
**Manchester City Council
Report for Information**

Report to: Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee -
7 February 2012
Executive - 15 February 2012

Subject: Manchester's Early Years Provision – Consultation Responses
and Proposal

Report of: Strategic Director of Children's Services

Summary

Following on from Executive approval, in September 2011, to consult on proposed changes to services for pre-birth to 5 year old children and their families ; this report provides details of the outcomes of the consultation particularly in respect of the quality of services, sufficiency and access to provision, potential impact on low income families and sets out the proposed new approach for approval which takes account of the consultation responses.

Recommendations

Members are recommended to:

1. Note the outcomes of the Early Years consultation
 2. Agree that the Council will become a commissioner of high quality targeted day care for those who require additional support and phase out being a general provider of day care in a planned and sequenced manner where it is satisfied that there is sufficiency of provision in a locality.
 3. Agree the establishment of a universal outreach service as set out in this report, and a targeted approach to work with the most complex families and those at risk of developing complex needs.
 4. Note that the criteria within the Manchester Investment Fund will be extended to ensure that any low-income families who maybe affected by the proposals to phase out being a general provider of day care are supported to enter and remain in work and progress in the labour market
 5. Note that the general designation of Children's Sure Start Centres will be maintained and agree that within this context the Sure Start Estate will be reviewed and re-focussed to provide sustainable community assets where appropriate whilst delivering cost savings as part of the wider corporate review of property being undertaken from April 2012.
-

Wards Affected: All

Community Strategy Spine	Summary of the contribution to the strategy
Performance of the economy of the region and sub region	Create the conditions for economic growth by promoting private, voluntary and independent sector investment in early years service to create jobs and reduce dependency on local authority provision
Reaching full potential in education and employment	Start early to enable parents and their children to reach their full potential through education and work, by supporting parents to work and ensuring children are ready for school when they reach statutory school age Support parents to work by ensuring a flexible and high quality Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) Early Years market. Mitigate any adverse impact on low income families and worklessness through the Manchester Investment Fund
Individual and collective self esteem – mutual respect	Raising parent’s ambition and self esteem and aspiration for themselves, their children, each other and their neighbourhoods
Neighbourhoods of Choice	Supporting neighbourhoods to develop and shape their own early years services alongside and integrated with other community services

Full details are in the body of the report, along with any implications for:

- Equal Opportunities Policy.
- Risk Management.
- Legal Considerations.

Financial Consequences – Revenue

It was agreed by the Executive in September 2011 that the Early Years budget savings agreed in February 2011 would be achieved over a longer timescale up to 2015/16. This was to allow time to ensure market readiness and continuity of essential services as part of a managed transition. The re-phased savings have been incorporated into the medium term financial plan for 2012/13 – 2014/15 funded from the use of one off resources and further savings and mainstream provision. Additional costs to ensure the proposed changes sustain and progress in the labour market the small number of families potentially affected by the day care and tax and benefit changes will be accounted for in the Manchester Investment Fund. The initial analysis indicates costs of no more than £530k per annum. It should be noted that there is considerable uncertainty about the level of resources available to the Council after 2013/14.

Adjustments to the Early Years Single Funding Formula are incorporated in the Budget Report to Executive (15 February) 'Dedicated School's Grant Budget Report 2012 to 2013'.

Financial Consequences – Capital

There may be capital receipts released from day care only settings.

Contact Officers:

Name: Mike Livingstone
Position: Strategic Director, Children's Services
Telephone: 0161 234 1326
E-mail: mike.livingstone@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Jenny Andrews
Position: Deputy Director, Children's Services
Telephone: 0161 234 7014
E-mail: j.andrews@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Rachel Rosewell
Position: Head of Finance, Children's Services
Telephone: 0161 234 3642
E-mail: r.rosewell@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Liz Treacy
Position: Head of Legal Services
Telephone: 0161 234 3339
E-mail: l.treacy@manchester.co.uk

Name: Sharon Kemp
Position: Assistant Chief Executive (People)
Telephone: 0161 234 7966
E-mail: s.kemp@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy please contact one of the contact officers above.

Report to Executive on 16 February 2011 - *Local Government Settlement 2011 - 13; Implications and Strategic Response*

Report to Executive on 16 February 2011 - *Budget proposals for Children's Services*

Report to Executive on 14 September 2011 – *Manchester's Early Year's Provision –*

Response to Financial Settlement

Alterline Research Report - *Manchester City Council – Early Years Consultation
October 2011 - January 2012*

Executive Summary

It is proposed that Early Years services in Manchester will be organised to improve outcomes for young children and their families, with a particular focus on targeting the available resources to the most disadvantaged in order to reduce inequalities in:

- Child Development and School readiness - ensuring that children from pre-birth to age 5 develop well, reach their milestones and are '*school ready*' to take full advantage of learning opportunities presented to them.

Supported by improvements in:

- Parenting Aspirations and Parenting Skills - reducing dependency on services in order that parents/carers have satisfactory parenting skills and are '*child ready*' - able to give their child 'the best start in life' and are aspirational for their children and for themselves
- Child and Family Life and Health Chances - promoting good physical and mental health for both children and their family, supporting parents to improve their personal skills and access education, training or gain employment so that they and their children are '*life-ready*'.

From the consultation the Early Years proposals were generally supported particularly focusing resources on commissioning the targeted offer for those most in need and refocusing buildings as community assets. The proposal to be a commissioner of high quality targeted day care for those who require additional support and phase out being a general provider of day care (809 day care places for children) was not well supported by respondents to the consultation questionnaire. There were three main concerns raised relating to the quality of day care provision, access to this provision and the potential impact on low income families with the increased costs of day care.

In response to the consultation it is proposed that the Council:

- Become a commissioner of high quality targeted day care for those who require additional support and phase out being a general provider of day care in a planned and sequenced manner where it is satisfied that there is sufficiency of provision in a locality.
- Extends the criteria of the Manchester Investment Fund to support the small number of families on a case by case basis where there maybe a risk to remaining in employment due to the movement from a subsidised Council day care service to a market rate for day care.
- Commissions high quality targeted services including day care for those who require additional support on a locality basis in tandem with phasing out general day care provision with ongoing communication and engagement and a two month notice period, prior to any withdrawal provided to parents
- Provides accessible information on the quality and sufficiency of day care provision as prioritised by parents and carers.

- Retain the designation of Children's Sure Start Centres.
- Focus resources on commissioning a targeted family offer for those most in need
- Re-focus buildings as sustainable community assets so they are open for longer, local usage is increased with a more integrated range of provision within them

1. Introduction

- 1.1 A suite of reports agreed by Executive on 16th February 2011 outlined the Council's response to the Local Government Settlement. In developing these reports, the Council used a set of principles based upon leadership for reform and the provision of universal services, targeted services, neighbourhoods and core services to guide the challenging budget decisions and shape the delivery of its services so that the reducing resource base is used to best effect.
- 1.2 This cohesive set of budget proposals agreed by the Executive in February 2011 provided the context within which the Early Year consultation proposals were developed, namely, focusing reducing resources on targeted services for those in most need or at risk of being in need and creating the conditions to enable other stakeholders to move into the provision of universal services where the Council can longer afford to deliver these services. The budget proposals also demonstrated how the Council would move to a different model through aligning its diminishing resources to its priorities: the creation of growth and reducing dependency whilst safeguarding the vulnerable.
- 1.3 In the context of the overall budget, the savings target for Manchester's Early Years Service was £22.1m (£10.5m by 1st April 2012, and a further £11.6m by 1st April 2013). High level proposals were agreed which would be subject to a further more detailed Executive Report, the outcome of consultation and full consideration of equality impact assessments.
- 1.4 Children's Services articulated the Directorate's strategic role as champions for children, particularly the most vulnerable, as part of the Council wide budget setting process with four explicit aims:
 - i. To focus our more limited budget to effectively safeguard the most vulnerable;
 - ii. To be at the forefront of public service reform by leading the development of new models of investment and integrated commissioning and delivery of services;
 - iii. To lead and develop collaborative partnerships beyond institutional barriers so as to influence external leaders of universal services, especially schools, to raise standards for all and to play their full part in children, young people and families developing skills as well as realising their potential in education and employment;
 - iv. To lead neighbourhood development with Neighbourhood Services and Regeneration.
- 1.5 As part of the budget setting process the Manchester Investment Fund was created which pulled together funding of £36m including £6m relating to the provision of targeted early years services to develop new delivery models which

integrate the delivery of services around families and individuals who have complex needs or who are at risk of developing complex needs.

- 1.6 This activity is important in demonstrating the way the Council is focusing on supporting people in most need in the most effective and efficient way as its resource base reduces. The key to public service reform is enabling independence and reducing dependency and to do this the resource base of all stakeholders needs to be aligned with the intent to jointly deliver or commission services in an integrated manner to best effect. This enables the delivery of services by those who are best placed to do so and enables the Council to encourage and stimulate those organisations whilst deploying its reducing resources to support those in most need.
- 1.7 This new delivery model forms one of the exemplar projects across Greater Manchester selected by the Government to demonstrate the concepts of community budgets across a whole place.
- 1.8 On 14th September 2011 more detailed proposals for the future of Early Years were agreed by the Executive for consultation based upon a number of key principles:
 - i. The requirement for the Local Authority to continue to deliver its statutory duties under the Child Care Act 2006.
 - ii. Ensuring delivery of the most effective outcomes with the resources available
 - iii. Supporting the Manchester Investment Fund approach to complex families and those at risk of developing complex needs.
 - iv. Developing the neighbourhood approach and focusing on supporting external leaders of universal services to raise standards to enable the Council's role to increasingly relate to strategic commissioning, planning provision to meet need, and ensuring a sufficiency of services of the highest standards.
 - v. The requirement for enhanced capacity and focus within the Council for quality assurance and market development.
 - vi. Rephasing of the remaining savings (£11.6million) phased between 2012-16.
- 1.9 In summary the reports to Executive in February and September set out the Council's role to include some direct provision but increasingly to relate to strategic commissioning, planning provision to meet need, and ensuring the delivery of the highest standards of services. The reports also state that the Council's role must be to ensure that Universal services play their full part in reducing dependency and promoting growth. The development of the neighbourhoods approach and its implementation has seen budgets becoming more neighbourhood focussed wherever possible with the creation of

integrated delivery teams. This approach is guiding the provision of services within neighbourhoods and an integrated commissioning approach is currently being implemented with regards to youth which demonstrates this important neighbourhood focus in action.

- 1.10 This Report will set out the current Early Years offer in the City, details of the consultation process and outcome, and the final proposals based on a consideration of the feedback received, the equality impact assessment and the Council's statutory obligations. It will then confirm the form of the proposed new Early Years Offer.

