



Equality Assessment Impact of Redesign on Service Users

Service area:	Integrated Youth Support
Name of service being reorganised:	Youth Offending Team
Officer leading on assessment:	Kathy Walker, Youth Offending Service Manager
Other staff involved:	Henry Kilpin, Planning and Partnerships Officer

1. Summarise details of proposed redesign

Provide details of the proposed redesign. Include information about the previous structure and the new proposed structure.

The intention is to decommission the existing Youth Offending Team (YOT) in Richmond and Youth Offending Service (YOS) in Kingston in its entirety and replace them with a shared service arrangement with a clear service specification. The proposed structure will involve:

- Locating management of shared Youth Offending services under the Strategic Head of Integrated Youth Support within the Protection and Early Help division.
- Re-locating the Family Intervention Project/ Youth Inclusion and Support Panels agenda/ service from the YOS in Kingston and aligning it with the wider emerging prevention and family support agenda. It will be done outside of the scope of this proposal.
- Relocating the existing shared Young People's Substance Misuse Service (YPSMS) out of the Kingston YOS to strengthen the focus on service improvement and alignment with the wider prevention agenda. This will also enable easier integration of the YOS. Line management of the YPSMS will be aligned to the Strategic Head of Integrated Youth Support.
- Delivering efficiencies, providing one FTE designated YOT Manager across two geographical areas of delivery, with a clear focus on leadership and management of effective integration of service delivery.
- Creating two FTE Operations Manager posts, one having a deputy function, to ensure clear lines of accountability and decision making within service delivery. It is proposed to allocate a mixed portfolio to each Operations Manager, instead of a geographical or thematic configuration, to promote integration of teams and to ensure robust management oversight.
- Creating one FTE Referral Orders and Restorative Justice Coordinator post to strengthen, consolidate and integrate delivery of Referral Orders/ Restorative Justice and victim support.
- Creating two FTE Senior Case Officers (one with focus on court and one with focus on Looked After Children (LAC)) to provide progression and specialism including: effective management of high risk LAC cases and consistent coordination of court proceedings, quality assurance of Pre-Sentence Reports and breach of bail trials.
- Developing 0.5 FTE Remand and Bail Officer post to develop more effective approaches for alternatives to remand, maximizing the mobilization of community based resources/ alternatives to reduce level of secure remands. This post will be funded from the devolved remand budgets.
- Creating two FTE Case Officers that will be holding a mixed case load across both boroughs subject to an agreed allocation process.
- Consolidation of business processes and the coordination of Intensive Supervision and Surveillance (ISS) within a 1 FTE post of ISS Officer across both boroughs.

- Creating two FTE Pre-Court Officers replacing the existing prevention/ Triage function. This is in response to the current final warning framework being repealed and replaced by the new out of court disposal system from April 2013 (mandated by the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012).
- Rationalizing Education, Training or Employment (ETE) work through the creation of a reduced 0.5 FTE post to provide ETE support to young offenders. This is in light of aligning post 16 Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) support for young offenders with existing NEET support arrangements in each borough. It is envisaged that, in the long term, the YOT Officers will absorb this function within their casework.
- Creating a 0.5 FTE Joint Reparation post to coordinate a joint programme of reparation work across both boroughs.
- Strengthening the quality of interventions, personalized support and transition through integrating one FTE Youth Work post secondment into the joined service structure.
- Strengthening restorative justice and victim work through a designated one FTE post.
- Increasing Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services support by the revision of the Service Level Agreement, creating a one FTE support capacity post available for the shared service.
- Rationalising partnership resources input, including Probation and Police personnel.

2. Reasons for redesign

Set out the rationale for the redesign.

