

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) Form

Please use in conjunction with the [EIA toolkit](#), which has been designed to guide you through completing your EIA form.

Service Area:	Children and Health Services/ Early Help Services
Name of service/policy/project being assessed:	Transforming Community Services- Family Hub Service
Officer leading on assessment:	Henry Kilpin, Head of Strategy and Programmes and Achieving for Children Equalities Lead
Other officers involved:	Rachael Park-Davies, Communities Service Manager; Lin Ferguson, Director of Children's Social Care (DCSC); Kevin McDaniel, Director of Children's Services; Elaine Browne, RBWM Head of Law and Deputy Monitoring Officer; Mary Severin, Monitoring Officer

1. Briefly describe the service/policy/project:

Introduction

Achieving for Children, who are commissioned to deliver Children's Services on behalf of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council, undertook a review of existing early help services in response to the government's Life Chances agenda and the All Party Parliamentary Group report on the future of children's centres: <https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/documents/s150825/app%25208%2520appg%252>

The intention was to better understand the developing approach to children's centre and youth centre service delivery. Based on this, a preferred model has been developed which, if approved, will see services reorganised into a Family Hub Service model. This approach aligns with national

and regional evidence, including the report noted above, and will enable the service to effectively meet the needs of the most vulnerable children, young people and families, whilst also providing value for money.

This model is preferred because it will deliver a number of benefits in Windsor and Maidenhead including the opportunity to:

- Strengthen the focus on children, young people and families who most need support through early intervention, in order to increase family resilience and reduce the need for statutory social care involvement. This will contribute to reducing the time that vulnerable families who need support have to wait for a service, but are unable to access it in a timely way through the current model.
- Build on the success of the Healthy Child Programme by continuing to deliver a universal Health Visiting Service that can be accessed by all families (for the purpose of this report, please note that universal health visiting is funded through the public health grant and not from the same funding stream as children's centres and youth centres and as such, this funding will be unaffected by this proposal).
- Move away from traditional models of service delivery focused on particular static sites with lots of fixed assets that require maintaining. Based on our experience of service delivery in RBWM and the data available to us, this is no longer considered effective at engaging vulnerable groups and so the preferred option is to move to a more flexible and responsive approach that brings services to those who need them i.e. outreach in the community and in the home. The 2019 Local Transformation Partnership survey found that 68% of young people would seek health and wellbeing support from someone in their family in the first instance. The needs of families are not static and often fluctuate over time. It is therefore essential that the proposed model is able to respond to these needs in a new way, so that families are not expected to travel across the borough to access services.
- In line with the above point, set up flexible and time limited outreach services on a smaller, more local scale, when intelligence suggests this is required in particular areas, e.g. work on knife crime.
- Support local communities so that they can develop universal provision in particular areas by providing advice and guidance on the effective delivery of services to children, young people and families and by working with them to identify potential sites that could be used for service delivery, should leases for particular buildings be discontinued.
- Deliver better impact for families from the £3.5m that will still be spent on early help services as the hub model would allow the discontinuing of leases on buildings in the early help portfolio that are no longer fit for purpose and will enable a staff remodelling which will better align with the proposed approach.

Background to the decision- UPDATED NOVEMBER 2020

A report setting out proposals relating to early help services in Windsor and Maidenhead was considered at Cabinet on 30 April 2020 and agreed by Councillors. This decision was subject to call-in and then the report was taken to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 14 May 2020. It was resolved at the Overview and Scrutiny Panel that:

1. It be noted that the Head of Law had reviewed the Cabinet's decision made on April 30th, what had been said at the Overview and Scrutiny Panel meeting on May 14th, and the reasons for the call in, and had concluded that the decision complied with the law and did not conflict with the Council's Access For All policy;
2. The Cabinet paper of April 30th will be brought back to Cabinet in June setting out a consultative pathway;
3. The results of a further consultation process and recommendations for a decision will be brought to the Cabinet in July or August.