2. The Current Early Years Offer

- 2.1 The City Council currently delivers services and its statutory obligations with regard to Early Years through the following resources and services:

- 2.2 68 premises spread across the city provide a varied menu of activities for children and families as well as targeted support and intervention for vulnerable families. Information, advice and guidance is also available

- i. The centres provide a venue for service delivery for other agencies including Health, Manchester Adult Education Service, Job Centre Plus, private and voluntary sector childcare providers.
- ii. Services are also commissioned from partner agencies in the private, voluntary and Health sectors and delivered at the centres.
- iii. Manchester City Council is also a provider of day care for 0-5 year olds with 11% of the market in 24 locations across the City. At the October 2011 census there were 809 children in MCC provided day care. This equates to 2.4% of all 0-5s in the City. Some of these children will be living outside the City and some will be children of MCC employees.

- 2.3 The quality and impact of the current offer is variable and the reach on average is less than one third of 0-5's in the City.

3. Consultation

- 3.1 The formal 90 day consultation on the early years proposals began on Monday 3rd October 2011 and closed on 2nd January 2012. The consultation as set out in the September report focused on the Council's strategy to transform early years services, underpinned by proposals to:

- i. Cease to be a provider of universal day care services in a phased and sequenced manner over time as there is confidence in the quality and coverage of provision;
- ii. Focus resources on commissioning the targeted family offer for those most in need;

- iii. Re-focus buildings as community assets.
- 3.2 The consultation provided a range of ways for individuals to provide their views and a range of strategies were deployed to ensure the widest possible range of Manchester resident participated in the consultation. There were over 4,700 responses to the questionnaire, contact with over 8000 parent/carers and over 60 public consultation events took place.
- 3.3 Parents and key groups were specifically targeted throughout the consultation to ensure sufficient and appropriate opportunity for those affected by the proposals to respond. These strategies were successful with an excellent reach to parents, BME communities and across different neighbourhoods within the City.
- 3.4 As part of the Budget setting process in early 2011 the Council received a number of petitions and supporting material from the Save Our Sure Start Campaign. The submissions at that time equated to about 1,700 signatures from people who were concerned about or opposed to various parts of the Sure Start proposals as they understood them. Details of the submissions are set out in the report to Council – Response to Budget Consultations March 2011 Report. Three further petitions were received on 1st February 2012. One petition is headed 'Keep Manchester Sure Start Public' and contains 1396 names, the second is from Friends of Sure Start Wythenshawe and is a petition to 'Save Sure Start in Wythenshawe - 763 names, and the third is a petition 'to stop the closure of Sale Road Sure Start Childrens Centre' with 182 names. The petitions are being checked for validity and an oral update will be provided to members at the Executive meeting.
- 3.5 During the present consultation process, officers have met regularly with the Sure Our Start Campaign and provided opportunities for issues on the current proposals to be raised. Amongst other matters reflected below specific questions were raised regarding the Council's ability to access finance from named partnerships, this has been reviewed and whilst they generate a variety of income sources to the Council these are already captured in the budget and support the Council budget overall and services in general.
- 3.6 An independent company was commissioned to analyse the responses to the consultation which includes questionnaires, letters from stakeholders and feedback from the numerous meetings. A full copy of the report from the independent company is available as a background paper.

4. Consultation outcomes and proposals

An analysis of the responses to the three proposals; any changes to be considered and the final proposals for agreement are detailed below:

Proposal 1: Cease to be a provider of universal day care services in a phased and sequenced manner over time as there is confidence in the

quality and coverage of provision

Consultation Findings - Proposal 1

- 4.1 Two thirds of respondents 67.8% (3,109 respondents) were not in support of the Council withdrawing from day care. However of those that were not in support a significant proportion felt that they could make alternative arrangements should the proposal be implemented. Therefore, leaving just over a third of all the respondents (38.5%) that disagree with the proposal and also feel that they would not be able to make alternative day care arrangements..
- 4.2 Of the 12.7% (583 respondents) who agreed with the proposal, 41% (204 respondents) indicated that their day care arrangements would directly be affected by the proposal. It should be noted however, that that there was some apparent confusion amongst respondents over whether or not they were recipients of Council day care, with 1,400 responses claiming to be users of the provision. This compares to 809 actual children in Council day care and therefore would indicate either multiple responses from individual families or people under the misconception that the provision they use is City Council provision.
- 4.3 Overall, there was recognition from some respondents of the economic climate and the impact on Council services. There were a number of comments from the survey around the proposals and the affordability of day care particularly in relation to parents being able to stay in work. It was noted by respondents that the Council day care rates are significantly lower than in the PVI sector with some concerns raised about affordability of these changes for low income families. Assurance was sought that there will be sufficient and safe good quality Early Years provision in the City. Respondents were asked what the Council could do to help give them confidence in the quality of day care provided. The top three most important activities are:
- i. Make the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) reports more accessible (48.5%)
 - ii. Tell me where the quality providers are located and the services they provide (42.5%)
 - iii. Make the results of Manchester's own Early Year's Quality Assurance Framework available (37%)
- 4.4 A consolidated response was received from the Director of Public Health signed and supported by all three Chairs of the Clinical Commissioning Groups, the three Chief Executives of Acute Providers and the Chief Executive of the Mental Health Trust. They stated they understood the reasons for these proposed changes, and accepted that Manchester City Council needs to be more in line with other Councils in Greater Manchester. They supported a 'needs-based', equitable and flexible approach to the allocation of day care places.

- 4.5 A range of responses were received from Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) providers both through written representation and attendance at specific events held for them. The PVI sector has a long history of delivering effective interventions with families. PVI providers stated that they had feedback from parents confirming their satisfaction with the quality of their day care provision. The PVI sector understands the reason for, and content of, these proposals and many welcomed the opportunities they create for the PVI sector. It is arguable that the Council's day care operation may be having an adverse impact on the functioning of the day care market within the city discouraging investment and growth.
- 4.6 There is a belief in the sector that they are able and have the capacity to fill the 809 day care places currently provided by the Council. The sector also stated that the role and capacity of Childminders is underestimated in the City; with the right support they could deliver more, and that there is a need to learn from best practice examples across the City. They stated that in places the performance of the PVI sector is rated highly by Ofsted. The Sector did have concerns over the possible impact on lower income families, that there is a need to engage with communities and parents in an ongoing dialogue about these changes, and that the reduction of hours in day care needs to be done safely.

The Council's Response to the Consultation Findings - Proposal 1

- 4.7 In summary there were three main issues raised with regard to the proposal to cease to be a provider of universal day care namely:
- the quality of provision.
 - how sufficiency of and local access to provision is ensured and
 - the affordability of services, particularly the impact of these changes on lower income families,

- 4.8 Detailed responses to the three main areas of concern are set out in the paragraphs below:

Quality of provision

- 4.9 The most important activities prioritised by respondents in relation to quality of provision was for Ofsted Reports and the results from the Council's Early Years Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) to be made available and accessible. The Council will make arrangements to communicate outcomes of Ofsted inspections and internal Quality Assurance reviews.
- 4.10 Investigation is now underway in response to the consultation to see if the Early Years Quality Assurance Framework can be developed into a 'kite mark' quality standard. This assessment of local outcomes using the Early Years Quality assurance Framework (QAF) is explicitly linked to the Early Years Foundation Stage Framework. It ensures that settings, including childminders, focus on evaluating and improving the quality of major areas of provision

including leadership and management, care and welfare, learning and development, outcomes for children, inclusion, transition and partnership. This framework is being used by a number of other Councils across the region.

- i. The quality of each area of provision is judged and senior quality assurance officers visit settings regularly to confirm the accuracy of evaluations and provide challenge for further improvements. The use of the Quality Assurance Framework across the City ensures that quality can be sustained and that gaps in provision can be identified and appropriate action taken by the LA and the setting.
 - ii. 100% of private providers in the city are engaged with the QA framework and QA framework gradings indicate there is evidence of improvement over time as a result of this involvement.
 - iii. There are 471 registered childminders in the city. Of the 340 with registered Ofsted outcomes. The quality of childcare is monitored through pre -registration assessment, Ofsted outcomes, network monitoring visits, accreditation assessments, peer support networks and childminder drop-ins
- 4.11 A report on the senior management structure of Children's Services to Personnel Committee in November 2011 approved senior leadership arrangements to strengthen the existing quality assurance function.
- 4.12 While proposing to phase out being a general provider of day care the Council will continue to be a commissioner of targeted day care for disadvantaged 2, 3 and 4 year olds. As a commissioner this enables the council to exert some influence over the range and quality of providers who enter the market and from whom the council will procure services. As a commissioner the council will want to procure targeted services from small local organisations, possibly including schools, who provide high quality and affordable care but also provide universal and targeted places.

Sufficiency of Provision

- 4.13 The Council is in the unusual position of being a provider of day care in 24 locations around the city. There is no other Council which operates day care on the scale that Manchester does in proportion to the overall market. The Council subsidises this provision at considerable cost and can no longer afford to do so.
- 4.14 Whilst the proportion of day care provided is larger than other local authorities, the City Council is still a comparatively small provider within the market. These places can be provided within the PVI sector. An analysis of capacity in the PVI sector has been independently verified. A recent poll of over 80% (66/80) of PVI sector day care providers has revealed an average occupancy rate of only 75%, (3,095 out of a total 4,128 full time places) which means there is significant spare capacity within the current non-local authority provision.

These figures exclude childminders.

