

## Appendix 1 Shropshire Equality and Social Inclusion Impact Assessment (ESIIA)

### Contextual Notes 2014

#### ***The What and the Why:***

The Equality and Social Inclusion Impact Assessment (ESIIA) tool replaces the Equality Impact Needs Assessment (EINA) tool previously in use by Shropshire Council. It is a tool to help us to identify whether or not any new or significant changes to services, including policies, procedures, functions or projects, may have an adverse impact on a particular group of people, and whether the human rights of individuals may be affected.

What we are now doing is broadening out such assessments to consider social inclusion. This is so that we are thinking as carefully and completely as possible about all groups and communities in Shropshire, including people in rural areas and people we may describe as vulnerable, as well as people in what are described as the nine 'protected characteristics' of groups of people in our population, eg Age, eg Gender Reassignment. We demonstrate equal treatment to people who are in these groups and to people who are not, through having what is termed 'due regard' to their needs and views when developing and implementing policy and strategy and when commissioning, procuring, arranging or delivering services.

It is a legal requirement for local authorities to assess the equality and human rights impact of changes proposed or made to services, such as through a new policy or a change in procedure. Carrying out ESIIAs helps us as a public authority to ensure that, as far as possible, we are taking actions to meet the general equality duty placed on us by the Equality Act 2010 to have what is called *due regard* to the three equality aims in our decision making processes. These are: eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation; advancing equality of opportunity; and fostering good relations.

#### ***The How:***

The assessment comprises two parts: a screening part, and a full report part.

**Screening (Part One)** enables energies to be focussed on the service changes for which there are potentially important equalities and human rights implications. If screening indicates that the impact is likely to be positive overall, or is likely to have a medium or low negative or positive impact on certain groups of people, a full report is not required. Energies should instead focus on review and monitoring and ongoing evidence collection, enabling incremental improvements and adjustments that will lead to overall positive impacts for all groups in Shropshire.

A **full report (Part Two)** needs to be carried out where screening indicates that there are considered to be or likely to be significant negative impacts for certain groups of people, and/or

where there are human rights implications. If you are not sure, a full report is recommended, as it enables more evidence to be collected that will help you to reach an informed opinion.

## Shropshire Council Part 1 ESIIA: initial screening and assessment

*Please note: prompt questions and guidance within boxes are in italics. You are welcome to type over them when completing this form. Please extend the boxes if you need more space for your commentary.*

**27 11 14**

**Updated 22 06 15**

**Updated 10 10 16**

### Name of service change

**Local Commissioning of Youth Activities**

### Aims of the service change and description

In 2015 Shropshire Council (SC) changed the way that it delivers group activities for young people aged 10 to 19 years old (25 for young people with learning difficulties) moving away from direct delivery to commissioning services.

In 2015 SC funding was provided to 18 Local Joint Committees\* (LJCs) based on a formula that calculates the areas of greatest need and rural isolation.

[\*23 Local Joint Committees (LJCs) provide an opportunity for local town and parish councils and Shropshire Council members to work together to address local community needs and priorities]

Supported by Community Enablement Team officers these LJCs make recommendations for the commissioning of activities for young people within their communities. Under this way of working Local Joint Committees undertake a review of existing provision and make recommendations on appropriate future provision for young people based on local need. Their recommendations are then procured by Shropshire Council through an appropriate provider.

Since the new model was introduced over 70 separate awards have been made to over 50 different providers. Awards range from small grants of less than £200, for example, for the purchase of equipment by community groups, to large contracts to established youth activity providers. The learning from the local commissioning of youth activities suggests that awards are making a positive difference to the lives of young people.

Looking forward the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy confirms the requirement to make 50% savings to the locally commissioned youth activities budget from 2017/18, leaving an available budget of £117,475 per annum.

From April 2016 it is proposed to provide funding to 9 LJC areas based on an assessment of need, experience gained to date and the opportunity to create long term sustainable local provision.