It was agreed at the Cabinet meeting on 28 May 2020 that the report would be 'put aside' and re-presented to Cabinet on 25 June 2020 to allow time for the further details required for clarity of the next steps to be added. As part of this, the EIA was revisited and re-drafted to take into account the new report that was considered at Cabinet in June. At this meeting, Cabinet agreed for a further consultation exercise which has now been completed. The findings from the consultation have shaped the final proposals which will be considered by Cabinet on 26 November 2020. If this was then approved, implementation of the new model would be in early 2021.

Proposed service delivery

As set out previously, the preferred model is to bring together services being run by children's centres, youth centres, the parenting service, health visitors, school nurses and the family resilience service so that residents can get all the help they need from one Family Hub. It is important to emphasise however that this does not mean that residents will get this support from one building. Alternatively the Family Hub Service model will act as a single point to coordinate services for vulnerable families.

The preferred model is to establish two main Family Hubs - one in Windsor and one in Maidenhead. In addition, there would be a number of sub-venues across both Windsor and Maidenhead. Children's centre services and youth services will be delivered from these venues, other community venues, in people's homes and via other outreach in the community.

The key principles underpinning the preferred model include:

- Delivering a service that has a whole family focus, through the provision of multi-disciplinary Family Hubs situated across the borough. There will be a strong emphasis on mental health and relationship support including integration of all early help services such as education, health and the voluntary sector.
- Predominantly supporting targeted vulnerable families across the age range of 0-19 years (or age 25 years where young people have learning difficulties and/or disabilities), so that the needs of families can be coordinated in one place, regardless of the ages of their children.
- Adopting a flexible approach to service delivery whereby the focus is more on delivering services where they are needed rather than at a single location. This means some services will be delivered at 'hub sites' but other services will be delivered via outreach in collaboration with partners and the community.
- At an early stage, working in partnership with children, young people and families by supporting them to be more resilient, and by offering the right support at the right time and in the right way, so that improvements in their lives can be sustained.
- Enabling children, young people and families needing our support to tell their story only once.
- In response to community concerns about knife crime and County Lines activities, delivering the youth service on an outreach basis in partnership with the Police and Community Safety, with activity in specifically targeted areas where issues have been identified.
- Accepting referrals into the Family Hub Service via the Single Point of Access (SPA) and undertaking a triaging exercise to ensure those most in need are prioritised, which will reduce current waiting times for accessing services.
- Working with the community and voluntary sector, including parent groups, to support them to deliver universal services where children's centre and youth centre provision is reduced.

The Family Hub Service will deliver a programme of services in various venues across their community area including universal health provision; school nursing; specific sessions and groups for vulnerable families; parenting support; and opportunities for early years learning and development by continuing to host a range of activities and groups from the independent and private sector.

Through the first stage of consultation with residents and stakeholders we have learned that respondents see the key priority as one to one work with families, particularly those with younger children or children with additional needs. Building community resilience was also a common theme and so we will ensure that this is an integral aspect of the model. By building community resilience and maintaining the 0-5 Healthy Child Programme, it is anticipated that families who need additional support will be identified and offered support at an early stage.

As part of the implementation, we will review our programme of activities to ensure that where possible, we are able to continue those sessions that support groups most in need, for example, groups for parents with children with additional needs and targeted sessions for hard to reach Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) families in the community.

Our youth service will continue to prioritise supporting more vulnerable young people on a 1-1 basis such as those that are: involved with statutory children’s social care services; engaging in risky behaviours; or with low self-esteem or mental health issues. The service will also continue to support participation and engagement of children and young people, including those in care and those leaving care, and deliver parent/ carer/ professional workshops on child sexual exploitation, gangs, substance misuse and online safety, and would also provide outreach to identified hotspots in the borough, as the need is identified. In terms of universal services, the proposal is to carry on delivering sessions and workshops to pupils in partnership with our local schools. This aligns with the findings from the 2019 East Berkshire Local Transformation Plan survey which was carried out to better understand children’s mental health and wellbeing. The survey found that 47% of young people would value support after school, and 14% before school. This finding will inform our future provision.

