In line with the principles of decision making outlined in the City Council Constitution, the Council will ensure that its decision making is open and transparent, and that due regard is given to the Council’s obligations and desire to promote equality of opportunity and equal treatment.

Part 1

This part must be completed and before formal consultation is undertaken and must be available during the consultation stage.

Author of this document: People Directorate Programme Team

Name of Service Area/Proposal: Children’s Internal Residential Care

Head of Service: Keith Francis

Date of completion: 25/1/17

Background to the planned changes

1. What is the background to the planned changes? Why is this change being considered? If further information is available on the different scenarios that have been considered as part of this work, provide a link to the public document which contains this information.

Coventry City Council currently operates two children’s homes for children and young people assessed as requiring residential care. These homes are Gravel Hill and The Grange, together registered for a maximum of 12 children of either gender aged between 10 and 18 years. Gravel Hill is used as a short-term assessment centre and offers a 12 week programme and The Grange offers medium to long term placements for those assessed as needing residential care.

The existing children’s homes incur average weekly placement costs which are significantly higher than the national average. Coventry homes average £5,405 per week (full cost based on average capacity in the year to January 2016). Other local authority homes average £2,964 per week (DfE 2014).

It is felt the existing homes do not closely mirror the domestic setting of a family residence but provide a more institutionalised living environment with industrial sized kitchens, large office space for staff and domestic staff employed to undertake the cleaning of the properties and cooking of meals. The proposal is to provide four smaller residential homes that offer good quality care in a group setting which replicates (as much as possible) day to day life in a thriving, happy and healthy family.

1.1 **Option 1 - Recommended Proposal** - Undertake a period of consultation on the preferred option to close the two existing children’s homes (The Grange and Gravel Hill) in their current form and the identification/acquisition of four properties (5 or 6 bedroomed) for the redesigned service. Utilise any capital receipts from the sale of current property to purchase the new provision. Establish four small homes with a maximum of four residents operating in a way that more closely resembles family life, where shared activity is paramount, where the creation of close nurturing relationships is emphasised and where the risk of institutional life is eliminated, or at least significantly
minimised. These will be homes where adults and children interact continuously, where menus are planned and food is cooked together, where individual and group activities are negotiated and undertaken, where pride and ownership of the property is a jointly shared and where there is shared responsibility for upkeep, maintenance and neighbourliness. These will be less children’s homes and more homes for children.

1.2 Option 2 – retain the current two homes with their existing Statements of Purpose and operating procedures representing a "no change option". This option is not recommended. In brief the homes use an outmoded and dated model of residential care practice, considered to be overly institutional by modern standards and in addition do not currently offer good value for money in comparison to residential care provided either by other local authorities or voluntary or private sector providers. Occupancy levels have been relatively low, as a result of which staff resource levels are relatively high and these factors have led to a weekly placement cost which is not sustainable.

1.3 Option 3 – dispense with internal residential provision altogether and simply commission placements according to identified need via a combination of block contracts, framework agreement provision and spot purchase from the market. Whilst this is a position which has been adopted by a number of local authorities it is not considered to represent the best way forward in Coventry for the following reasons:

- A greater degree of control of placement supply is retained by having internal provision
- Retaining in-house provision allows for greater flexibility in overall service delivery and the use of controllable resources
- The proposed model increases overall capacity and occupancy which reduces the need for more expensive external placements
- Retention of capital assets which may well appreciate in value over time
- Increases local provision and better ensures continuity of education and healthcare

Further details about this proposal can be found in the cabinet report [here](#).

2. Who do you need to consider as part of this ECA? *stakeholder analysis
- Resident children
- Carers
- External Agencies
- The public
- Staff
- Trade Unions

**Pre-Consultation Engagement**

*This section refers to any activities that took place (such as briefings, meetings, workshops, scoping exercises etc) with stakeholders before the formal consultation period.*

The timescales of this project meant that this ECA is being developed at the same time as consultation is taking place. No specific engagement activities were conducted beforehand.
3. What engagement activities took place prior to formal consultation and what feedback was received in relation to equality issues?