Funding allocations, current and proposed, are summarised within the table below:

		2015 funding allocation (for a full year)		Proposed 2017/18 funding allocation
LJC Area	Specific Needs	£3,000 Rurality	Total Funding	

	Score	Allocation		Total Funding
Shrewsbury	2.48		£81,500	£40,750
Oswestry	0.75		£24,640	£11,500
Market Drayton	0.73		£24,060	£11,500
Whitchurch	0.47		£15,580	£11,500
Longden, Ford, Rea Valley and Loton	0.42	√	£16,630	£6,000
Gobowen, Selattyn, St Martin's, and Weston Rhyn	0.37		£12,120	£8,500
Ludlow and Clee area	0.33		£10,850	£11,500
Bridgnorth, Worfield, Alveley and Claverley	0.31		£10,120	£11,500
Wem and Shawbury	0.29	√	£12,450	£4,500
Bishop's Castle, Chirbury, Worthen and Clun	0.19	√	£3,000	
Strettondale and Burnell	0.18	√	£3,000	
Ellesmere	0.17	√	£3,000	
Five Perry Parishes	0.17			
Tern and Severn Valley	0.16	√	£3,000	
St Oswald	0.15	√	£3,000	
Craven Arms and Rural	0.15	√	£3,000	
Highley and Brown Clee	0.14	√	£3,000	
Shifnal and Sheriffhales	0.13			
Cleobury and Rural	0.11	√	£3,000	
Bayston Hill	0.09			
Broseley and Rural	0.09			
Albrighton	0.07			
Much Wenlock and Shipton	0.04	√	£3,000	
<b>Total</b>			<b>£234,950</b>	<b>£117,250</b>

Alongside support for direct provision in areas of greatest need SC has commissioned the service of an Infrastructure Support Provider (Shropshire Youth Association and Energize). The role of this consortium is to provide a range of support to largely volunteer based community based youth activity. Over 100 clubs are now affiliated to the Shropshire Youth Association and receive a wide range of support. Further details can be found at: <http://www.sya.org.uk/>

### Intended audiences and target groups for the service change

The following points underpin the Council's approach to the commissioning of youth activities:

- As a local authority, Shropshire Council has a duty to secure, so far as reasonably practicable, equality of access for all young people to the positive, preventative and early help they need to improve their well-being.
- The Council must also take steps to gain the views of young people and to take them into account in making decisions about services and activities for them.
- The Council's aim is to ensure that as many young people as possible, can access a wide range of activities after school, at weekends and in school holidays. These activities are known collectively as Youth Activities and their purpose is to support young people's well-being, development of personal and social education and preparation for adulthood.
- Youth Activities are part of Shropshire's Early Help Offer for young people.  
visit: <https://shropshire.gov.uk/media/1216935/Shropshire-CYPF-Plan-2014.pdf>

- The provision of youth activities will contribute to the following outcome areas in the Shropshire's Children, Young People and Families Plan 2014:
  1. Ensuring all Children & Young People are safe and well looked after in a supportive environment
  2. Narrowing the achievement gap in education & work
  3. Ensuring emotional wellbeing of Children & Young People by focusing on prevention and early intervention
  4. Keeping more Children & Young People healthy and reducing health inequalities

Visit: <https://shropshire.gov.uk/media/1216935/Shropshire-CYPF-Plan-2014.pdf>

Summary of principal target groups:

- Young people aged between 10 to 19, as well as up to their 25th birthday if they have learning difficulties
- Young people, identified through a review of local evidence and the knowledge of LJC members and stakeholders, whose needs are not fully catered for by mainstream provision, through the voluntary sector or by other means and who may benefit from "targeted youth worker support".
- The parents, carers and families of young people
- Positive activity providers, and their workers and volunteers delivering activities

Summary of other target groups:

- LJC SC members & Town / Parish Council members
- Other council services supporting children & families
- Partner organisations supporting children & families
- Pre-school, school and further education providers
- Wider voluntary and community sector
- Wider business community

**Evidence used for screening of the service change**

Eight measures were confirmed by Cabinet in December 2014 to calculate an index of specific youth related need for each LJC. These eight measures were chosen to best reflect the outcomes sought by the Children's Trust. A needs score was calculated for each LJC area, which was used to determine the proportion of funding allocated to the LJC. The eight measures used in the funding formula were as follows:

- The no of 10-19 year olds
- The no of 10-19 year olds with a learning disability
- The no of 10-10 year olds living in a deprived area
- The no of 10-17 year olds offenders
- The no of 10-19 year olds with poor school attendance
- The no of referrals to social care for 10-17 year olds
- Occurrence of anti-social behaviour
- Percentage of obesity of 10-11 year olds

One measure, the number of 10-19 year olds per square mile, was used to distinguish rural areas from market towns. This was used to determine a specific rurality contribution, allocated separately from the main element of the funding determined by the formula described above.