- 4.15 It is arguable that the Council's day care operation may be having an adverse impact on the functioning of the day care market within the city discouraging investment and growth. For example 6 of the 10 largest national day care operators have no provision within Manchester
- 4.16 The proposal to phase out being a general provider of day care recognised the potential risks with regard to sufficiency and quality and the report to the Executive in September 2011 noted the mitigation of these through phasing and sequencing to enable the Council to satisfy itself about the sufficiency and quality of day care provision. The report also noted the rephasing of the savings over a longer period to enable the Council to satisfy itself and in consideration of customers to ensure a managed transition. The PVI providers welcomed the opportunities that the Council's withdrawal would create and believe they are able and have the capacity to fill the 809 day care places currently provided by the Council. There are circa. 5,000 places provided by the PVI Sector and circa. 1,000 places provided by childminders. While there is spare capacity in the current market it is acknowledged that the available spaces may not be of the right type or in the right place. Ensuring local access to the right type of day care provision will be an essential consideration before any decision is made to withdraw council provision in a locality.
- 4.17 The Council proposes to phase out being a general provider of day care only as it has the confidence that there is quality and sufficiency within the market. It will continue to remain a provider of last resort. It is proposed that this will take place over two years on a locality by locality basis with 50% withdrawal by 31 March 2013 and full withdrawal by 31 March 2014.
- 4.18 There will be ongoing communication and engagement with local members, all stakeholders, and a two months notice period, prior to any withdrawal, provided to parents.
- 4.19 The phasing out of being a general provider of day care will be subject to further independent verification of sufficiency.
- 4.20 Children's Services will ensure it has the capacity and skills to develop the day care market, including child minding, through strengthened Market Development, Quality Assurance and Supplier / contract management arrangements
- 4.21 There will be a regular review of progress including the production of an Annual Business Plan to assist in mitigating any risks and uncertainties in market development and sufficiency.
- 4.22 The Council will develop a comprehensive communications strategy that will ensure parents know where services are provided, will incorporate the information parents have requested about quality of services and will dispel myths about low quality and availability of PVI services

Affordability

- 4.23 From the consultation a number of respondents and partner organisations were concerned that the proposal to withdraw from day care could affect the ability of some families, particularly those on lower incomes, to remain in employment. It should be noted that this was a generic statement about this group rather than a personal statement about individual circumstances and intentions. It is also worthy to note that even without the Council's provision child care costs in the North West of England are less than the national average.
- 4.24 At October 2011 there was a total headcount of 809 children using the Council's universal day care provision, 86% (c,696) were fee paying places and of these 19% were Manchester City Council Employees. 14% (c113) of the 809 children were fee-free Child in Need places. The 809 children come from approximately 770 families
- 4.25 The proposals will make no financial change to approximately 107 families who access the 113 fee- free Children in Need places.
- 4.26 For the 86% (c696 children from approximately 663 families) who are fee paying, the proposals could mean increases of between £11 and £37 per week dependant upon individual family circumstances. The actual impact will be specific to the circumstances of each family and no specific data is available around the economic circumstances of these families as this is not collected. Therefore assumptions of individual impact cannot be made. Broad analysis would suggest that not all families using the day care places will be of low income and those whose continued employment may be at risk due to lower income could be between 15% and 54%.
- 4.33 Creating the conditions for economic growth and reducing worklessness are key priorities within the Community Strategy and to mitigate the risk that increased day care costs may potentially contribute to a decision to withdraw from the labour market for some families. which could increase dependence on, and costs to public services. it is proposed that the Manchester Investment Fund would provide an appropriate framework to provide support through:
- Extending the criteria to enable consideration of financial or other support for those people who may be forced out of work by paying the market rate for day care provision;
 - Developing capacity and a system to enable a case by case review by professionals within the Early Years Services against clear criteria so that as being a provider of general day care is phased out on a locality basis, those that may require support to stay in work can access support through the Manchester Investment Fund

4.35 In summary the Council's response to Proposal 1 is:

The Council will:

- Agree that the Council will become a commissioner of high quality targeted day care for those who require additional support and phase out being a general provider of day care in a planned and sequenced manner where it is satisfied that there is sufficiency of provision in a locality.
- Extend the criteria of the Manchester Investment Fund to support the small number of families on a case by case basis to maintain employment that may be at risk due to the movement from a subsidised Council day care service to market rate for day care.
- Commission high quality targeted services including day care for those who require additional support. This will take place on a locality basis in tandem with the phasing out of being a general day care provider with ongoing communication and engagement and a two month notice period, prior to any withdrawal provided to parents

Proposal 2

5. Focus resources on commissioning the targeted family offer for those most in need

Consultation Findings Proposal 2

- 5.1 Over half (55.8%) of respondents to the survey support the proposal to focus services on those families most in need.
- 5.2 In response to how they would feel about a family worker visiting their home during the early stage of parenthood to offer support and advice, just over half (54%) of respondents said that they would welcome any support and advice. A third (35.3%) would prefer to ask if they needed advice, 6.2% did not like it but understood why it was important, and 4.6% said that they would resist it.
- 5.3 Respondents to the survey noted that there needs to be clarity about the criteria that are going to be used to target services. In particular it was requested that income would not be necessarily the only criteria for assessment.
- 5.4 There were some concerns expressed by respondents about risk to children with the proposed changes. There were also some comments from respondents about the perception and potential stigmatisation of families who will start receiving targeted services, potential for duplication with other services, and a belief among some respondents that the service should be universal.
- 5.5 In general, there was agreement from organisations that there is a need to focus on those most in need. In their response to the consultation, partners and stakeholders suggested that the Council could commission the Outreach service from a non-Council organisation. There was interest from the

Voluntary Sector in the delivery of certain services such as family support and outreach work. Stakeholders and partners gave a commitment to work closely with the Council on the implementation of these changes.

- 5.6 There were some concerns expressed about potential duplication with other services, for example the Health Visiting Service. However from Health there was also a commitment to work together on the delivery of this new approach and a desire to see Health Visiting playing a more pivotal role in the delivery of the new outreach model.
- 5.7 The Chair of the Manchester Children's Safeguarding Board (MCSB) provided a consolidated response on behalf of the Board. There was full support for the proposals from the MCSB and strong support for refocusing on families in greatest need and a 'needs based' approach at a local level. The Board also noted that the proposals will potentially strengthen the level of service and support to those families who are identified as needing more than universal support, and that the proposals are seen as a significant part of what will become the 'early help' offer.
- 5.8 The PVI sector believe they can run more than just day care but also family intervention support and the outreach service. It was also noted in the consultation that PVI providers thought they were better at reaching complex families and those at risk of developing complex needs than Council Services.

The Council's Response to the Consultation Findings - Proposal 2

- 5.9 Learning from good practice including the Ardwick City Pilot and other areas such as Old Moat Children's Centre will be used to focus resources on commissioning the targeted family offer for those most in need and ensure through the market development process that there is a plurality of providers available.
- 5.10 A phased approach to implementation by locality and ongoing communication with local members and stakeholders will be undertaken to enable local circumstances to shape the extent and way services are commissioned and/or delivered directly by the council.
- 5.11 The work being undertaken as part of Community Budgets provides an effective platform and new opportunities to align and integrate services where appropriate to maximise outcomes for children and families. Work will be undertaken with Health colleagues to address issues regarding potential duplication of roles as part of the joint work on the Healthy Child Programme and pathway. Integrated service delivery will remain a key principle guiding the development of the Early Years Outreach Services and the re-design of the Health Visiting Service. The Council will work with partners to focus on the core purpose to ensure children are school ready, and parents are child ready.
- 5.12 The proposed eligibility criteria for the targeted offer for disadvantaged two year olds and three and four year olds will be clearly communicated and is set out in Appendix A.

- 5.13 The Council will continue to ensure effective safeguarding and the delivery of its statutory obligations.
- 5.14 Appropriate and effective communication channels will be considered as part of an integrated communications strategy, this will also consider the issue of perceptions of families accessing the targeted service.

In summary the Council's response to Proposal 2 is:

- 5.15 This proposal was welcomed by the majority of respondents to the consultation, it will support and develop the delivery of the Sure Start requirements and also promote a reduction in dependency as part of the reform of public services.
- 5.16 It is therefore recommended that the Council focus resources on commissioning the targeted family offer for those most in need

6. Proposal 3

Re-focusing Buildings as Community Assets

Consultation Findings Proposal 3

- 6.1 Overall the consultation noted that Children Centres are seen as valuable community assets and there is support for increased local usage. Almost two thirds (66.2%) of parents and service users were supportive of buildings being used as community assets. Health colleagues endorsed the use of buildings with a more integrated range of provision within them. Also it was noted in the consultation that there should be more information on how volunteering could be developed to increase skills and self sufficiency within communities and also as routes into work. Some PVI providers stated that they would be interested in space within buildings if the rent was affordable. A wide range of suggestions for extending the use of buildings were put forward by survey respondents.
- 6.2 Some concerns expressed related specifically to rent and cost issues and the amount of early years provision available in each building.
- 6.3 Initial discussions with schools have indicated a willingness to explore the opportunities that these proposals bring including providing additional teaching spaces for the increasing number of children who require a reception class place.

The Council's Response to the Consultation Findings Proposal 3

- 6.4 The general designation of Children's Sure Start Centre's will be maintained. This means that the Centres will continue to be used to deliver the Council's Sure Start obligations as well as other services.

- 6.5 A phased approach by locality will be undertaken with the engagement of local members and other local stakeholders.
- 6.6 Information will be provided on which services will be commissioned by the Council and what funding will be available.
- 6.7 The Council will engage in ongoing dialogue and engagement at a local level to ensure that local people have a voice in what happens in their local children's centre and a communications strategy will support continuous dialogue with local residents
- 6.8 The safeguarding and quality assurance function will remain with the local authority and these areas will be enhanced as described elsewhere in this report.
- 6.9 A phased programme will be developed in April 2012 and run through until March 2015 as part of the wider corporate review of property to deliver the efficiencies and savings required.

In summary the Council's response to Proposal 3 is:

- 6.10 This proposal was welcomed by respondents to the consultation and it is therefore recommended that the Sure Start estate will be re-focused as community assets where appropriate; and that the general designation of Sure Start Centres will be retained in recognition of their role to provide early help to families, to promote independence and reduce dependency.

7. Equality Impact Assessment

- 7.1 The requirements of Section 149 of the Equality Act state that public bodies must have due regard to the need to:
 - i. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act.
 - ii. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and
 - iii. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.
- 7.2 The Directorate has carried out a comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment of the proposals and a copy of the full EIA is attached at Appendix B. The assessment considered in detail what impact the proposals could have on the protected characteristics: age, disability, gender re-assignment, pregnancy, maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 7.3 These proposals could have a detrimental impact on some users of the service, however, a summary of how the impact will be mitigated for the main areas of race, disability and gender are set out below and in more detail in the

full EIA

- i. The Early Years commissioning framework will make sure the needs of BME groups are addressed as part of the targeted offer. This may need to include specific activities working with minority groups, specific focus on certain localities and specific targeting for example for traveller communities.
 - ii. For children with disabilities the continuation of the six Specialist Resource Centres will ensure continued focus on the needs of this group and the commissioning proposals together with the development of the market will make sure that children with disabilities have full access to all services.
 - iii. On issues of gender it will be important to ensure key activities continue to take into account the needs of lone parents and fathers.
- 7.4 The development of the universal outreach approach, closer working with health services and the targeting of resources on those in greatest need all mitigate potential impact of these changes.
- 7.5 Officers are therefore satisfied that the concerns expressed by consultees can be addressed and mitigated; that there will not be a disproportionate impact on those groups with protected characteristics; and that the EIA action plan will address all identified issues.

