

# Equality Analysis

## Birmingham City Council Analysis Report

<b>EA Name</b>	Proposed Changes To Funded Full Time Early Education Places
<b>Directorate</b>	People
<b>Service Area</b>	Children - Early Years Service
<b>Type</b>	Amended Policy
<b>EA Summary</b>	Birmingham City Council's Early Years Childcare and Children's Centre Service currently funds free full-time early education places for children who meet certain eligibility criteria. However, we no longer have the funding to continue with these arrangements and are proposing changes which will reduce the number of funded full-time early education places
<b>Reference Number</b>	EA001222
<b>Task Group Manager</b>	Julie.Wall@birmingham.gov.uk
<b>Task Group Members</b>	Clare.M.Nankivell@birmingham.gov.uk, tracey.linton@birmingham.gov.uk, Lindsey.Trivett@birmingham.gov.uk
<b>Date Approved</b>	2016-04-12 01:00:00 +0100
<b>Senior Officer</b>	Lindsey.Trivett@birmingham.gov.uk
<b>Quality Control Officer</b>	Charles.Ashton-Gray@birmingham.gov.uk

### Introduction

The report records the information that has been submitted for this equality analysis in the following format.

### **Overall Purpose**

This section identifies the purpose of the Policy and which types of individual it affects. It also identifies which equality strands are affected by either a positive or negative differential impact.

### **Relevant Protected Characteristics**

For each of the identified relevant protected characteristics there are three sections which will have been completed.

- Impact
- Consultation
- Additional Work

If the assessment has raised any issues to be addressed there will also be an action planning section.

The following pages record the answers to the assessment questions with optional comments included by the assessor to clarify or explain any of the answers given or relevant issues.

## **1 Activity Type**

The activity has been identified as a Amended Policy.

## **2 Overall Purpose**

### **2.1 What the Activity is for**

What is the purpose of this Policy and expected outcomes?	<p>The purpose of this policy and the expected outcomes is to support the Local Authority to continue to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Improve the take up of the Early Education Entitlement places ;</li><li>2. Improve the quality of Early Years provision in all settings;</li><li>3. Improve education outcomes;</li><li>4. Reduce child poverty;</li><li>5. Close the inequality gap in terms of education and life chances;</li><li>6. Develop a provision to offer a more targeted approach aimed at our most vulnerable; and disadvantaged young children.</li><li>7. Secure value for money in the context of significant budgetary pressure; Birmingham has a history of providing full-time early education provision which pre-dates the current universal education entitlement of 15 hours. Full time places are delivered by maintained LA nursery schools and nursery classes attached to primary schools and Private ,Voluntary and Independent (PVI) providers to children that meet specific criteria.</li></ol> <p>This proposal is one of the five measures to mitigate the 5.52m funding pressure within the Early Years Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for the financial year 2016/17 and, through changing the criteria in the existing full-time (30 Hours) Early Education Policy, it would allow for the reduction in the number of children that are eligible and enable a much needed saving of 1.8m whilst ensuring that our most vulnerable children continue to access early education.</p>
---	---

**For each strategy, please decide whether it is going to be significantly aided by the Function.**

Public Service Excellence	Yes
A Fair City	Yes
A Prosperous City	Yes
A Democratic City	Yes

### **2.2 Individuals affected by the policy**

Will the policy have an impact on service users/stakeholders?	Yes
Will the policy have an impact on employees?	Yes
Will the policy have an impact on wider community?	Yes

### **2.3 Analysis on Initial Assessment**

The initial assessment identifies that the policy will have a potential negative impact on a proportion of the stakeholders across the city. The 2 protected characteristics where there will be impact relate to age and race.

Reasoning regarding impact related to Age is the policy is targeted to children aged 3 and 4.

Reasoning regarding impact related to Race is the policy has withdrawn the eligible criteria of Children having English as an Additional Language.

Due to the above a Full Assessment will be undertaken and a final decision informed by data available and a comprehensive Consultation process with stakeholders.