The key drivers for developing the shared service arrangements are:

- Both Councils are facing reductions to their current funding levels and having to make significant cost savings. Risks include a reduction in the Early Intervention Grant and the need for cost savings in both boroughs across children's services to the degree of approximately £1.2m in Richmond and £2m in Kingston.
- More specifically, both young offending services are facing financial pressure, potential cuts- both locally and nationally. Developing a shared service will provide an effective solution to managing financial resources for the delivery of youth justice services more efficiently.
- There has been year on year reductions from the Youth Justice Board (YJB) grant which forms 49% of the current overall budget for the delivery of youth justice services in Richmond and 30% in Kingston. The YJB confirmed an expected 10-20% reduction at this point with the best case scenario of grant allocation remaining the same within the budget for 2013-14.
- Devolution of the financial responsibility for secure youth remands, transferring remand budgets from the YJB to YOTs from April 2013 and further top slicing of remand budget by 15% will present a significant pressure on respective Youth Offending Service budgets. A joint approach and pooling of devolved remand budgets would enable the development of more effective strategies for alternatives to remand, maximise the mobilisation of community based resources/ alternatives and achieving economies of scope to mitigate against budget pressure and potentially reinvest any savings.
- Both services benefit from a good robust performance management focus and have received good inspection results. Both services have maintained a positive trajectory of continued reduction of first time entrants, attributed to good investment into prevention/ Triage. Kingston YOS has higher rates of custodial and secure remands in comparison with Richmond YOT which will prevent a risk for the shared service to consider and manage, although the Kingston trajectory is promising.
- Rates of re-offending are similar with Kingston YOS having a slightly lower rate of re-offending of 0.86 than Richmond standing at 0.91. Consolidation of existing intervention strategies, strengthening transitions and better alignment with the prevention agenda should be a priority within the development of a shared service to tackle the rate of re-

offending more effectively.

- Given the current respective remand performance, any new service design should consider a robust strategy to reduce remands and mitigate against potential adverse financial implications given the respective positions as is.
- Kingston YOS has nearly double the caseload than Richmond YOT. Kingston YOS caseloads are higher than in Richmond, who currently have an under-utilised capacity. A shared service will enable more efficient resource configuration and optimum capacity utilisation to respond to predicted demands.
- Both services have a similar structure and resource investment into post/ pre court work. Richmond YOT benefits from a better investment into the specialist posts of CAMHS, Nurse and Police and an in kind contribution from the Youth Service. Through an additional investment into Restorative Justice and victim work, Richmond YOT has been able to benefit in terms of improving Restorative Justice and victim work within the last 12 months. Kingston YOS includes the following additional services under its umbrella- Young People's Substance Misuse, prevention including Family Intervention Project (FIP)/ Youth Inclusion and Support Panels (YISP), which presents an additional management/ leadership capacity demand for the YOS as it currently stands whilst Richmond YOT is a standalone service with prevention and FIP being located elsewhere. Focusing the specification of the shared service on a delivery core youth justice service only will strengthen management capacity resilience to respond to changes and deliver service improvement. Plans are in hand in Kingston to re-align the FIP with the Troubled Families initiative and the YISP functions are being considered as part of a more general review of prevention services. The YPSMS is subject to a separate review process.
- Areas of strength for both respective services identify many similarities, in terms of strong performance focus, committed staff, multi-agency collaboration and a good range of interventions. Areas for development for both services are quite similar in terms of HM Inspection of Probation recommendations. There appear to be synergies in terms of similarities and opportunities to integrate good practice that could leverage the existing differences in performance and improve quality of the service overall.
- Both services' governance arrangements and standard operating procedures are very similar and aligned with prescribed national standards. However, each service uses a different case management system. To continue using two different case management systems is not feasible or viable. A shared service will need to transition to using one case management system. Further consideration and business appraisal of options on case management system integration should be undertaken in consultation with ICT and the Youth Justice Board. This will pose some operational challenges and training issues that will require careful management to mitigate against adverse risks to quality standards and outcomes for young people.

3. What data collection and consultation have you undertaken?

What data and information have you used to complete this equality assessment? What consultation have you carried out with service users to gather their views? How has this fed into the equality assessment?