<http://shropshire.gov.uk/committee-services/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=130&MID=2359>

In the development of specific local youth commissioning proposals in 2015 LJCs:

- (a) Took advice from SCs Positive Activities team and the councils Infrastructure Support provider, Shropshire Youth Association & Energize
- (b) Examined a range of evidence and facts

- (c) Considered existing youth activity provision
- (d) Considered the outcomes of previous consultations with young people
- (e) Met with existing providers and potential future providers
- (f) Met with young people within existing SC youth club, other youth club and school settings
- (g) Conducted surveys of young people
- (h) Communicated their finding and commissioning recommendations at public meetings

Looking forward, and in the context of significant budget reductions, our approach to maximising the value of funding from April 2017 is based on:

- Targeting funding to those areas where previous intelligence has confirmed that the “specific needs” are the highest
- Withdrawing all “rurality” funding allocations – funding largely relates to areas that have historically not been directly funded and that have reasonably well developed voluntary sector providers. Voluntary sector providers will continue to be supported by the SYA and Energize.

Alongside the above, the aim in awarding funding from 2017/18 to a limited number of areas will be to provide the best chance of encouraging long term sustainable local provision independent of direct financial support by the Council by:

- Encouraging the community to take “ownership” of local provision, for example through the creation of local youth forums, fund raising and even the direct employment of youth workers.
- Encouraging partner financial contributions that support on-going provision, for example via local town and parish councils, businesses, etc.
- Encouraging and supporting the role of qualified volunteer youth workers working alongside paid youth workers where appropriate
- Supporting a creative and innovative approach to provision that maximises positive outcomes for young people, reduces costs and maximises income

Further details of funding proposals for individual areas are provided below:

How have you arrived at the proposed funding allocations for Shrewsbury, Oswestry, Market Drayton, Whitchurch, Ludlow and Bridgnorth?

The proposed funding is approximately sufficient funding for the employment of two youth workers per session. Currently in most cases existing sessions are supported by three youth workers and this remains best practice with regard to safe and supportive operating practices for busy town based sessions with a high volume of participants.

Therefore, for existing youth clubs to continue operating safely in 2017/18 additional funding, equivalent to approximately £1,250 per club, will be required in order to employ a third member of staff and / or trained and skilled volunteers will need to be recruited.

How have you arrived at the proposed funding allocations for Minsterley, Weston Rhyn, Gobowen and Wem?

Within these areas there remains a need to build on existing financial support within the context of developing local sustainable provision independent of Shropshire Council. The funding proposed in 2017/18 is based on the “Shropshire Youth Association Partnership Offer” to provide one youth worker alongside a local management committee and the active involvement of volunteers.

How have you arrived at the proposed funding allocations for Westbury, Ford, Nesscliffe, Great Hanwood, St Martins and Shawbury?

Youth club provision within these communities is now well established with strong prospects of being maintained locally. A small funding allocation will further increase the prospects of long term sustainability without Shropshire Council funding.

Transition grant pot

In recognition of the potential consequences of the complete removal of funding from some areas (in

the nine areas currently only receiving rurality funding) it is proposed to create a one off (i.e. for 2017/18 only) “transition grant pot”. The aim will be to use the grant pot to support long term local sustainable youth provision. Funding of up to £1,500 will be awarded to local town / parish councils or appropriately constituted youth consortia to match an equivalent sum raised locally and to be spent in support of the delivery of activities for young people, particularly where their needs are not catered for by mainstream provision. In adopting this approach, it is anticipated that the Council will be the enabler of activities rather than the direct commissioner.

### **Specific consultation and engagement with intended audiences and target groups for the service change**

In developing its approach to the local commissioning model, Shropshire Council conducted a specific consultation with stakeholders over an 11-week period in **January to March 2014**. The aim of the consultation was to seek feedback on the proposed model of commissioning. We used an online survey to achieve the consultation.

The consultation generated 591 responses, including 289 young people. Most stakeholders agreed with the principles of the proposal. Concern and confusion was also expressed about some aspects of the proposal. The responses were used to further develop the proposal and included:

- Reducing the bureaucracy by using existing local governance boards (LJCs)
- Further development on how to best engage young people in commissioning
- Adding clarity on roles and responsibilities
- Communicating our plans as clearly as we can and to continue to engage with stakeholders to keep them informed of progress.