8. The New Early Years Offer

- 8.1 The details of the proposed early years offer have been refined following the consultation and taking into account the proposed responses and mitigations set out in earlier sections.

Proposed Model

- 8.2 The proposed Early Years approach will include the following functions:
- Local leadership for the sufficiency and quality of the Early Years Core Offer/Purpose
 - Universal outreach and targeted additional support using the Manchester Investment Fund
 - Quality assurance and sufficiency
 - Market Development and Market Management
 - Commissioning of targeted offer
 - Facilities management
 - Business Support

Universal Offer

- 8.3 The Sure Start core offer will continue to be delivered through the designated centres including information, advice and guidance.

- 8.4 There will be access to and information about child care. Manchester will continue to have a key role in ensuring there is a sufficiency of childcare provision across the city of the right quality and in developing and managing the market at a locality level
- 8.5 Working closely with health partners the proposed universal outreach service will support the delivery of the Healthy Child Programme. Every child will be visited at home during the first weeks of life, and families will subsequently receive each month a copy of 'Baby Express' providing information in an accessible form on child development and associated activities.
- 8.6 The universal free entitlement to 15 hours early education for 3-4 year olds will continue to be delivered by schools and the private, voluntary and independent sector childcare market.

Targeted Offer

- 8.7 Information gathered through the universal outreach visits will be used to target resources for early help, and to protect the most vulnerable. There will be a case by case assessment of those families potentially affected by the phased withdrawal from day care and additional support available to sustain them in work and to progress in the labour market. This approach will be aligned with work being undertaken by Neighbourhood Services and Regeneration Teams to develop integrated commissioning at a neighbourhood level to tackle worklessness and other priorities.
- 8.8 There are currently 400 places available for disadvantaged two year olds; this will increase over the next three years.
- 8.9 For disadvantaged 3 and 4 year olds or those with additional needs, provision above the statutory 15 hours will be available.

Buildings

- 8.9 Work on the review and refocusing of buildings will be led by Neighbourhood Services with the objective of enabling multi-community usage and varied service provision within local neighbourhoods where possible. Proposals are being developed in the context of the current corporate property rationalisation programme and will focus on cost reduction and delivering the savings in the Medium Term Financial Plan.
- 8.10 Consideration will be given to buildings being open for longer hours than is currently the case, providing a base for a range of services for the whole community and meeting spaces for neighbourhood and community groups. This in turn may enable alternative Council buildings in localities to close and to consolidate activity on one site.
- 8.11 This approach will be underpinned by the need to ensure that a sustainable

business plan is created for each building. A rental charge will be levied to all providers and community groups using the building.

- 8.12 A number of existing buildings are located on or near school sites and there is clear potential for these premises to be operated by the schools themselves.
- 8.13 As proposals are brought forward there will be significant community engagement on locality basis.

9. Capacity to deliver the new model

- 9.1 A discrete project team bringing together expertise from across various Council Services will develop and oversee the delivery of locality plans reporting to the Council's Strategic Management Team. In support of the functions listed, there will be a small commissioning team. This team under the leadership of the Assistant Director, Strategic Commissioning will incorporate a number of outreach workers and early years commissioners with responsibility for the delivery of the early years core offer at a neighbourhood level and a sufficiency of provision to maintain the designated status across the forty designated children's centres. It will include working with the Manchester Investment Fund to ensure the commissioning of targeted services for children with additional or complex needs and that any low-income families affected by the proposals to withdraw from being a provider of universal day care are supported to enter and remain in work and progress in the labour market.
- 9.2 A childcare sufficiency lead will have responsibility for the Council's statutory responsibilities in ensuring there is adequate childcare available to match need in the city. Existing quality assurance arrangements will be strengthened and there will be a focus on market development and management.
- 9.3 Work will be undertaken with colleagues in Neighbourhood Services to ensure the right reception and facilities management capacity is in place to support the operation of buildings as community hubs. In addition actions will be undertaken to ensure that each centre has the right leadership to manage and coordinate activities both within the building and the wider community; these will be developed in the next phase of work.
- 9.4 There are a range of support functions and work with colleagues in the corporate core will be undertaken to ensure adequate capacity is in place in the Performance, Research and Intelligence Service, contact centre, finance and contract management to support the effective functioning of the new early years model.

10. Staffing Implications

- 10.1 There are currently circa 500 fte within the service. The new model would see this reduce to circa. 100 fte by March 2014, this would be a reduction of circa

400 fte over two years. However, when natural turnover to March 2014 is taken into account this reduces the required reduction to circa. 360fte.

- 10.2 Approximately 112 Early Years staff have already opted into **m people** and a commitment has already been made to consider their release to other opportunities aligned to the implementation plan for withdrawal from day care.
- 10.3 Approval of the proposals within this report will be subject to a requirement for a formal period of consultation with the Trade Unions on the workforce implications for a minimum of three months. As part of this consultation engagement with staff and Trade Unions will be undertaken. Individual support will be available along with information on other roles available across the Council as well as opportunities to retrain. This approach is in line with the **m people** principles of supporting and developing a flexible workforce.
- 10.4 Consideration will also be given during this consultation to a possible targeted enhanced VER/VS scheme for the Early Years. At the time the enhanced VER/VS scheme was made available, staff were informed it would be likely they would TUPE transfer to new providers and it can be assumed that a number of staff did not apply for VER/VS because they would have been content to TUPE and remain working in childcare. In order to provide staff with the opportunity to fully consider their options in the light of any agreed model as well as the promoting the roles available within the Council and the opportunities to retrain, consideration will be given to the possibility of a targeted enhanced VER/VS scheme. Any proposal to instigate such a scheme would be submitted to Executive and Personnel after the three month consultation period.

11. Financial Implications

- 11.1 It was agreed by the Executive in September 2011 that the early years budget savings agreed in February 2011 would be achieved over a longer timescale up to 2015/16. This was to allow time to ensure market readiness and ensure continuity of essential services as part of managed transition. The re-phased savings have been incorporated into the medium term financial plan for 2012/13 – 2014/15 funded from use of one off resources, further Children's Services savings now identified and mainstream provision. One off resources includes the utilisation of past early years grants.
- 11.2 Additional costs to ensure the proposed changes sustain and progress in the labour market the small number of families potentially affected by the day care and tax and benefit changes will be accounted for in the Manchester Investment Fund. The initial analysis indicates costs of no more than £530k per annum. It should be noted that there is considerable uncertainty about the level of resources available to the Council after 2013/14.
- 11.3 The proposals made in this report will deliver the savings required by 2015/16 as agreed in September 2011. This includes the savings that are required from the re-focusing of Children's Centres as community assets by April 2015

and the phased withdrawal from day care provision of 50% by April 2013 and 100% by April 2014.

- 11.4 The table below (to be confirmed) shows the planned budget over the next four years, which will be required to meet the cost of the proposed new early years service.

Early Years Medium Term Financial Plan	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
	£000	£000	£000	£000
PLANNED EXPENDITURE				
Total Children's Centres (inc Day Care)	11,450	5,300	1,000	500
Outreach	450	1,500	1,500	1,500
Sufficiency and Quality Assurance	475	795	795	795
Development and support	225	205	205	205
Total Universal	12,600	7,800	3,500	3,000
Early Intervention	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100
Disabled Children - Special Needs	700	700	700	700
Targeted Childcare for under twos	300	500	500	500
Total Targeted	4,100	4,300	4,300	4,300
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	16,700	12,100	7,800	7,300
FUNDING				
Early Years cashlimit budget	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Dedicated Schools Grant	2,000	2,000		
One-off Mainstream Funding	2,300			
Use of reserves	2,300			
Further identified savings in 2012/13 MTFP	3,100	3,100	800	300
TOTAL FUNDING	16,700	12,100	7,800	7,300

12. Summary

- 12.1 The Council has undertaken a comprehensive and transparent consultation process on three significant proposals to reshape the future of early years provision in the City. The principles behind the proposals are well documented in this and previous reports to the Executive. Whilst there is an understanding of the context, it is inevitable that the proposals have generated concern. These concerns are reflected in the Council's response through mitigating actions such as the extension to the criteria of the Manchester Investment Fund and it is the view of Officers that the final proposals respond positively to the concerns and issues raised. Any residual concerns will be addressed as part of the ongoing dialogue and engagement on a locality basis or on a case by case basis through the support provided via the Manchester Investment Fund.
- 12.2 In conclusion, these proposals if implemented will enable the Council to ensure that there are sufficient resources for safeguarding the most vulnerable within the City; that new models of service delivery, through commissioning and targeting resources effectively will enable people to make choices about the services they require.

13. Next Steps

13.1 Subject to approval to the recommendations detailed below the following actions will be undertaken:

- A detailed phased plan to become a commissioner of high quality targeted day care for those who require additional support and phase out being a general provider of day care in a planned and sequenced manner where there is satisfaction that there is sufficiency of provision in a locality will be developed on a locality basis. This will be subject to independent verification of sufficiency and two months notice will be given to parents prior to the decision to withdraw from day care.
- Arrangements for local stakeholder engagement in localities will be put in place to ensure ongoing dialogue and involvement in the re-focussing of buildings as Community Assets. A detailed and phased plan for the refocusing of the buildings on a building by building basis will be developed, supported by clear business plans. This approach will ensure that centres will continue to be used to deliver the Council's Sure Start obligations as well as increasing the use of the buildings by other services, partners or the local community.
- Formal consultation with Trade Union representatives will be undertaken over a three month period. Support will be made available to staff in considering opportunities to access other roles within the Council and consideration will also be given to a targeted enhanced VER/VS Scheme.
- There will be ongoing dialogue and engagement with partners and service users regarding the development of the Early Years core offer and the implementation of the proposed model
- Arrangements will be put in place with health partners to ensure that there is an integrated approach to the development and design of the early years outreach services and the redesign of the health visiting service.

14. Recommendations

14.1 Having considered the outcome of the consultation and the Council's Statutory responsibilities the Director of Children's Services is satisfied that implementation of the proposals will enable the authority to meet its Early Years obligations and its corporate aims of creating the conditions for growth, reducing worklessness and dependency and safeguarding the most vulnerable,

14.2 Members are therefore recommended to:

1. Note the outcomes of the Early Years Consultation
2. Agree that the Council will become a commissioner of high quality targeted day care for those who require additional support and phase out

being a general provider of day care in a planned and sequenced manner where it is satisfied that there is sufficiency of provision in a locality

3. Agree the establishment of a universal outreach service as set out in this report, and a targeted approach to work with the most complex families and those at risk of developing complex needs
4. Note that provision will be made within the Manchester Investment Fund to ensure that any low-income families affected by the proposals to withdraw from being a provider of universal day care are supported to enter and remain in work and progress in the labour market
5. Note that the general designation of Children's Sure Start Centres will be maintained and agree that within this context the Sure Start Estate will be reviewed and re-focussed to provide sustainable community assets where appropriate whilst delivering cost savings as part of the wider corporate review of property being undertaken from April 2012.