Whilst the expertise/specialism of each service will remain, the delivery will be integrated to best match the needs of the local community. To achieve an integrated Family Hub Service model we would propose to:

Activity	Details	Benefits and impact
Continue to deliver universal health provision	There are currently no planned changes to the universal health provision that is delivered. This includes:	Health services were rated as one of the most popular services delivered by children’s centres in the stage one public consultation exercise.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Full Healthy Child Programme, offering every family 5 health reviews in the first 3 years (crucial first 1000 days) of their child's life and a range of support services in the community, i.e. drop in clinics, new baby groups. ● School Nursing Service which provides support with long term conditions and universal support for pupils in school. ● Home visiting support for families whose child is developmentally delayed, socially isolated or living with other vulnerabilities. 	<p>All families will still be able to access universal health support to give their children the best start in life.</p> <p>Drop in clinics will be delivered at the same frequency i.e. five times a week, but locations and timings may change following the review of sites. We will however ensure that clinics are delivered in accessible locations and new timings and locations are communicated effectively to our families.</p> <p>Going forward, there may be further changes to how we deliver services but the universal offer that is accessible to all will remain.</p> <p>It is worth noting that that is currently some disruption to our health service provision due to COVID-19. We will continue to follow Public Health guidance in terms of the delivery of these services.</p>
<p>Deliver outreach work more flexibly and in a greater number of locations to reach people who are not currently accessing provision.</p>	<p>We will extend our outreach work and focus on delivering services in the community, rather than at a specifically designated children's centre or youth centre.</p> <p>This will enable us to engage more with hard to reach groups by delivering programmes from a range of local venues such as schools, leisure and community centres, partner properties and other community locations.</p>	<p>The intention is to increase the amount of outreach work we do by freeing up staff from the management and maintenance fixed assets, such as buildings.</p> <p>This approach will strengthen the focus on the most deprived areas with the highest level of need. It will also mean we are better able to reach those families who are not currently accessing our services.</p> <p>It will also enable us to move away from the traditional delivery of youth services i.e. drop in sessions at a centre which have proven less and less popular over recent years),</p>

		<p>towards a more flexible approach whereby we take services to the young people, where this is needed most. It is anticipated that this will lead to increased engagement with those more vulnerable children and young people.</p>
<p>Reduce the number of designated children’s centres delivery sites from 13 to eight and youth centres from nine to three (with future use of one site still to be confirmed)</p>	<p>By delivering more services through outreach and other community venues, we will be less reliant on children’s centre and youth centre buildings.</p> <p>Detailed analysis of current usage of children’s centres has enabled us to identify which centres could be closed with the least impact. We propose to maintain those centres that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Well used by residents. ● Best equipped to meet the future needs of the service. ● Located close to areas of relative deprivation. ● Well-placed for public transport or with good parking facilities. ● Wheelchair and pushchair accessible. ● Able to offer good value for money in terms of rental costs. ● Aligned with the RBWM new climate/ environmental strategy. ● Align with the CAMHS transformation project. <p>It is estimated for a full year the reduction in sites would reduce costs by £40,000.</p>	<p>This will mean a reduction in the quantity of children’s centre and youth centre services that we are able to offer.</p> <p>It will also mean that families or young people whose nearest children’s centre or youth centre is earmarked for closure will have further to travel to visit a centre.</p> <p>We will mitigate against some of the impact of these changes by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adopting a new, more responsive and flexible service. ● Providing more services through outreach at alternative venues in the community. ● Working more closely with community and voluntary sector groups. ● Signposting young people or families who may no longer be able to access universal services to alternative providers. ● Offer a range of “drop-in” sessions for parenting advice and advice for young people. <p>As part of the initial consultation we have already asked users views on which services they most value and we would</p>