This equality assessment has been completed using information from the YOS Redesign Consultation document and the YOS Business Case that was provided to DMT for consideration.

During the consultation period, staff were provided with opportunities to comment on the proposals and the feedback that was gathered was used to shape the final proposals.

4. Assess the impact of the redesign on service users with regard to each of the protected characteristic groups:

Summarise the main issues identified with the redesign in relation to service users and the evidence for this under the protected characteristic that is affected e.g. age, disability, etc. For example, re-locating a service could

lead to accessibility issues.

Consider whether any differences are justified (e.g. are there legislative or other constraints)? If they are, explain in what way.

If there is no evidence or feedback received for a particular strand, note this and move on.

In addition to identifying any problems or issues with the redesign, try to identify ways in which the changes will lead to positive impacts for protected characteristic groups.

It is assumed that the changes that are proposed as part of the redesign of the YOS will have little impact on service users as service delivery will remain as is. It is hoped, if anything, that the new joint service may be beneficial for service users in terms of sharing learning and experience.

<i>Protected Group</i>	<i>Findings</i>
<i>Age</i>	<p>The new joint YOS will continue to work with young people aged between 10 to 17.</p> <p>Data shows that in both boroughs of the young people who come into contact with the service are aged 15-17.</p>
<i>Disability</i>	<p>Data relating to disability is not routinely collected by either existing team. However, services are accessible to all, including those young people with a disability, and will continue to be so.</p>
<i>Gender (sex)</i>	<p>The new joint YOS will work with both males and females.</p> <p>Data currently shows that in both boroughs the majority of young people who come into contact with the YOS are male</p>
<i>Gender reassignment</i>	<p>Data relating to gender reassignment is not collected.</p> <p>However if necessary, the YOS will signpost young people to the LGBT+ youth group for young people who require additional support.</p>
<i>Marriage and civil partnership</i>	<p>Data relating to marriage and civil partnership is not collected.</p> <p>If an issue relating to this emerged however, support would be offered and appropriate referrals would be made to organisations that specialise in supporting young people within this area.</p>
<i>Pregnancy and maternity</i>	<p>Data relating to pregnancy and maternity is not collected.</p> <p>There are protocols which are followed should pregnant young people come into contact the service however.</p>
<i>Race/ ethnicity</i>	<p>The new joint YOS service is accessible to all young people.</p> <p>Data currently shows that in both boroughs the majority of young people (approximately 70-75%) who access the service are White. The remaining young people (25-30%) are from a BAME background.</p> <p>Where necessary, additional support will be given to young people who may require more assistance. For example, translations are available for English as an Additional Language and interpreters can be used where necessary.</p>
<i>Religion and belief including non-belief</i>	<p>Data relating to religion and belief is not collected.</p> <p>However support is offered where necessary and appropriate</p>

	<p>referrals to faith organisations that specialise in supporting young people within this area are made if required.</p> <p>The Joint YOS will continue to ensure young people's religious beliefs are taken into account where possible when coming into contact with the service.</p>
<i>Sexual Orientation</i>	<p>Data relating to sexual orientation is not collected.</p> <p>However if necessary, the YOS will signpost young people to the LGBT+ youth group for young people who require additional support.</p>

5. What issues have you identified that require action?

Summarise the issues identified in the equality assessment and the actions that will be taken to address these in the table below, for example, making reasonable adjustments to improve accessibility.

The action plan should be drawn up in conjunction with the Directorate Lead Manager for the redesign. Once the equality assessment has been signed off then the actions should be transferred into the relevant Service Plans to ensure that they are followed through and progress monitored.

<i>Issue identified</i>	<i>Planned action</i>	<i>Lead officer</i>	<i>Completion Date</i>
No issues have been identified.			

6. When completed, the equality assessment should be approved by a member of AfC Management Team

Approved by	AfC Equalities Working Group
Date of approval:	April 2014
Date of publication:	May 2014