Appendix A - Proposed criteria for full time places and additional provision for three and four year olds above the statutory 15 hours per week.

The proposal is for a universal offer of the statutory 15 hours per week (term time only) in both primary school nursery classes and the private, voluntary and independent sector, which meets the Council's statutory requirements. Additional provision above the 15 hours statutory provision or full-time places in schools can be provided for children that are Manchester residents with additional needs and/or those from a disadvantaged background that meet defined criteria. The proposed criteria has two levels:

Level 1

In order to be eligible for additional hours or a full time place the child must be a Manchester resident or a Manchester Looked After Child with a placement outside the city's boundaries. Once this criteria has been satisfied any of the following criteria would be applicable to offer additional hours in the PVI sector or a full-time place in a school

1. Looked after children, or who have been allocated a social worker who has referred a child for a full-time place or has an agreed Child Protection Plan
2. Children with a disability or SEN, based on the definition under section 7 of the Children Act 1989. This could also include children who have an observable disability which has not yet been formally assessed, however would otherwise meet the definition of disability. We acknowledge some children may not yet be "in the system" and schools may be the first service to identify an unmet need for a child
3. Family has an allocated Complex Families Team worker who has referred a child for a full time place or has an agreed Family / Parent Action Plan: this could be either the Family Intervention Project (FIP); Families First; or, on one of the parenting courses delivered by this team.
4. Other criteria in line with the current criteria for the Childcare Commissioning Team.

Level 2

The school may also select additional criteria to offer a full-time place. Children in circumstances where the head teacher / Governing Body consider a full-time place could be beneficial. Again the child must be a Manchester resident or a Manchester Looked After Child with a placement outside the city's boundaries. Once this criteria has been satisfied any of the following criteria would be applicable to offer a full-time place in a school:

1. Home postcode is in the 50% most deprived areas in the country using IDACI.
 - a. The Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) index is calculated by Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and measures in a local area, the proportion of children under the age of 16 that live in low income households. The local areas for which the index is calculated

- are Super Output Areas (SOAs) which are a set of geographical areas developed following the 2001 census.
- b. Schools will be provided with IDACI postcode information for children in the Nursery each year for planning purposes. For applying the eligibility criteria schools will be provided with a list of postcodes in Manchester that are in the top 50% most deprived areas.
2. Children eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) - Parents do not have to pay for school lunches if they receive any of the following:
- a. Income Support
 - b. Income-based Jobseeker's Allowance
 - c. Income-related Employment and Support Allowance
 - d. Support under Part VI of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999
 - e. The Guarantee element of State Pension Credit
 - f. Child Tax Credit, provided they are not entitled to Working Tax Credit and have an annual income (as assessed by HM Revenue & Customs) that does not exceed £16,190
3. Other circumstances that are known to the school i.e:
- a. Poor language acquisition
 - b. Parents / carers have a mental health need
 - c. Parents / carers have a substance misuse issue
 - d. Members of the household are experiencing domestic abuse
 - e. Due to citizenship status parents / carers are ineligible for some benefits and are also unable to work
 - f. The family has a history of repeat presentation to homelessness
 - g. Known observable developmental delay

Eligibility criteria for disadvantaged two year olds – targeted group is 25% of the two year olds living in IDACI postcode for most deprived SOA

Current Criteria

Parents must be in receipt of one of the following

- Income Support
- Income based Jobseekers Allowance
- Child Tax Credit at rate higher than the Family element
- Extra working Tax Credit relating to disability
- Pension Credit

Or are a registered asylum seeker

The Government announced on 16th December 2011 that funding is to be provided to Local Authorities each year for them to build up free early years entitlement for disadvantaged two-year olds.

Appendix B Demonstrating Outcomes of Equality Analysis

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Directorate:	Children's Services	Is this a new or existing policy/service/function?	Existing Service	Officer responsible for the assessment:	Jenny Andrews
Section:	Strategic Commissioning	Date of Assessment:	16 December, 2011 (review following public consultation 3/1/12)	Lead manager responsible for the assessment:	Frank McGhee
Name of the policy/service/function to be assessed:	Early Years Service	Date of completion:	2 February, 2012	Date passed to OI&SI team: Date published:	January, 2012 February, 2012

RELEVANCE TEMPLATE

For more information on 'relevance' please see 'Step 2' of the guidance document

Is a Full EIA required?

YES

Please explain how you have reached your 'relevance' conclusion

The Childcare Act 2006 places a statutory duty on local authorities to improve the well being of young children in their area and reduce inequalities between them. The Act requires local authorities to encourage and facilitate the involvement of partners, including early year's providers in the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector.

The Council is required to ensure that the provision of children's centres is sufficient to meet local need. In determining this, local authorities should ensure that universal access to children's centres is achieved to meet the needs of local families, especially the most disadvantaged. The Act requires that a consultation takes place when there are any significant changes to the provision of children's centre services.

The Council has consulted on proposals that will radically alter the way that services are managed - moving from a provider of universal services to a greater commissioning role. A full equality impact assessment is therefore required. It is essential to understand the impact on the different groups protected by the Equality Act 2010 and mitigate any impact upon them.

The relevance assessment has identified the policy as having relevance to the following protected characteristic/s (please tick below):

Age <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender (inc. Gender Reassignment, Pregnancy and Maternity) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sexual Orientation <input type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief (or lack of religion or belief) <input type="checkbox"/> Marriage or Civil Partnership <input type="checkbox"/>
Date of assessment : 16 December, 2011

Equality Impact Assessment Template

Your relevance assessment has identified an EIA should be undertaken – Please read the guidance before completing this section

Section 1- About your service / policy / function

1 Briefly describe the key delivery objectives of the policy/service/function being assessed	Reports to the Council Executive on 16 February, and 14 September 2011, set out the guiding principles for the Early Years service in response to the Local Government Settlement and overall savings for the Early Years service totalling £22.1m within the context of the statutory duties in the Child Care Act, 2006. The proposals demonstrated how the Council would move to a different model by aligning its reduced resources to its strategic priorities, the creation of growth and reducing dependency whilst safeguarding the most vulnerable. The Executive agreed to consult on proposals to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Withdraw from being a volume provider of universal day care in a phased and sequenced manner where the Council is satisfied that there is sufficiency of provision in a locality,• Improve on the number of children & families who can be effectively screened for more targeted interventions by adopting an assertive outreach approach based on effective information sharing protocols• Commission to clear outcome impact targets based on strong evidence aligned to the Manchester Investment Fund
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Make better use of buildings as community assets within neighbourhoods• Increase and improve partnership working with schools and other partners, especially NHS• Be a part provider, part commissioner and wholesale quality assurer of work. <p>Currently, the service is delivered through the following resources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Services are delivered through 64 operational premises across the city. There are currently circa 500 full time equivalent staff within the service,ii. Services are also commissioned from partner agencies in the private, voluntary and Health sectorsiii. Manchester City Council provides approx 11% of the total supply of 0-5 years day care places within the City, excluding sessional care and school nursery places.iv. Centres provide a venue for service delivery for other agencies (including Health, Manchester Adult Education Service, private and voluntary sector childcare providers, etc)v. The service provides a large universal varied menu of activities for children and families, which goes beyond the statutory requirements, and is of variable quality and impactvi. The service provides targeted support & intervention for vulnerable families. However, there is evidence of a variable quality and impact. <p>The City Council commissions and provides a range of services through Children's Centres, often in partnership with stakeholders that reflect needs in each locality. Each centre has a guide that provides advice on activities. These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sure Start offer• Outreach and family support• Adult education• Employment based activities (with Job Centre Plus)• Advice and information (Citizens Advice Bureau)• Single parent support (Gingerbread)• Sessional care• Before and after school clubs <p>There are a number of services that take place at Children's Centres that are provided through the</p>
--	---

	<p>NHS. This includes activities affecting health and well-being such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Postnatal/antenatal services; midwifery● Health visits● Family planning advice,● Speech and language therapy● Mother and baby health/clinics● Smoking cessation <p>Subject to the outcome of consultation and the decision of the City Council a new model is proposed for the service.</p> <p>Universal Outreach Approach</p> <p>The introduction of a new universal offer based on assertive outreach to every family will provide enhanced screening for higher levels of need and ensure vulnerable families get the right support at the right time to avoid escalation towards higher level of need. This will underpin enhanced partnership working with other organisations within neighbourhoods such as Registered Providers, Police, Health, Schools, training and employment services.</p> <p>Each family of a newborn will be visited in their home by an outreach worker, followed by a monthly information sheet until their child is 3 years old. The universal free entitlement to 15 hours early education for 3-4 year olds will be delivered by schools and the private, voluntary and independent sector childcare market.</p> <p>The Council will play a stronger commissioning role, with the market development of evidence-based practices and stronger accountability and performance management. This will require improved intelligence through the use of data and data sharing with Health Services and other partners. The outreach service will be complementary and will enable early assessment of need and targeted services.</p> <p>Targeted Services</p> <p>Information gathered via assertive outreach will be used to target resources to protect the most vulnerable using evidenced based diagnostic and treatment interventions. Funding will be aligned to commission interventions for those in the most need. Work will also be undertaken with Neighbourhood Services and Regeneration Teams to develop integrated commissioning to tackle worklessness at neighbourhood level and other local priorities.</p>
--	--

	<p>Day care The Council will cease to be a provider of day care services in a phased and sequenced manner over time where the Council is satisfied that there is sufficiency of provision in a locality. The Council will continue to be a significant commissioner of day care from the PVI sector through places purchased for children in need.</p> <p>Using Buildings as Community Assets Buildings will be re-focussed as community assets with varied service provision within local neighbourhoods wherever possible. Proposals will be developed in the context of the current property rationalisation programme and focus on sustainable models of provision as well as meeting the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings will be open for longer hours than is currently the case and will provide a range of services for the whole community • A rent will be charged to all providers using the buildings to ensure a sustainable business plan by the generation of income • Buildings will provide a meeting space for neighbourhood and community groups. <p>A number of existing buildings are located on or near school sites and there is clear potential for these premises to be operated by the schools themselves. A number of stand alone day care sites may be the subject of interest from PVI providers who may wish to offer a day care business from that location</p> <p>As proposals are brought forward there will be significant community engagement on a locality basis.</p>
<p>2 What are the desired outcomes from this policy/service/function?</p>	<p>Early years services in Manchester will be organised to improve outcomes for young children and their families, with a particular focus on the most disadvantaged in order to reduce inequalities in child development and school readiness - 'school ready'. Ensuring that children from pre-birth to age 5 develop well, reach their milestones and are ready to take full advantage of learning opportunities presented to them.</p> <p>This will be supported by improvements in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parenting aspirations and parenting skills– reducing dependency on services in order that parents/carers have satisfactory parenting skills and are 'child ready' - able to give their child 'the best start in life', and are aspirational for their children and for themselves