### **3.1 Age**

#### **3.1.1 Age - Differential Impact**

Age	Relevant
-----	----------

#### **3.1.2 Age - Impact**

Describe how the Policy meets the needs of Individuals of different ages?	The policy supports eligible children aged 3 and 4. Based on full time places funded in the Autumn Term 2015 it is estimated that 1704 children will be affected i.e. proposed changes in child eligibility criteria.
Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	Yes
Please record the type of evidence and where it is from?	The evidence is based on actual recorded funded places for the Autumn Term 2015.
Have you received any other feedback about the Policy in meeting the needs of Individuals of different ages?	No
You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Not applicable
Is there anything about the Policy and the way it affects Individuals of different ages which needs highlighting?	No

#### **3.1.3 Age - Consultation**

Have you obtained the views of Individuals of different ages on the impact of the Policy?	Yes
If so, how did you obtain these views?	A consultation process was undertaken between the period 22nd February 2016 and 22nd March 2016. The process consisted of 3 consultation events and an online consultation questionnaire available on Be Heard. 179 responses to the consultation questionnaire were received on Be Heard from a range of stakeholders. This included 75 parents,19 childcare providers from the Private ,Voluntary and Independent sectors,19 Nursery Schools,44 Schools with a Nursery Class,26 Early Years Professionals and 24 other - not specified.(For clarity a number of individuals responded under more than one category i.e. as a parent and as a childcare provider) The age range of stakeholders who completed the questionnaire ranges from the age of 24 to 80+.
Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Policy on Individuals of different ages?	Yes

If so, how did you obtain these views?	A consultation process was undertaken between the period 22nd February 2016 and 22nd March 2016. The process consisted of 3 consultation events and an online consultation questionnaire available on Be Heard. 179 responses to the consultation questionnaire were received on Be Heard from a range of stakeholders. This included 75 parents, 19 childcare providers from the Private, Voluntary and Independent sectors, 19 Nursery Schools, 44 Schools with a Nursery Class, 26 Early Years Professionals and 24 other - not specified. (For clarity a number of individuals responded under more than one category i.e. as a parent and as a childcare provider) The age range of stakeholders who completed the questionnaire ranges from the age of 24 to 80+.
Is there anything about the Policy and the way it affects Individuals of different ages which needs highlighting?	No

### **3.1.4 Age - Additional Work**

Do you need any more information to complete the assessment?	No
Is there any more work you feel is necessary to complete the assessment?	No
Do you think that the Policy has a role in preventing Individuals of different ages being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their age?	No
Do you think that the Policy could help foster good relations between persons who share the relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?	No

## 3.2 Race

### 3.2.1 Race - Differential Impact

Race	Relevant
------	----------

### 3.2.2 Race - Impact

Describe how the Policy meets the needs of Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds?	The policy will have a negative impact on children from a number of diverse ethnic communities across the city due to the Priority 2 eligibility criteria of English as an additional Language being withdrawn . Therefore wards across the city with a high diverse ethnic mix will be affected by the policy as historically children from those groups have accessed full time places based on EAL. As stated in the Cabinet Report 'Changes to the Full - Time Early Education Places Policy and Nursery Schools Admissions' 19th April 2016 the impact is mitigated by the fact that research suggests that 'Children whose first language isn't English are at no greater risk of speech, language and communication needs than any other child'(Misunderstood 2011) In addition parents and families improving the child's communication environment including accessing books, making trips to the library, parents teaching a range of activities and making toys available will make a difference. An additional mitigation is to continue to include a criteria around children who are in the first stages of language development( language delay) as this is a better indicator and will enable an impact of narrowing the gap. The policy will continue to support those children who are vulnerable i.e. Children with a Child Protection Plan. a Children in Need plan, Children in Local Authority Care ,Children diagnosed with a Disability or Special Educational Need etc.
Do you have evidence to support the assessment?	Yes