A formal public consultation on youth activity provision ran for a six-week period from **11<sup>th</sup> May to 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2015**. The consultation was primarily web based, using the “Have your say” section of Shropshire Council’s website and a survey monkey questionnaire. In addition, a range of specific consultation sessions were undertaken with young people. The consultation provided specific detailed information on the proposals developed by the Local Joint Committees for the nine areas that have current SC delivered youth services, i.e.:

- Bishop’s Castle
- Bridgnorth
- Broseley
- Craven Arms
- Ludlow
- Market Drayton
- Oswestry
- Shrewsbury
- Whitchurch

A total of 145 responses were received. 89% of these responses were from people from a white British background, 34% of respondents are between 30-59 years of age and 41% were under 19 years of age. Nearly 71% of respondents are female and 8% declared that they have a disability. 28% of responses were from residents of the Bridgnorth area, 24% from the Shrewsbury area and 18% from the Broseley area.

Overall 52% of respondents did not agree with the commissioning intentions outlined within the consultation. Many of these 52% of responses relate specifically to Broseley (17% of the 52%).

The following trends can be seen in the responses given as to why respondents don’t agree:

- Concern over the capacity and expertise of the voluntary/ community sector to deliver appropriate youth work
- Concern over the criteria used to calculate which areas are proposed to receive funding- in particular relating to Broseley
- Concern over the level of resources being insufficient to deliver a quality service

- Concern over the impact of reduction in or withdrawal of funding for activities- particularly around the risk of increased anti-social behaviour, petty crime and vandalism

Many respondents (44%) were willing to provide some ideas around alternative provision. The following trends can be seen:

- Use of and investment into existing organisations such as scouts and the Air Training Corps and infrastructure within communities such as village and community halls
- The need to focus on school holidays, evenings and weekends
- The need to join up provision with other partners- e.g. police
- The need to find solutions to the isolation of young people in rural areas
- The need to continue to support professional youth workers

The final question on the questionnaire provides space for any further comments to be made. 42% of respondents took the opportunity to provide comment and again many (15%) relate to Broseley.

Trends in these comments are:

- Youth services should continue to be delivered by Shropshire Council
- Particular concern over the cuts in funding to certain areas and their impact on communities
- Concern over the capacity of the voluntary/ community and Parish and Town Council sector to work with young people currently supported by direct youth services

Following confirmation of the 50% budget reduction from April 2017 LJsCs (local Members and town and parish council members) were consulted on proposed funding allocations from the **summer to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016**. In support of the consultation a set of Frequently Asked Questions were provided.

Comments were received from twelve areas out of a total of eighteen areas that received funding in 2016/17. The level of feedback may partly reflect the fact that in recent years nine of these areas, mostly those that have only received rurality funding, have not been directly supported by Shropshire Council. It is also noteworthy that in a limited number of areas LJsCs found it difficult to spend their full allocation on appropriate local projects.

The consultation generated a number of comments which are summarised together with a Council response below.

Comments	Shropshire Council response
Concern that there had been no consultation on the proposed change to criteria used to allocate funding in 2017/18	A set of Frequently Asked Questions accompanied the consultation. These set out the rationale for the proposed funding allocations. Local Joint Committee members have been provided with the opportunity to comment on suggested allocations and to provide arguments in support of a different approach. Responses have been collated within this report with the final approach subject to a Cabinet decision.
Suggestion that funding should be reduced by 50% across all those areas that previously received funding	Officers consider that this “one size fits all” approach is a blunt and non-evidence based way to allocating limited resources. It is recognised that proposals to reduce all rurality funding will have a potential negative impact on young people but these areas have largely not previously had Council funding, have a reasonably well developed voluntary sector and will continue to be proactively supported by the Council’s infrastructure support provider partner and by Community Enablement Team officers.
Within the nine areas currently receiving specific needs funding comments were received from seven areas. Two areas did not respond; five were broadly in agreement with the	It is proposed that Oswestry receives the same level of funding as Market Drayton, Whitchurch, Ludlow and Bridgnorth. Funding has been calculated to be almost sufficient to run two weekly term time youth clubs with three qualified employed youth workers. Some additional financial support, for example from the respective Town Council, could be considered to supplement this depending on the chosen delivery model. It is recognised that the funding allocations will provide little or no opportunity for additional