The timescales of this project meant that this ECA is being developed at the same time as consultation is taking place. No specific engagement activities were conducted beforehand.

**Analysis of Impact**

In this section please ensure that you consider the three aims of the general duty as they affect *protected groups*. These groups are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage/Civil Partnership
- Pregnancy/Maternity
- Race
- Religion/Belief
- Sexual Orientation

The **three aims of the general duty** require that a public authority, in the exercise of its functions, must have due regard to the need to:

1. Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation
2. Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
3. Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

**Note – when identifying potential impacts below, please only include impacts that may exist over and above general impacts that may affect the wider community/population.** For example, a reduction in grant to Coventry Citizens Advice would affect all service users through a reduced level of first line advice being available to all – but it would affect the following groups more; age, disability, gender and race as they represent a larger proportion of the clients who use the advice service.

4. Outline below how this proposal/review could impact on protected groups positively or negatively, and what steps (if any) could be taken to reduce any negative impact that has been identified. **NB. only include realistic mitigating actions that could be delivered.**

This proposal is aimed at improving the accommodation for Looked After Children (LAC) in Coventry's residential Care. As such it will impact on the children currently living in the Grange, should they still be there when the move takes place. As Gravel Hill is a 12 week
assessment centre, the children there currently will not be affected, as they will have moved on by the time the project is implemented.

To assess the equality impact of the project on residents it is helpful to understand the characteristics of the whole LAC population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected characteristic</th>
<th>Coventry’s Looked After Children (LAC) population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>The total number of children in Coventry aged 0–15 is 67,800, of whom 23,700 are aged 0-4. In August 2016 Coventry had 2054 children who were on a Child in Need plan and 504 on a Child Protection plan. The current number of Looked after Children (LAC) is 601. Coventry currently has 79 children (13.6% of LAC) placed in children’s homes. This number is relatively stable, but is higher than the national average. The age range of the young people referred for residential care was 11-16 years. The majority of young people were aged between 13 – 15 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>11% of current Looked After Children have a disability, this is compared with 4.5% of all children in Coventry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>The gender split of Looked After Children is 44% female, 56% male.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>No formal data is available for this characteristic. However, informal evidence is available that some service users are currently going through gender reassignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>67% of the Looked After Children in Coventry are White British, with a mix of ethnicities for the other 33%. This is in line with the Coventry population, however it is worth noting that there have been a number of unaccompanied asylum seekers in residential provision, often these young people have different needs and experiences than the local young people, and this needs to be considered in our service provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no available data on sexual orientation, religion or belief, or carers.

This project will therefore impact disproportionately on 13-15 year olds, looked after by the local authority, with a higher than average incidence of disability (11% compared to 4.5%) The mitigation for this is that the project aims to improve the environment and care offered to these children in an effort to make their experiences closer to normal family life. There is a potential negative impact on LAC with a disability, as the new model would not accommodate children with a disability, where Gravel Hill (assessment centre) currently does. To mitigate against this, the Council would need to ensure that there is adequate in-city provision from other providers for disabled children.

There will also be an impact on staff as there are a number of proposed changes to staffing models to meet the needs of the new homes, details of which will be provided in question 7.

5. Are there any other vulnerable groups that could be affected? i.e. deprivation, looked after children, carers.
Also include any information about the health/Marmot implications of this proposal. Contact Georgia Faherty (georgia.faherty@coventry.gov.uk or tel. 7683 1950) or Hannah Watts (hannah.watts@coventry.gov.uk or tel. 7683 3973) in Public Health for more information.

As detailed above, this proposal will affect Looked After Children, but the aim is for this to be a positive change. There may be a potential negative impact if there are young people required to move from the Grange to a new home, so this would need to be planned for to ensure the young people feel comfortable and supported to move.

There is no specific data on deprivation but anecdotal evidence shows users who currently access this service are from deprived areas of city.

