96	237	151
Bullied at or near school last year	17%	41%	17	31	15	20	24	29	34	30	23
High Resilience Score	17%	7%	21	15	14	12	10	16	13	13	14
High wellbeing score	20%	9%	19	12	0	16	9	16	21	10	15
Worry 'quite a lot/ a lot' about being different	6%	39%	17	11	13	9	20	8	8	9	11
Ever tried smoking	34%	49%	38	56	61	44	60	39	30	51	33
Drank alcohol last week	35%	42%	31	34	28	36	41	30	36	29	44
Ever offered drugs	28%	38%	26	42	33	36	43	32	30	34	34
Ever taken drugs	14%	20%	15	23	26	19	26	16	15	22	17
Sexually active	19%	30%	16	40	38	24	28	24	16	28	28
7+ hours exercise /week	27%	16%	24	21	10	22	23	23	31	16	29
I know my own targets at school and I am helped to meet them	62%	48%	61	55	65	54	48	54	55	54	56

Grey squares = difference from all Year 10 is statistically significant

d.5

Appendix C: Workforce Equality Profile (30/06/15)

Disability	Yes	No	Blank	Total
%	1.4	69.0	29.7	**100.0**

Gender	M	F	Blank	Total
%	20.9	79.1	0.0	**100.0**

Age	16-24	25-35	35-45	45-55	55-65	65+	Total
%	2	24	24	33	16	1	**100**

Maternity	Yes	No	Total
%	1.9	98.1	**100**

Ethnic Origin	%
Blank	11.3
Any Other Black Background	0.3
Any Other Ethnic Group	0.2
Caribbean	0.2
English	0.3
Indian	0.2
Irish	1.5
Not Notified – Form not returned	2.2
Pakistani	0.2
Prefer not to say	0.5
Scottish	0.3
White - Any other	0.2
White - English/Welsh/ Scottish/ N Irish	0.7
White & Black Caribbean	0.3
White British	79.8
White Other	1.0
White: British	0.5
White: Other	0.2
Total	100

d.5