<p>proposals; and two, Longden and Oswestry, were against.</p>	<p>grant aided support to local voluntary groups, but support will continue to be provided by the Council's infrastructure support provider partner and by Community Enablement Team officers.</p> <p>Funding for the Longden LJC area has been determined on the basis of how the existing financial support provided to five youth clubs – Minsterley, Westbury, Hanwood, Ford and Nesscliffe - can be built on to provide the best chance of long term sustainability independent of the Council. In recent time three established youth clubs – Ford, Hanwood, and Nesscliffe - were solely supported by their local parish councils and their fund raising efforts.</p> <p>Although no specific alternative proposals have been suggested on how to sustain local youth provision in Longden LJC, representations have been made that this should be left to the LJC to recommend following a full analysis of the evidence and opportunities; it is proposed to organise an LJC planning meeting to confirm allocations as soon as possible, bearing in mind that cabinet have already determined the funding criteria and allocations.</p>
<p>Within the 9 areas receiving only rurality funding comments were received from 6 areas. 2 areas acknowledged the Council's budget situation. Bishops Castle, Craven Arms, Strettondale and St Oswald &amp; Llanymynech made a case for ongoing support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Investment" in young people</li> <li>• Match funding to support the development of local capacity and sustainability</li> <li>• Deprivation and local need</li> <li>• Rurality and transport challenges</li> <li>• Response to anti-social behaviour issues</li> </ul> <p>Bridgnorth LJC also made a plea to retain its rurality funding contribution on top of its specific needs funding based on its large area and numerous small communities.</p>	<p>In considering feedback from these areas it is noteworthy that (a) in recent years most of these areas have not been directly supported by Shropshire Council; (b) a limited number of LJCs found it difficult to spend their full allocation on appropriate local projects; and (c) where funding was awarded it tended to be mainly small grants to existing clubs to enable them to purchase equipment and to supplement existing activities rather than to support new activities.</p> <p>Ideally the Council would like to provide ongoing support to young people in all LJC areas. However, in the context of a significantly reduced budget the principle of directing resources to the areas of greatest need has previously been accepted. While issues resulting from dispersed communities are recognised as important additional budget reductions require a further review of where limited resources are best spent.</p> <p>However, in order to ease the transition to zero funding (in the nine areas currently only receiving rurality funding) and to support long term local sustainable provision it is proposed to create a one off (i.e. limited to 2017/18) match grant funding pot of up to £1,500. Funding will be awarded to local town / parish councils or appropriately constituted youth consortia to match an equivalent sum raised locally and to be spent in support of the delivery of activities for young people. In adopting this approach, it is anticipated that the Council will be the enabler of activities rather than the direct commissioner.</p> <p>Alongside this proactive support will continue to be provided in rural areas by the Council's infrastructure support provider partner and by Community Enablement Team officers, and this will include opportunities to fund raise to support local activities.</p>

The response to the consultation has been used to inform the proposed funding allocations, in particular the development of a one off "transition grant pot".

## Potential impact on Protected Characteristic groups and on social inclusion

### Guidance notes on how to carry out the initial assessment

Using the results of evidence gathering and specific consultation and engagement, please consider how the service change as proposed may affect people within the nine Protected Characteristic groups and people at risk of social exclusion.

1. Have the intended audiences and target groups been consulted about:
  - their current needs and aspirations and what is important to them;
  - the potential impact of this service change on them, whether positive or negative, intended or unintended;
  - the potential barriers they may face.
2. If the intended audience and target groups have not been consulted directly, have representatives been consulted, or people with specialist knowledge, or research explored?
3. Have other stakeholder groups and secondary groups, for example carers of service users, been explored in terms of potential unintended impacts?
4. Are there systems set up to:
  - monitor the impact, positive or negative, intended or intended, for all the different groups;
  - enable open feedback and suggestions from a variety of audiences through a variety of methods.
5. Are there any Human Rights implications? For example, is there a breach of one or more of the human rights of an individual or group?
6. Will the service change as proposed have a positive or negative impact on fostering good relations?
7. Will the service change as proposed have a positive or negative impact on social inclusion?

### Guidance on what a negative impact might look like

<b>High Negative</b>	Significant potential impact, risk of exposure, history of complaints, no mitigating measures in place or no evidence available: urgent need for consultation with customers, general public, workforce
<b>Medium Negative</b>	Some potential impact, some mitigating measures in place but no evidence available how effective they are: would be beneficial to consult with customers, general public, workforce
<b>Low Negative</b>	Almost bordering on non-relevance to the ESIIA process (heavily legislation led, very little discretion can be exercised, limited public facing aspect, national policy affecting degree of local impact possible)

## Initial assessment for each group

Please rate the impact that you perceive the service change is likely to have on a group, through inserting a tick in the relevant column.