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Child and family life and health chances – promoting good physical and mental health for both children and their family, supporting parents to improve their personal skills and access education, training or employment so that they and their children are 'life ready'. <p>It is proposed that by April 2015, every newborn child will be being seen in the family home and screened for additional needs with follow up contacts and access to fully integrated health and social care services. Parents will receive monthly information service. 3-4 year olds will receive 15 hours nursery education (universal service). For those in most need, assessment will align needs with services required from universal through to the targeted level 3 offer for the most complex families.</p> <p>Whilst changes to the universal day care provision will have an impact on some services users, this assessment is concerned with any differential impact that this may have on equality groups and takes due regard of the impact this may have and any necessary steps to mitigate this.</p>
--	---

Section 2 – Understanding your customer

3. Do you currently monitor the service/policy/function by the adjacent protected characteristics?	Protected Characteristics	Y/N	If no, please explain why this is the case and / or note action to prioritise the gathering of this equality data in your action plan
	Race	Y	<p>Ethnicity data for 0-5 year old service users has been obtained from the e-start registration database – ethnicity data element of the registration process was completed by 53.6% of service users.</p> <p>There are a number of potential reasons why a proportion of service users have not completed the registration form including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing ethnicity information is optional and service users have chosen not to provide the information. Language barriers, meaning users have not been able to complete the form. There has been insufficient support available from the centre to assist parents from ethnic backgrounds in completing registration forms. <p>Children centre administrators and reception staff have been trained to advise and support service users so that all forms are completed accurately and that service users understand why information is being collected and the purpose for which it will be used.</p> <p>The format of the Sure Start registration is also being updated so that it is easier to complete and supports the collection and input of data into e-start.</p>

	Gender (inc. gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity)	Y	Data on gender has been obtained on a centre by centre basis from the e-start database. Additionally, information is available on courses run at each centre on teenage pregnancy, neo/ante-natal.
	Disability	Y	Data has been provided from e-start.
	Sexuality	N	Each Sure Start centre has developed targeted and specialist sessions/activity that focus on sexuality.
	Age	Y	E-start data provides details of 0-5 year olds.
	Religion or belief (or lack of religion or belief)	N	
	Marriage or civil partnership	N/A	
<p>4. What information has been analysed to inform the content of this EIA? What were the findings?</p> <p>Please include details of any data compiled by the service, any research that has been undertaken, any engagement that was carried out etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from existing e-start records provide the basis for information assessed for age, gender, ethnicity and disability. The findings from this are included in section 3. • Manchester wide data used for comparison is provided by the Office for National Statistics (ONS), updated in 2009 (mid-year estimates). • Self-evaluation forms (Ofsted) maintained for each centre provide details of core and specialist activities held at each of the centres. The forms record a range of activities at centres involving mums, dads, other family members and carers. • Discussions have taken place with Heads of Children's Centres about activities at each centre especially those provided for protected groups and any potential impact from the proposals. Information on activities has been collated and is included in this EIA. • Consultation on the proposal was carried out from October to December, 2011. The 		

<p>Please specify whether this was existing information or was specifically in relation to this equality analysis and EIA process</p>	<p>details of this are set out below</p> <p>Public consultation An extensive consultation with services users, residents and key stakeholders was carried out during October to December, 2011. Over 90 consultation events were held at which an outline of the proposal was provided. A questionnaire and on-line explanation of the proposal was also provided. Outreach contact was made with parents and additional support was provided at Children's Centres to assist people with language difficulties in completing questionnaires. A number of meetings with parents have taken place and over 4,700 responses to the questionnaire have been received. Analysis of the responses has been carried out by an independent research company, Alterline.</p> <p>Public Consultation questionnaire – respondent profile</p> <p>Race = The consultation engagement resulted in 1,715 questionnaire responses being completed by people from BME groups, this equates to 39% of all the responses.</p> <p>Disability = 4.2% of all the respondents stated that they had a disability and 6.0% stated that they had a child/children with a disability.</p> <p>Gender = This was only asked of the respondent and not the child. Respondents were 90% female and 10% male.</p> <p>Age = This was only asked of the respondent and not the child. Respondents were 1% between 14-18; 16% 19-24; 47% 25-34; 25% 35-44; 6% 45-54; 2% 55-64; and 1% over 65.</p> <p>Sexual Orientation = 86.2% of all respondents stated that they were Heterosexual, 0.8% were Bisexual, 0.7% were Lesbian, 0.3% were Gay, and a 11.8% preferred not to state their sexuality.</p> <p>Religion = 43.9% of the respondents stated that they had an active faith or belief, 37.9%</p>
--	--

said they had no active faith or belief, and 19.1% preferred not to answer.

Marriage and Civil Partnerships = Although no asked as a specific question in the consultation questionnaire, the consultation did collect information on broad household composition. Therefore, 25.3% of respondents indicated that they we in a households with a single adult with child(ren), 62.3% were households with multiple adults with children, and 12.3% indicated that they were in a households with no children.

Day Care response by respondent profile

Race = 39% of all the responses stated they were from a BME group. Respondents from these BME groups were:

- Slightly less likely to disagree with the proposals to withdraw from day care (62.5% of respondents from BME groups disagreed, compared to 71.4% of respondents from White groups, 67.8% overall)
- Less likely to say that they could find alternative day care or would no longer require day care for their child/children post 2014 (32.1%) compared to 44.2% in the White groups and 39.4% overall. Therefore were more likely to say that they would need support in finding an alternative provider (41.1% BME, and 35.4% White).
- When asked about the impact of 30h to 15h changes, there were no major differences between the BME group (32% not affected) & overall average (32%).

Disability = 4.2% of all the respondents stated that they had a disability and 6.0% stated that they had a child/children with a disability.

- Those respondents that stated that they had a disability were less likely to disagree with the proposals to withdraw from day care (66.9% of respondents with disabilities disagreed, compared to 67.8% overall)
- Those respondents that stated that they had a child/children with a disability were more likely to disagree with the proposals to withdraw from day care (74.1% of respondents with children with disabilities disagreed, compared to 67.8% overall)

- When asked about the potential impact of the changes to day care provision:
 - 34.6% of adult respondents with a disability stated that they could find alternative day care or would no longer require day care for their child/children post 2014, compared to 29.2% for those that said they had a child/children with a disability (39.4% overall)
 - 25.6% of adult respondents with disabilities stated that they would need assistance to find alternative day care for their child/children, compared to 17.6% for those that said they had a child/children with a disability (37.3% overall)
 - 39.7% of adult respondents with disabilities stated that they didn't think that there was an alternative day care available for their child/children, compared to 53.2% for those that said they had a child/children with a disability (23.3% overall)
- When asked about the impact of 30h to 15h changes, both those respondents with disabilities (20.4% not affected) and those with child(ren) with disabilities (16.4% not affected), were less likely to feel that they could make alternative arrangements (32% overall).

Gender = The consultation did not ask about the gender of any children using the service. In terms of the gender split for the respondents themselves there were very little differences in opinions towards the day care proposals, although men were slightly less likely to say that they feel they'll be able to make alternative arrangements following the reduction for 30h to 15h (25.9% men said not affected, 32.8% women, 32% overall).

Age = Not applicable as the consultation did not ask about the age of any children using the service.

Sexual Orientation = 1.9% of all the responses stated they were from a LGB group.

- Respondents from LGB groups were less likely to disagree with the proposals to withdraw from day care (61.7% of respondents with disabilities disagreed, compared to 67.8% overall)
- More likely to say that they could find alternative day care or would no longer require day care for their child/children post 2014 (44.3%) compared to 39.3%

	<p>overall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• When asked about the impact of 30h to 15h changes, those from LGB groups were less likely to say that they are not affected and could make alternative arrangements (23.6% not affected, overall average - 32%). <p>Religion = 43.9% of the respondents stated that they had an active faith or belief, 37.9% said they had no active faith or belief, and 19.1% preferred not to answer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respondents with an active faith were less likely to disagree with the proposals to withdraw from day care (64.5% of respondents with disabilities disagreed, compared to 67.8% overall)• Showed no difference in terms of finding alternative day care or would no longer require day care for their child/children post 2014 (40.2%) compared to 39.3% overall.• When asked about the impact of 30h to 15h changes, those with active faiths were no more likely to say that they are not affected and could make alternative arrangements (32% not affected) than the overall average (32%). <p>Marriage and Civil Partnerships = Not applicable as the consultation did not ask about the relationships.</p> <p><u>Focusing on those in most need by respondent profile</u></p> <p>Race</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respondents from BME groups are more likely to support the proposal to focus on those families in most need (61% compared to 55.8%)• They are also more supportive of the outreach proposals with 62.3% saying they would welcome advice on child development (54% overall) <p>Disability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Respondents with a disability</u> are less likely to support the proposal to focus on those families in most need (52.6% compared to 55.8%)• They are however more supportive of the outreach proposals with 58.1% saying
--	---

	<p>they would welcome advice on child development (54% overall)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Respondents with a child(ren) with a disability</u> are less likely to support the proposal to focus on those families in most need (50.4% compared to 55.8%)• They are however more supportive of the outreach proposals with 61.6% saying they would welcome advice on child development (54% overall) <p>Gender</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There were no major differences between the views of men and women in terms of support the proposal to focus on those families in most need (57.9% men, 55.5% women, compared to 55.8%)• Women were slightly more supportive towards the outreach proposals than men (49.2% men, 54.6% women, 54% overall) <p>Age = The consultation did not ask about the age of any children using the service.</p> <p>Sexual Orientation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respondents from LGB groups were more supportive about the proposal to focus on those families in most need (63.4% LGB, compared to 55.8%)• But were less supportive towards the outreach proposals (46.7% LGB, compared to 54% overall) <p>Religion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respondents with a religious belief were more supportive about the proposal to focus on those families in most need (58.2% with a faith, compared to 55.8%)• Likewise they were more supportive towards the outreach proposals (59.4% with a faith, compared to 54% overall) <p>Marriage and Civil Partnerships = The consultation did not ask about the relationships.</p> <p><u>Re-purpose of buildings by respondent profile</u></p> <p>Race</p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respondents from BME groups are more likely to support the proposal to make better use of council buildings (68.2% compared to 66.2%) <p>Disability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Respondents with a disability</u> are less likely to support the proposal to make better use of council buildings (60.9% compared to 66.2%)• <u>Respondents with a child(ren) with a disability</u> are less likely to support the proposal to make better use of council buildings (62.4% compared to 66.2%) <p>Gender</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The views of men and women are the same in relation to the proposal to make better use of council buildings (c. 66%) <p>Age = The consultation did not ask about the age of any children using the service.</p> <p>Sexual Orientation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respondents from LGB groups are more likely to support the proposal to make better use of council buildings (69.2% compared to 66.2%) <p>Religion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respondents with a religious belief are more likely to support the proposal to make better use of council buildings (71.5% compared to 66.2%) <p>Marriage and Civil Partnerships = The consultation did not ask about the relationships.</p> <p>Outreach Events</p> <p>A series of outreach events were organised by Parental Involvement Officers involving 497 recorded discussions with parents and service providers. An event was held with partners working with teenage parents to record comments and opinions on the proposals. Any potential impact for teenage parents is addressed in section 8 below. The outcome</p>
--	---

from these events together with responses from directly interested groups such as Speech and Language Therapy Service and NHS, are summarised in the report on the consultation.