6. What are the gaps in evidence? Can this be addressed during the consultation stage? If so, how?

There is a need to gather children’s, stakeholder and staff feedback on the proposal. This consultation is running concurrently with the development of the ECA, and will be fed into part two.

No further data collection is planned as part of this project, however the data included in the tables above is being refreshed as part of the recommissioning of external residential care project. This will be included in part two of the ECA.

7. What are the likely impacts of this project/review on staff from protected groups?

The data for the staff currently working at the Grange and Gravel Hill is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Headcount</th>
<th>Total Contract Count</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>Total Contract Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Contract Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Contract Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>12.90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Total Contract Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Disabled</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The staff group has a higher percentage of women aged 45-54 than the general Coventry population. Therefore the project will impact disproportionately on this group.

Specifically the proposals look to remove the Team Leader, waking night, cooks and cleaner roles from the current structure. The change of location would affect all staff.

The Council will mitigate the impact of these changes by applying the City Council’s Security of Employment Policy and ensuring affected staff are given the options within the policy e.g. Redeployment, Redundancy, along with support from Human Resources.

Part 2

*This section should be completed AFTER the consultation stage has been concluded.*

Author of this document: People Directorate Programme Team

Date of completion: 25/1/17

Post-Consultation

8. Referring to the information detailed in question 4 of Part 1 of the ECA Form, state if the consultation has confirmed the potential impacts identified that were identified. Also detail below any additional information about potential impacts that has been highlighted during the consultation.

A range of consultation activities were carried out to capture stakeholders’ views on the proposal.

These include:

- An online survey
- Staff workshops
- Partner’s workshops
- Feedback from the Young People’s Transformation Board
- Briefings and responses from Trade Unions
- Workshops with carers and resident children
The consultation confirmed that the project would impact on teenaged looked after children and staff working at the homes. There was support for moving to a more family-like model of residential care, and it was felt that this would have a positive impact on children. It also further identified a potential increased demand for supporting services, and the need to mitigate against this. Potential risks to children of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and going missing were identified if waking night staff were removed. There were broader concerns of having adequate staffing levels in the new model.

The consultation also questioned the need to move Gravel Hill, suggesting that the current site could be appropriate for one of the new homes. There was also concern raised for the staff that would be affected by roles and shift patterns being affected. These concerns are being worked on by HR to ensure mitigating actions are put into place.

Workshops were held with children currently residing in the Grange and Gravel Hill. They took the form of a structured discussion facilitated by the Council’s participation service. When asked what future homes should be like, the children were mixed on the size of the houses but felt they should have lots of activities, ensuite rooms for privacy and kitchens for them to cook in. They suggested enough staff to ensure cover and a place and time for meetings with young people. They suggested the location be out of town but with good transport links to town and that the homes should be mixed gender.

**Outcome of equality impact**

9. Indicate which of the following best describes the equality impact of this project/review:

- There will be **no** equality impact if the proposed option is implemented
- There will be **positive** equality impact if the proposed option is implemented
- There will be **negative** equality impact if the proposed option is implemented but this can be objectively justified
- There will be both **positive and negative** impacts if the proposed option is implemented ☒

**Summary of ECA**

The proposal to reconfigure Coventry City Council’s children’s residential homes aims to move to a more family like environment by moving from two large homes to four smaller homes. This will impact on the children who currently live there and the wider care population who may move there in the future. It will also involve staff changes to adopt the new model.

The negative impacts on the children could be having to move home, and reduced night care could lead to higher risk of CSE and going missing. This will need to be mitigated against. The positive impact on children will be a smaller home which is closer to normal family life.
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The negative impact on staff will be in the removal of certain roles, and potential changes in work location, shift patterns and supervision arrangements. The positive impact on staff would be working in an improved environment, with potentially improved outcomes for young people.

Next steps

Please send this completed ECA to the Insight Team as follows:

Wendy Ohandjanian (wendy.ohnandjanian@coventry.gov.uk tel. 7683 2939)

Jaspal Mann (jaspal.mann@coventry.gov.uk tel. 7683 3112)
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