Protected Characteristic groups and other groups in Shropshire	High negative impact <i>Part Two ESIA required</i>	High positive impact <i>Part One ESIA required</i>	Medium positive or negative impact <i>Part One ESIA required</i>	Low positive or negative impact <i>Part One ESIA required</i>
<p><b>Age</b> (please include children, young people, people of working age, older people. Some people may belong to more than one group eg young person with disability)</p>			<p>Some potential negative impact on young people in areas not receiving funding. etc.</p> <p>Note that the potential impact of funding reductions within areas previously only receiving rurality funding will be partly mitigated by the creation of “transition grant pot”</p>	<p>Provision is for young people aged 10 – 19 (25 with learning difficulties). Within this range, there may be activities that are aimed at specific age ranges (e.g. older teenagers) and this will be determined by local circumstances and needs.</p> <p>Note that SYA and Energize are commissioned by Shropshire Council to provide support to the voluntary sector to provide youth. Alongside this CET officers will continue to support the development of local community groups to access funding</p>
<p><b>Disability</b> (please include: mental health conditions and syndromes including autism; physical disabilities or impairments; learning disabilities; Multiple Sclerosis; cancer; HIV)</p>			<p>Some potential negative impact on young people in areas not receiving funding.</p>	<p>Provision is for young people aged 10 – 19 (25 with learning difficulties). Specifically, activity is geared towards meeting the needs of young people whose needs are not fully catered for by mainstream provision, through the voluntary sector or by other means” and who may benefit from “targeted youth worker support”.</p> <p>Note the Council will continue to provide specialist support for young people with additional learning needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smile, Monkmoor</li> <li>• Big Time Club, Harlescott</li> <li>• Who, Bridgnorth</li> </ul> <p>The Short Breaks Programme provides opportunities for children and young people up to and including 18 years of age who have a disability or additional needs that make (or would make) attending mainstream clubs, groups or facilities difficult.</p> <p>The Short Breaks programme is commissioned by the Council to a variety of specialist providers.</p>

<b>Gender re-assignment</b> (please include associated aspects: safety, caring responsibility, potential for bullying and harassment)			Some potential negative impact on young people in areas not receiving funding.	No young people will be excluded on the basis of their gender. Some youth club groups may, however, be single sex groups.  Note that alongside LJC commissioning the Council will continue to provide specialist activities for young people within the LGBT group in Shrewsbury. This group meets once a month and attracts support from across the county.
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b> (please include associated aspects: caring responsibility, potential for bullying and harassment)				N/a
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b> (please include associated aspects: safety, caring responsibility, potential for bullying and harassment)			Some potential impact on young people in areas not receiving funding.	No young people will be excluded on the basis of pregnancy or being a parent, where an activity does not compromise their health & safety. The service does not provide childcare, which may prevent young parents from accessing.
<b>Race</b> (please include: ethnicity, nationality, culture, language, gypsy, traveller)			Some potential impact on young people in areas not receiving funding.	No young people will be excluded on the basis of race.
<b>Religion and belief</b> (please include: Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Non conformists; Rastafarianism; Sikhism, Shinto, Taoism, Zoroastrianism, and any others)			Some potential impact on young people in areas not receiving funding. etc.	No young people will be excluded on the basis of their religion or belief.
<b>Sex</b> (please include associated aspects: safety, caring responsibility, potential for bullying and harassment)			Some potential negative impact on young people in areas not receiving funding.	No young people will be excluded on the basis of their gender. Exceptions may apply where group activities are specifically designed for boys or girls.
<b>Sexual Orientation</b> (please include associated aspects: safety; caring responsibility; potential for bullying and harassment)			Some potential impact on young people in areas not receiving funding.	No young people will be excluded on the basis of their sexual orientation.  Note that alongside LJC commissioning the Council will continue to provide specialist activities for young people within the LGBT group in Shrewsbury. This group meets once a month and attracts support from across the county.
<b>Other: Social Inclusion</b> (please include families and friends with caring responsibilities; people with health inequalities; households in poverty; refugees)			Being a young carer may prevent a young person from	YP experiencing or at risk of child sexual exploitation (CSE) are now acknowledged as a vulnerable group. While this approach does not

and asylum seekers; rural communities; people you consider to be vulnerable)			<p>participation.</p> <p>Having child care responsibilities may prevent young persons from participating</p> <p>Rurality may prevent young people from accessing activities.</p> <p>Poverty may prevent young people from accessing activities.</p>	<p>prevent this group accessing youth activities, there is an opportunity for youth providers to raise awareness of CSE and to be able to refer to relevant support when needed.</p> <p>Note that it is expected that the use of local resources and existing volunteers will result in cost effective provision.</p> <p>The infrastructure support provider can advise community based providers on building their capacity to work with volunteers. This has the potential to help young people access activities</p>
--	--	--	---	---