		prioritise these when putting together the service offer for 2020-21 and beyond.
Deliver a wider range of services for families coordinated from the remaining centres which prioritises those most in need	<p>For the remaining buildings we will coordinate a more family-focused offer, by bringing together a range of services, for example, health services, family support , support for childminders, and responsive outreach.</p> <p>As part of this we will continue to deliver the specific services and groups for children with additional needs and their families; for women at risk of or living with domestic abuse; for first time or young or vulnerable parents; for families involved in statutory social care; for care leavers including those who are parents; for childminders and the children in their care; for parents in need of mediation or support with parental conflict; and for parents with poor mental health.</p>	<p>Although the proposals in this consultation would result in a reduced universal early help offer, we propose to mitigate against some of the impact by bringing more services together in a more coordinated way, thereby enabling families to access more of the support they would most benefit from.</p> <p>This will mean that those needing targeted support such as information about domestic abuse and health guidance, would be more likely to access it.</p> <p>Where specific issues arise in particular areas, for example, a rise in knife crime, we will deliver targeted support in that area which will be accessible for all.</p>
Strengthen partnerships with local community and voluntary groups	<p>We will work with the local community and voluntary sector to identify those groups and/or individuals who are willing and able to run universal sessions for children, young people and families. We will provide advice and guidance to enable them to establish sessions accessible by all. This could include supporting parents to deliver sessions and / or support themselves where possible.</p> <p>We will also develop a directory of resources which will include local organisations offering universal and targeted support. We will use this to signpost children, young people and families to the support they need in the wider community. The intention is to make the directory easy to navigate and we will seek to</p>	<p>Local community and voluntary sector organisations could deliver some of the universal services that are not proposed as part of the new model, thereby ensuring all families are able to access some level of provision.</p> <p>By providing advice and guidance to these groups, we will be equipping the local community with greater knowledge and skills.</p>

	provide additional online resources including self-help tools which have become more prevalent during the current pandemic i.e. Solihull Parenting Support and KOOH (mental health support for young people).	
--	---	--

Staffing

Should the proposed Family Hub Service be approved we would look to implement a new staffing model that better aligns with the new approach.

The Family Hub Service model would see a move from three separate teams (children’s centres, family resilience and youth services), each with their own management structure, priorities and specific roles, to a ‘Hub Team’ which will have a range of skills and expertise but seek to work to meet the needs of the whole family.

This will require a change to the service which will involve all members of staff and we would expect a reduction in staffing numbers accordingly. This is because the new model will require a smaller number of workers as the focus will be on need rather than maintaining poorly attended drop in sessions or maintaining buildings. However we will aim to retain the talent, skills and experience of our specialist workers, for example those skilled and experienced in working with families where domestic abuse or poor mental health or drug misuse is an issue. The public consultation identified parenting support as a priority need and therefore a workforce with the talent, abilities and experience of delivering this support will be integral to the new model. Research has shown us that “whole family” support leads to improved outcomes for children and young people, including those with disabilities, and this ethos will be a cornerstone of the proposed new model.

The individual details of these staffing changes will be finalised by Achieving for Children as part of the implementation of the change. Initial scoping has indicated that a reduction in the region of 24 FTE including vacancies will result and contribute towards the efficiency target of £600,000 built into the existing budgets. There will be a significant number of changes which will involve all members of the service working to new job descriptions. We estimate about 10 FTE worth of redundancies after allowing for existing vacancies. Details of which will not be known until any process is concluded.

A separate equality impact assessment will be undertaken to understand the impact on staff.

Sites

As part of the review of early help services and the development of the preferred model, we have considered all existing service delivery sites and made proposals for how those sites could be used going forward.

We have a number of criteria against which we have reviewed the sites. Based on this we made a number of proposals for which to retain and which to discontinue the leases on. Following on from the second stage of consultation, these proposals have now been finalised.

We are proposing to retain sites that meet a number of the following criteria:

- Well used.
- Best equipped to meet the future needs of the service.
- Located close to areas of relative deprivation.
- Well-placed for public transport or with good parking facilities.
- Wheelchair and pushchair accessible.
- Able to offer good value for money in terms of rental costs.
- Aligns with the emerging Council Asset Strategy.

We are proposing to cease using and discontinue leases on some sites designated as children's centres and some sites used as youth centres that meet a number of the following criteria:

- Are situated in areas where they are no longer the most needed.
- Are too small or not cost effective to run and are not equipped to meet the future needs of the service or the Council's climate priorities.
- Are under-used compared to other centres.
- Are unable to offer additional service i.e. health clinics, due to lack of space or lack of accessibility.
- Are potentially able to be used by parents, community or voluntary groups to deliver sessions independently.

The table below provides a summary of which centres we have proposed to retain and which we have proposed to discontinue the lease for and cease using as a children's centre or youth centre. This is based on the criteria set out above and on feedback from the second stage of

consultation. The responses from the consultation for each individual site has been included for information along with the initial and the final proposal.