Please record the type of evidence and where it is from?	Data as at December 2015, per ward citywide identifying vulnerable children i.e. Children with a Child Protection Plan, a Children in Need plan, Children in Local Authority Care, Children diagnosed with a Disability or Special Educational Need etc. However the data does not identify ethnicity. Research from Misunderstood 2011 report quoted in BCC Speech Language and Communication Needs Joint Commissioning Strategy 2014-16, authors John Freeman and David Coles - BCC Commissioning
Have you received any other feedback about the Policy in meeting the needs of Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds?	No
You may have evidence from more than one source. If so, does it present a consistent view?	Yes
Is there anything about the Policy and the way it affects Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds which needs highlighting?	No

### **3.2.3 Race - Consultation**

Have you obtained the views of Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds on the impact of the Policy?	Yes
---	-----

If so, how did you obtain these views?	A consultation process was undertaken between the period 22nd February 2016 and 22nd March 2016. The process consisted of 3 consultation events and an online consultation questionnaire available on Be Heard. All stakeholders from all ethnic groups were given the opportunity to engage with the consultation. 179 responses to the consultation questionnaire were received on Be Heard from a range of stakeholders. This included 75 parents, 19 childcare providers from the Private, Voluntary and Independent sectors, 19 Nursery Schools, 44 Schools with a Nursery Class, 26 Early Years Professionals and 24 other - not specified. (For clarity a number of individuals responded under more than one category i.e. as a parent and as a childcare provider) The questionnaire was completed by the following ethnic groups as follows: 111 - white, 1 any other white background, 6 Mixed/multiple ethnic groups, 14 Asian/Asian British, 12 Black African/Caribbean/Black British, 2 Other ethnic group, 3 prefer not to say.
Have you obtained the views of relevant stakeholders on the impact of the Policy on Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds?	Yes

If so, how did you obtain these views?	<p>A consultation process was undertaken between the period 22nd February 2016 and 22nd March 2016. The process consisted of 3 consultation events and an online consultation questionnaire available on Be Heard. All stakeholders from all ethnic groups were given the opportunity to engage with the consultation. 179 responses to the consultation questionnaire were received on Be Heard from a range of stakeholders. This included 75 parents, 19 childcare providers from the Private, Voluntary and Independent sectors, 19 Nursery Schools, 44 Schools with a Nursery Class, 26 Early Years Professionals and 24 other - not specified. (For clarity a number of individuals responded under more than one category i.e. as a parent and as a childcare provider) The questionnaire was completed by the following ethnic groups as follows: 111 - white, 1 any other white background, 6 Mixed/multiple ethnic groups, 14 Asian/Asian British, 12 Black African/Caribbean/Black British, 2 Other ethnic group, 3 prefer not to say.</p> <p>We asked a specific question within the consultation on the impact to this particular group of children. The overwhelming response was having EAL was not a good indicator- on the contrary- having a second language is seen as a positive. Many respondents also stated that good language development(irrespective of language) in a child will most often lead to quick English language acquisition within the statutory 15 hours entitlement without the need for additional hours.</p>
Is there anything about the Policy and the way it affects Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds which needs highlighting?	No

### **3.2.4 Race - Additional Work**

Do you need any more information to complete the assessment?	No
Is there any more work you feel is necessary to complete the assessment?	No
Do you think that the Policy has a role in preventing Individuals from different ethnic backgrounds being treated differently, in an unfair or inappropriate way, just because of their ethnicity?	No
Do you think that the Policy could help foster good relations between persons who share the relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?	No

### **3.3 Concluding Statement on Full Assessment**

After completing a full assessment it is concluded that all due regard to the aims of the duty have been undertaken.

The Assessment has been informed by using robust internal data and the results of a comprehensive stakeholder consultation.

All protected characteristics have been assessed, however Age and Race have been identified as characteristics where the policy will have potential negative impacts. However we believe that the potential negative impacts have been mitigated within the context of the wider eligibility criteria and the universal 15 hours entitlement.

In conclusion we are confident that the revised policy will continue to support our most vulnerable children and will align with the criteria for the Right Service Right Time approach and at the same time ensuring that the service will be delivered within the cash envelope available for the financial year 2016/17.

On going engagement with stakeholders will continue to take place through various forums and close monitoring of the impact of the policy will continue to take place.

### **4 Review Date**

31/03/16

### **5 Action Plan**

There are no relevant issues, so no action plans are currently required.