## Decision, review and monitoring

Decision	Yes	No
Part One ESIIA Only?	x	
Proceed to Part Two Full Report?		X

***If Part One, please now use the boxes below and sign off at the foot of the page. If Part Two, please move on to the full report stage.***

<b>Actions to mitigate negative impact or enhance positive impact of the service change</b>
<p><i>Check: for the groups affected, what actions will you now take to mitigate or enhance impact of the service change? For example, if you are reducing a service there may be further use you could make of publicity and awareness raising through social media and other channels to reach more people who may be affected.</i></p> <p>Limiting funding to fewer areas than previously has the potential to result negative impact to young people in areas where funding is withdrawn or significantly reduced.</p> <p>However, in the context of 50% of existing funding it makes sense to target this at young people with the greatest need; not surprisingly all the evidence suggests that this is largely within areas of deprivation within the main Shropshire market towns.</p> <p>Outside these areas there has in the main been no recent history of direct youth activity provision by Shropshire Council. Rather the Council's approach has been to engage an "infrastructure support provider", the Shropshire Youth Association (working more recently with Energize), to support the development of safe and effective voluntary sector providers; this approach will continue.</p> <p>Most funding outside the areas of greatest need has been directed at existing youth clubs and has provided some additional support with the purchase of equipment or on putting on additional activities. It is not anticipated that the withdrawal of funding within these areas will result in clubs folding.</p>

However, the potential impact of funding reductions within areas previously only receiving rurality funding will be partly mitigated by the creation of one off “transition grant pot”.

Alongside the infrastructure support provider Community Enablement Team Officers will continue to support local youth clubs to access funding and provide sustainable delivery.

In the 2015 consultation a significant number of comments were specifically raised by young people in Broseley in response to proposals to withdraw funding completely. As a response a one off grant was provided alongside an extension of the Much Wenlock funding allocation to include Broseley. As a result the Broseley Youth Forum has developed a plan for youth activity and supported a weekly youth club. The Council will continue to “support” the development of local sustainable provision independent of Shropshire Council funding.

### **Actions to review and monitor the impact of the service change**

*Check: what arrangements will you have in place to continue to collect evidence and data and to continue to engage with all groups who may be affected by the service change, including the intended audiences? For example, customer feedback and wider community engagement opportunities, including involvement of elected Shropshire Council councillors for a locality.*

- Ongoing evaluation and review of the ESIIA including mitigating actions and actions to enhance the positive impact resulting from funding allocations.
- Ongoing evaluation of local commissioning of youth activities, providing opportunity for continuous improvement and ensuring mitigation of any negative impact.
- Ongoing monitoring at a local level by the LJC in line with provider contracts / grants and with outcome targets
- Feedback from young people and their families and providers as part of the review process
- Management information from providers about the number and nature of service users, the needs of service users, the achievement of commissioning outcomes, and the impact of service provision on equalities.
- Management information from the infrastructure support provider on the number of clubs supported, nature of support, etc.
- Research into good practice at sub-regional and national level, including support to young people and their families living in rural areas.

### **Activity at Part One screening stage**

<b>Names</b> (list those involved in carrying out assessment)	<b>Job titles</b>	<b>Contact details</b>
Neil Willcox	Local Commissioning Manager	01743 255051
Date commenced		
Date updated	10 <sup>th</sup> October 2016	
Date transferred to ESIIA		

### **Scrutiny at Part One screening stage**

<b>People involved</b>	<b>Signatures</b>	<b>Date</b>
<i>Lead officer carrying out the screening</i>	Neil Willcox	10/10/16
<i>Any internal support</i>		

<i>Any external support</i>	 Mrs Lois Dale, Rurality and Equalities Specialist	10/10/16
<i>Head of service</i>		

**Sign off at Part One screening stage**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Signatures</b>	<b>Date</b>
<i>Lead officer's name</i>	Neil Willcox	10/10/16
<i>Head of service's name</i>	George Candler	