It is worth noting that whilst some service delivery could take place in the sites that are recommended for retention, the key principle of this model is that services would be delivered in a range of venues across the borough, coordinated by staff operating out of these sites.

Please also note that the references to distances between different centres and between centres and public transport have been made based on directions from postcode to postcode on foot using Google Directions. Councillors Carroll and McWilliams (the relevant Lead Members) have also checked some of these distances as part of their visits to each centre.

Building	Initial proposal	Rationale	Consultation response to proposal	Final proposal
Children's centres				
Datchet Children's Centre SL3 9EJ	Retain as sub-venue in Windsor.	Meets the accommodation requirements for the preferred Family Hub model; close to areas of relative deprivation; good transport links- 200 feet to nearest train station; accessible facilities; low rental cost; high footfall.	- 58.7% agree or strongly agree. - 4.6% disagree or strongly disagree. - 24.4% neither agree nor disagree and 12.2% do not know.	Retain as sub-venue in Windsor.
Larchfield Children's Centre SL6 2SG	Retain as sub-venue in Maidenhead.	Meets the accommodation requirements for the preferred Family Hub model; close to area of relative	- 65.2% agree or strongly agree. - 3.3% disagree or strongly disagree.	Retain as sub-venue in Maidenhead.

		deprivation; good transport links- 0.9 miles to nearest train station; accessible facilities; low rental cost; high footfall.	- 21.6% neither agree nor disagree and 9.9% do not know.	
Manor Children's Centre/ Youth Centre SL4 5NW	Retain as sub-venue in Windsor.	Meets the accommodation requirements for the preferred Family Hub model; close to area of relative deprivation; accessible facilities; high footfall.	- 49.4% agree or strongly agree. - 1.7% disagree or strongly disagree. - 35.5% neither agree nor disagree and 13.4% do not know.	Retain as sub-venue in Windsor.
Poppies Children's Centre SL4 4XP	Retain as sub-venue in Windsor.	Meets the accommodation requirements for the preferred Family Hub model; well positioned for targeted interventions on the army estate; accessible facilities; high footfall.	- 48.5% agree or strongly agree. - 3.8% disagree or strongly disagree. - 31.4% neither agree nor disagree and 16.2% do not know.	Retain as sub-venue in Windsor.
Riverside Children's Centre SL6 7JB	Retain as main Family Hub in Maidenhead.	Meets the accommodation requirements for the preferred Family Hub model; central location; good transport links- within 0.6 miles of nearest train station;	- 70.3% agree or strongly agree. - 5.0% disagree or strongly disagree.	Retain as main Family Hub in Maidenhead.

		accessible facilities; high footfall.	- 16.5% neither agree nor disagree and 8.2% do not know.	
Eton Wick Children's Centre SL4 6JB	Discontinue lease.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; no designated disabled parking; low footfall.	- 24.2% agree or strongly agree. - 1.3% disagree or strongly disagree. - 38.5% neither agree nor disagree and 15.9% do not know.	De-designate as a children's centre and discontinue lease. The site will be returned to Datchet St Mary's Primary Academy for use by the school. AfC is currently the only user at the site.
Pinkneys Green Children's Centre/ Youth Centre SL6 5HE	Discontinue lease.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; close to other provision- Marlow Youth Centre and Riverside Children's Centre both within 1.6 miles; potential interest from local voluntary and community groups to deliver services at the site; low footfall at youth service sessions.	- 22.4% agree or strongly agree. - 36.9% disagree or strongly disagree. - 30.7% neither agree nor disagree and 10.1% do not know.	Retain the site but repurpose primarily for the Family Contact Service that will support children in care through one to one work and contact with family members. The site will be used for some Family Hub Service delivery i.e. weekly health provision and targeted evening youth groups i.e. Esteem. The universal