Consultation with Schools

Consultation events held for 4 weeks in November and December, 2011, sought the views of 134 primary and nursery settings, school governors and the Manchester Governors Association to the proposals to move from funding 25 hours per week childcare for all 3 and 4 year olds to the statutory requirement for 15 hours per week.

Overall, settings agree with the proposals. 88% of respondents agreed that the case for change is clear and 80% agree that the proposed criteria will effectively target full time places towards children with additional needs and or from a disadvantaged background.

The Council are proposing two levels (criteria) for accessing additional hours above the 15 hours free entitlement. The first level is for high needs and would be used by schools and the Local Authority and would enable the child to access a full-time place in either a school setting or private, voluntary and independent setting. This includes Looked After Children, Children with disabilities and children referred through Family Recovery/Action Plan. The second level is additional criteria that only schools would use to assess a child for a full-time place. Criteria include eligibility for free school meals, living in the most deprived areas, and non-English speaking children. 84% of respondents agree with the proposed eligibility criteria and 71% agree with that Level 2 criteria should only apply to schools.

It will be important for measures that mitigate any detrimental impact on protected groups to be included in the action plan and for the service to continue to engage with users through, for example, providing data on the availability and quality of daycare, issues of affordability, employment and benefits, access to training and services for children with complex needs.

Section 3 – Delivery of a customer focussed service / policy / function

5. Could the policy/service have a differential impact relating to race equality?	Y	N	What evidence or data exists to support your analysis?
	Y		

- 1) Ethnicity data for 0-5 year old service users has been obtained from the e-start registration database completed by 53.6% of service users
- 2) Data specific enough to compare the ethnicity of service users to the wider population is not available. The most relevant available data for the ethnicity of the wider population of the City is the 2009 Mid Year Estimates, which are experimental statistics.
- 3) The Mid Year Estimates are not broken down by geographical area, and are only split into the 0-15 years age group, not 0-5 years.

These factors affect analysis of the potential differential impact as the gap in available data is sufficiently large to severely impact the accuracy of any breakdown of service users by ethnicity

Accepting the caveats above and based solely on the available data, it is reasonable to conclude that there would be a disproportionate impact on those service users from BME groups. BME groups form a higher percentage of overall services users (49.7%) than they do in the population of the City as a whole (29.2%). In 30 of the 41 centres, the percentage of BME service users is higher than the wider population. Over 4,700 responses to the consultation have been received and these have been assessed including data on ethnicity. The response to the consultation includes 39% of questionnaires completed by BME groups.

The proposal for transforming the Early Years service forms part of the corporate approach to improving outcomes for young people. In terms of the impact on the proportion of people from protected groups, as people from minority racial groups make up a larger proportion of users of the service than minority racial groups in the population of Manchester as a whole, any proposals to the Early Years service could have a greater impact particularly on young families within minority racial groups. In localities where there are higher proportions of users from protected groups, the impact of any changes could be felt more strongly than in localities where this is not so.

From the mid-year estimates in 2009, over half of BME residents lived in seven wards – Ardwick, Cheetham, Hulme, Longsight, Moss Side, Rusholme and Whalley Range. Data from e-start registrations indicate the largest impact of changes could be felt in these localities.

Centre Activity

In addition to the universal offer each Sure Start centre has developed targeted and specialist sessions/activity. This is often in partnership with other public or PVI bodies. Common activity takes place in centres across the city, but there is also centre specific activity- both are listed for the purpose of this EIA. Proposed changes could result in a negative impact on these groups if targeted and specialist support is not safeguarded or alternative arrangements put in place:

<p>If the impact is negative what solutions will be introduced?</p>	<p>A new commissioning framework with partners is proposed. It will make sure BME groups are addressed as part of the targeted offer. This may need to include specific activities working with minority groups and specific focus on certain localities</p> <p>The proposal includes the development of Children's Centre hubs as community resources. Services commissioned are planned to include activities working with minority groups such as through the development of Stay and Play Sessions and adult education including language.</p> <p>Improving services for groups which may be hard to reach such as traveller communities are specifically included within the current proposals for Early Years for developing assertive outreach to meet the needs of minority groups who may have found the current building based approach hard to access.</p> <p>The proposals for Early Years are intended to target resources more closely to disadvantaged groups. Language difficulties, particularly for new arrivals, often prevent access to information about quality services. The proposal includes measures that will improve information about services for BME groups.</p> <p>Plans to extend by 2013 the current pilot scheme for providing free nursery places for the most disadvantaged 2 year olds, will further meet the Council's intention to reach more families in most need</p>
---	---

<p>If the impact is positive how will this be safeguarded?</p>	<p>The proposal includes plans that require the development of a more targeted and integrated approach to services focussing on the achievement of better outcomes for those in need. This will be achieved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new integrated commissioning framework with partners that takes full account of the Council's statutory duties • An assertive approach across the continuum of need • Making better use of buildings as community assets • Planning and implementing services that will respond and meet the needs of the most vulnerable including protected groups • Improving the assurance provided to service users through high quality service standards <p>Commissioning or providing high quality evidence based targeted engagement, screening, assessment and intervention.</p>
<p>Which business plans or equality action plans have these been transferred to? E.g. Equalities Delivery Plan, Business Objectives Delivery Plan, Workforce Delivery Plan etc</p>	<p>Childcare Act 2006 Children's Services Equality Action Plan Children's Services Business Plan</p>

<p>6. Could the policy/service have a differential impact on disability equality?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>What evidence or data exists to support your analysis?</p>
	<p>Y</p>		

Disability data has been obtained from e-Start. There are 144 registered with Sure Start 0-5 year olds who are disabled, just under 0.5% of the total registered users. According to data from an ONS survey of disability applied to the 2008 Sub-National Population Projection and projected forward to 2011, 1.5% of children in Manchester aged 0-4 years have some form of disability.

The data demonstrates that Claremont SS has a disproportionately high number of children registered as disabled using its centre. Proposed changes could therefore result in negative impact on users of this centre in particular.

Specialist Resource Centres

The Specialist Resource Teams are based in the six Specialist Resource Centres located across the city to provide a locally based service for families of children with a disability. Manchester has a duty of care under the Children's Act 2006 to safeguard and improve outcomes for the most vulnerable children (Children In Need), and this includes those registered as disabled or children with Special Educational Needs (SEN).

The teams consists of Pre-School Special Needs Workers who provide home learning for children aged 0-5 and the Specialist Outreach and Family Support Workers who offer advice, support and information for parents/carers of children with a disability aged 0-16 years.

The provision includes:

- assessment and support to babies and children under the age of 5 who have developmental delay, learning difficulties or disability and
- working in partnership with parents and carers to support learning by developing play activities and individualised learning programmes,

Closure or relocation of services provided through the Specialist Resource Centres could have a differential impact for services to children with disabilities if targeted and specialist support is not safeguarded or alternative arrangements put in place.

Centre Activity

In addition to the universal offer each Sure Start centre has developed targeted and specialist sessions/activity. This is often in partnership with PVI bodies. Common activity takes place in centres across the city, but there is also centre specific activity- both are listed for the purpose of this EIA. Proposed changes could result in a negative impact on these groups if targeted and specialist support is not safeguarded or alternative arrangements put in place:

- Child and Adult Mental Health (CAMHS) support

<p>If the impact is negative what solutions will be introduced?</p>	<p>The proposals intend to stimulate the market in the not for profit sector to ensure the right quality of provision in Manchester for children in need and for children with disabilities who should be able to access provision in a non-stigmatised manner.</p> <p>The proposals include a new commissioning framework with partners. It will include requirements for children with disabilities to have access to targeted and universal Early Years provision including fully accessible buildings</p> <p>The proposals for day care provision set out the eligibility criteria by which children aged 3 and 4 years may access day care provision in school and nursery settings above the statutory 15 hours per week. The criteria (Level 1 and Level 2) have been designed to ensure that access for children with disabilities is safeguarded.</p> <p>The proposal includes the development of Children’s Centre hubs as community resources. Services commissioned are planned to include activities working with children with disabilities such as through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the development of Stay and Play Sessions,• Child and parent services (CAPS)• Pre-school psychology clinics• Speech and Language Support• Short breaks• making sure that we make best use of Rodney House capacity as a specialist resource in any future redesign of the service and• a range of other support services specifically for children with disabilities <p>The proposals for Early Years are intended to target resources more closely to disadvantaged groups. The proposal also includes measures to improve information about specialist services for children with disabilities.</p> <p>Plans to extend by 2013 the current pilot scheme for providing free nursery places for the most</p>
---	---

	disadvantaged 2 year olds, will further meet the Council's intention to reach more families in most need
<p>If the impact is positive how will this be safeguarded?</p>	<p>Improving services for children in need are specifically included within the current proposals for Early Years. There are no plans to close the six Specialist Resource Centres across the City for disabled children. Activities in the centres themselves (listed above) must also be safeguarded if the solution is to be positive.</p> <p>The proposal includes plans that require the development of a more targeted and integrated approach to services focussing on the achievement of better outcomes for those in need. This will be achieved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new integrated commissioning framework with partners that takes full account of the Council's statutory duties • An assertive approach across the continuum of need • Making better use of buildings as community assets • Planning and implementing services that will respond and meet the needs of the most vulnerable including protected groups • Improving the assurance provided to service users through high quality service standards <p>Commissioning or providing high quality evidence based targeted engagement, screening, assessment and intervention.</p>
<p>Which business plans or equality action plans have these been transferred to? E.g. Equalities Delivery Plan, Business Objectives Delivery Plan, Workforce Delivery Plan etc</p>	<p>Childcare Act 2006 Children's Services Equality Action Plan Children's Services Business Plan Special Educational Needs Strategy</p>

	Y	N	What evidence or data exists to support your analysis?
<p>7. Could the policy/service have a differential impact relating to equality for Gender? IMPORTANT: note that analysis here includes analysis of impacts relating to gender reassignment and pregnancy and maternity.</p>	Y		<p>From data provided by e-start, there is very little difference in the proportion of children by gender aged 0-5 accessing Early Years services. Across all centres, service users are 51.6% male and 48.4% female which is exactly the same distribution as the 2009 mid year estimates for all Manchester 0-15 year olds. From the public consultation, 85.5% of respondents are from women. Over 50% of respondents indicated that they could require assistance in finding a new daycare provider. This could have a differential impact for parents on low incomes if it were not to be addressed through mitigation.</p> <p><u>Centre Activity</u></p> <p>In addition to the universal offer each Sure Start centre has developed targeted and specialist sessions/activity. This is often in partnership with PVI bodies. Common activity takes place in centres across the city, but there is also centre specific activity- both are listed for the purpose of this EIA. Proposed changes could result in a negative impact on these groups if targeted and specialist support is not safeguarded or alternative arrangements put in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antenatal classes/Midwife clinics and support • Father only sessions including 'Men behaving dadly', • Women's Aid – supporting survivors of domestic violence • Gingerbread (charity) activity that supports service single parents and particularly teen parents • Breastfeeding support groups • Activities focussing in assisting those in low paid work through training and employment initiatives
<p>If the impact is negative what solutions will be introduced?</p>			<p>The proposal will continue, within the statutory guidance, the work of the Sure Start core offer. This includes services that understand and are responsive to local needs, including effective support for families through children's centres. This also includes bringing together a range of services contributing to the achievement of improved outcomes for families and that directly contribute to assisting low paid workers (predominantly women) including:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach, family support and parenting courses • Adult education • Employment based activities (with Job Centre Plus) • Advice and information (CAB) • Single parent support (Gingerbread) • Sessional care • before/after school clubs <p>The proposal includes plans to integrate a range of services focussed around ante-natal and midwifery and the importance of good parenting including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postnatal/antenatal services;midwifery • Health visits • family planning advice, • speech and language therapy • mother and baby health/clinics • smoking cessation • pace based tip sheets delivered to the home on good parenting <p>The proposal also includes measures to improve the provision of information about the range and quality of day care services for children and to work with families in each locality to identify potential alternative providers.</p> <p>Plans to extend by 2013 the current pilot scheme for providing free nursery places for the most disadvantaged 2 year olds, will further meet the Council's intention to reach more families in most need</p>
<p>If the impact is positive how will this be safeguarded?</p>	<p>The proposal includes plans that require the development of a more targeted and integrated approach to services focussing on the achievement of better outcomes for those in need. We will achieve this through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new integrated commissioning framework with partners that takes full account of the Council's

	statutory duties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assertive approach across the continuum of need • Making better use of buildings as community assets • Planning and implementing services that will respond and meet the needs of the most vulnerable including protected groups • Improving the assurance provided to service users through high quality service standards • Commissioning or providing high quality evidence based targeted engagement, screening, assessment and intervention. 		
Which business plans or equality action plans have these been transferred to? E.g. Equalities Delivery Plan, Business Objectives Delivery Plan, Workforce Delivery Plan etc	Childcare Act 2006 Children's Services Equality Action Plan Children's Services Business Plan		
8. Could the policy/service have a differential impact	Y	N	What evidence or data exists to support your analysis?
		N	

<p>relating to age equality?</p>	<p><u>Centre Activity</u></p> <p>In addition to the universal offer each Sure Start centre has developed targeted and specialist sessions/activity. This is often in partnership with PVI bodies. Common activity takes place in centres across the city, but there is also centre specific activity- both are listed for the purpose of this EIA. Although services are primarily Early Years, the proposals could have implications for these groups if targeted and specialist support is not safeguarded or alternative arrangements put in place: <i>(highlighted under Gender)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gingerbread (charity) activity that supports service single parents and particularly teen parents
<p>If the impact is negative what solutions will be introduced?</p>	<p>A new commissioning framework with partners is proposed. It will include the Council's statutory duties to ensure people are not discriminated against on the basis of age, buildings are accessible and that access is provided to the full range of Council services. Services commissioned will also include the special responsibilities for working with teenage parents and single parents as highlighted under gender above.</p> <p>The proposal includes the development of Children's Centre hubs as community resources. Services commissioned are planned to include a range of activities for people of different age groups. This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sessions for grandparents (drop-in) • Adult education • Help and advice for teenagers – linking with the work of the Teenage Pregnancy Team <p>This is in addition to new parent drop-in and childminding networkers groups</p> <p>Plans to extend by 2013 the current pilot scheme for providing free nursery places for the most disadvantaged 2 year olds, will further meet the Council's intention to reach more families in most need</p>
<p>If the impact is positive how will this be safeguarded?</p>	<p>The proposal includes plans that require the development of a more targeted and integrated approach to services focussing on the achievement of better outcomes for those in need. This will be achieved through:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new integrated commissioning framework with partners that takes full account of the Council's statutory duties • An assertive approach across the continuum of need • Making better use of buildings as community assets • Planning and implementing services that will respond and meet the needs of the most vulnerable including protected groups • Improving the assurance provided to service users through high quality service standards • Commissioning or providing high quality evidence based targeted engagement, screening, assessment and intervention. 		
<p>Which business plans or equality action plans have these been transferred to?</p>	<p>Children's Services Equality Action Plan Children's Services Business Plan Valuing Young People Statement and Strategy Neighbourhood Services Business Plan</p>		
<p>9. Could the policy/service have a differential impact relating to sexual orientation equality?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>What evidence or data exists to support your analysis?</p>
		<p>N</p>	
	<p><u>Centre Activity</u></p> <p>In addition to the universal offer each Sure Start centre has developed targeted and specialist sessions/activity. This is often in partnership with other public sector, or 3rd sector bodies. Common activity takes place in centres across the city, but there is also centre specific activity- both are listed for the purpose of this EIA. Although services are primarily Early Years, the proposals could have implications for these groups if targeted and specialist support is not safeguarded or alternative arrangements put in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LGBT Parents Group – (Moss Side) 		
<p>If the impact is negative</p>	<p>A new integrated commissioning framework with partners is proposed. It will include the Council's</p>		

<p>what solutions will be introduced?</p>	<p>statutory duties to ensure people are not discriminated against on the basis of sexual orientation and that access is provided to the full range of Council services.</p> <p>Services run from centres will be commissioned to ensure that the needs of LGBT young people for separate social and networking activities are fully supported.</p>
<p>If the impact is positive how will this be safeguarded?</p>	<p>The proposal includes plans that require the development of a more targeted and integrated approach to services focussing on the achievement of better outcomes for those in need. This will be achieved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new integrated commissioning framework with partners that takes full account of the Council's statutory duties • An assertive approach across the continuum of need • Making better use of buildings as community assets • Planning and implementing services that will respond and meet the needs of the most vulnerable including protected groups • Improving the assurance provided to service users through high quality service standards • Commissioning or providing high quality evidence based targeted engagement, screening, assessment and intervention.
<p>Which business plans or equality action plans have these been transferred to? E.g. Equalities Delivery Plan, Business Objectives Delivery Plan, Workforce Delivery Plan etc</p>	<p>Children's Services Equality Action Plan Children's Services Business Plan Valuing Young People Statement and Strategy Neighbourhood Services Business Plan</p>

10. Could the policy/service have a differential impact relating to equality in religion and belief (or lack of religion or belief) ?	Y	N	What evidence or data exists to support your analysis?
		N	
If the impact is negative what solutions will be introduced?			
If the impact is positive how will this be safeguarded?			
Which business plans or equality action plans have these been transferred to? E.g. Equalities Delivery Plan, Business Objectives Delivery Plan, Workforce Delivery Plan etc			

<p>11. Could the policy/service <i>cause discrimination</i> in relation to marriage and civil partnership?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>What evidence or data exists to support your analysis?</p>
		<p>N</p>	
	<p><i>Note: Centre Activity supporting single parents (mothers and fathers) can be found under Gender</i></p>		
<p>If the impact is negative what solutions will be introduced?</p>			
<p>If the impact is positive how will this be safeguarded?</p>			
<p>Which business plans or equality action plans have these been transferred to? E.g. Equalities Delivery Plan, Business Objectives Delivery Plan, Workforce Delivery Plan etc</p>			

EIA Action Plan

Service / Directorate Equalities lead:

Strategic Director:

Corporate Service Inclusion Team lead:

Actions Identified from EIA	Target date for completion	Responsible Officer	Is this action identified in your business plan and / or Equality Delivery Plan (Yes / No / n/a)	Comments
Design the Early Years commissioning framework, to make sure the needs of protected groups are included as part of the targeted offer	March, 2012	Frank McGhee	Yes	
Ensure that potential negative impacts identified through the public consultation are fully accounted for in the service design specification		Frank McGhee	Yes	
Ensure that key stakeholders continue to be consulted during the new service design and implementation		Frank McGhee	Yes	

Actions Identified from EIA	Target date for completion	Responsible Officer	Is this action identified in your business plan and / or Equality Delivery Plan (Yes / No / n/a)	Comments
Review demographic and service data to ensure accuracy for design specification	June, 2012	Tony Decrop	Yes	Reports to Social Care Systems Board – Dec, 2011
Through closer working with health services, develop the assertive outreach approach and the targeting of resources on those in greatest need to mitigate any negative impact	June, 2012	Shirley Woods-Gallagher	Yes	Commissioning Framework
Ensure sufficiency of universal and targeted daycare provision to enable protected groups to access the full range of services available specifically those with disability	September, 2012	Tony Decrop	Yes	
Including activities that assist with training and employment opportunities in plans for the re-purposing of buildings	June, 2014	Tony Decrop		

Actions Identified from EIA	Target date for completion	Responsible Officer	Is this action identified in your business plan and / or Equality Delivery Plan (Yes / No / n/a)	Comments
Continuation of the five Children's Centre community hubs that focus on the needs of children with disabilities	March, 2014	Tony Decrop	Yes	

Section 4 – Director level sign off

Name:	Mike Livingstone	Date:	
Directorate:	Children's Services	Signature:	