				youth club will not remain however and the site will be de-designated as a Children's Centre.
The Lawns Children's Centre SL4 3RU	Discontinue lease/ end rental agreement.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; only open during term-time; close to other provision- Manor Children's Centre/ Youth Centre within 0.5 miles; access via a footbridge- wheelchair users and those with mobility issues may need help to access.	- 19.4% agree or strongly agree. - 23.5% disagree or strongly disagree. - 42.4% neither agree nor disagree and 14.7% do not know.	De-designate as a children's centre and discontinue lease. We would no longer rent the space (a single room and adjoining kitchen) from the Lawns Nursery School. AfC is currently the only user at the site.
Woodlands Park Village Centre Children's Centre SL6 3GW	Discontinue lease/ end rental agreement.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; limited transport links- 2.7 miles away from nearest train station; potential interest from local voluntary and community groups to deliver services at the site.	- 20.5% agree or strongly agree. - 33.3% disagree or strongly disagree. - 34.4% neither agree nor disagree and 11.7% do not know.	De-designate as a children's centre and discontinue lease. We would no longer rent the space (a room) from the Woodlands Park Village Community Centre. AfC is not the only user at the site.
Children's centre satellite sites				

<p>Low Ropes Activity Course at Beech Lodge</p> <p>SL6 6QL</p>	Retain as sub-venue.	No other similar provision available locally; could be used for targeted groups; no rental cost- low maintenance cost.	<p>- 57.4% agree or strongly agree.</p> <p>- 1.6% disagree or strongly disagree.</p> <p>- 21.9% neither agree nor disagree and 19.1% do not know.</p>	Retain as sub-venue.
<p>Maidenhead Nursery School</p> <p>SL6 7PG</p>	Retain as sub-venue.	Meets the accommodation requirements for the preferred Family Hub model; good transport links- nearest train station within 0.2 miles; accessible facilities; no rental cost.	<p>- 63.1% agree or strongly agree.</p> <p>- 1.0% disagree or strongly disagree.</p> <p>- 20.3% neither agree nor disagree and 15.4% do not know.</p>	Retain as sub-venue.
<p>South Ascot</p> <p>SL5 9EB</p>	Retain as sub-venue.	Meets the accommodation requirements for the preferred Family Hub model; good transport links- nearest train station within 0.3 miles; accessible facilities; low rental cost.	<p>- 41.0% agree or strongly agree.</p> <p>- 1.8% disagree or strongly disagree.</p> <p>- 38.0% neither agree nor disagree and 19.3% do not know.</p>	Retain as sub-venue.
<p>Old Windsor</p> <p>SL4 2PX</p>	Discontinue lease/ end rental agreement.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; limited transport	- 21.0% agree or strongly agree.	De-designate as a children's centre and discontinue lease.

		links- nearest train station is 2 miles away; low footfall.	- 21.6% disagree or strongly disagree. - 40.9% neither agree nor disagree and 16.4% do not know.	We would no longer rent the space (a room) in the hall. AfC is not the only user at the site.
Wraysbury Village Hall TW19 5NA	Discontinue lease/ end rental agreement.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; low footfall.	- 18.1% agree or strongly agree. - 22.2% disagree or strongly disagree. - 41.5% neither agree nor disagree and 18.1% do not know.	De-designate as a children's centre and discontinue lease. We would no longer rent the space (a room) in the hall. AfC is not the only user at the site.
Youth centres				
Marlow Road Youth Centre SL6 7YR	Retain as a sub-venue in Maidenhead.	Meets the accommodation requirements for the preferred Family Hub model; good transport links- nearest train station is within 0.6 miles; high footfall.	- 68.9% agree or strongly agree. - 1.7% disagree or strongly disagree. - 18.3% neither agree nor disagree and 11.1% do not know.	The Council have agreed to support Maidenhead Community Centre (MCC) through a move to Marlow Road. AfC will base youth operations elsewhere and are in discussions with MCC to retain some access for Family Hub Service provision. In addition AfC will seek to deliver additional services at one or more of the

				alternative sites that are being retained.
Windsor Youth Centre SL4 3HD	Retain as main Family Hub in Windsor.	Meets the accommodation requirements for the preferred Family Hub model; good transport links- nearest train station is within 0.7 miles; external hires ensure that the centre runs as cost neutral; high footfall.	- 55.9% agree or strongly agree. - 2.4% disagree or strongly disagree. - 28.8% neither agree nor disagree and 12.9% do not know.	Retain as main Family Hub in Windsor.
Charters Youth Centre SL5 9QY	Discontinue lease.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; school has requested site reverts back to school use; low footfall.	- 15.9% agree or strongly agree. - 16.5% disagree or strongly disagree. - 45.9% neither agree nor disagree and 21.8% do not know.	Discontinue lease. Negotiation of site return to use by Charters School will be undertaken during implementation.
Datchet Youth Centre SL3 9HR	Discontinue lease.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; close to other provision- within 0.4 miles of Datchet Children's Centre; low footfall.	- 15.5% agree or strongly agree. - 22.0% disagree or strongly disagree. - 43.5% neither agree nor disagree and 19.1% do not know.	Discontinue lease. A local pre-school has expressed interest in utilising this site. AfC is the only user at the site and it will need to be maintained securely.

Eton Wick Youth Centre SL4 6LT	Discontinue lease.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; high rental cost; low footfall.	- 17.6% agree or strongly agree. - 21.2% disagree or strongly disagree. - 42.4% neither agree nor disagree and 18.8% do not know.	Discontinue lease. Recent interest from a local resident to deliver provision from this site. This will be explored further. AfC is the only user at the site and it will need to be maintained securely.
Larchfield Youth Centre SL6 4BB	Discontinue lease/ end rental agreement.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; close to other provision- within 0.4 miles of Larchfield Children's Centre; steadily reducing footfall.	- 16.0% agree or strongly agree. - 36.0% disagree or strongly disagree. - 34.3% neither agree nor disagree and 13.8% do not know.	Discontinue lease. We would no longer rent the space (a hall and storage) in the hall. The site is used by other groups and it would be available to others.
Other buildings				
Maidenhead Project Centre, Reform Road SL6 8BY	Discontinue lease and staff move sites.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; potentially part of RBWM regeneration plans; high rental cost.	- 16.6% agree or strongly agree. - 31.0% disagree or strongly disagree.	Retain as a sub-venue in part to mitigate the loss of some of the space at 4 Marlow Road. Increase usage at the site i.e. evening and weekend Family

			- 36.5% neither agree nor disagree and 16.0% do not know.	Hub Service delivery. There is a cost implication to this option.
Outdoor provision in Hurley SL6 5ND	Transfer to community provider to maintain.	Limited space available making it unsuitable for future use; potential interest from a community provider to maintain the provision- would seek access for targeted groups as part of new arrangement.	- 28.7% agree or strongly agree. - 10.3% disagree or strongly disagree. - 41.4% neither agree nor disagree and 19.5% do not know.	Transfer to community provider to maintain, with contractual access for Family Hub Service users.

The proposals are summarised in the table below:

Retain
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Datchet Children’s Centre ● Larchfield Children’s Centre ● Manor Children’s Centre/ Youth Centre ● Poppies Children’s Centre ● Riverside Children’s Centre ● Pinkneys Green Children’s Centre/ Youth Centre (changed use) ● Low Ropes Activity Course at Beech Lodge ● Maidenhead Nursery School ● Marlow Road Youth Centre (changed and reduced use) ● South Ascot ● Windsor Youth Centre

- Maidenhead Project Centre, Reform Road

De-designate/ discontinue lease or end rental agreement/ no longer use

- Eton Wick Children's Centre
- The Lawns Children's Centre
- Woodlands Park Village Centre Children's Centre
- Old Windsor
- Wraysbury Village Hall
- Charters Youth Centre
- Datchet Youth Centre
- Eton Wick Youth Centre
- Larchfield Youth Centre
- Outdoor provision in Hurley

2. What sources of information have been used in the preparation of this equality assessment? (e.g national research, JSNA, user feedback)

Information Source	Description and outline of the information source
Business case for early help transformation- autumn 2019	Report to RBWM Council to seek approval to undertake a public consultation on the proposed changes to early help services.
Windsor and Maidenhead children's centre scorecards- Q3 2019-20	Data relating to the use of children's centres across RBWM.
Early help impact report- January 2020	Annual report setting out the impact of early help services provided by Achieving for Children across RBWM.
Windsor and Datchet Hub and Maidenhead Hub datapack- Q3 2019-20	Data relating to the needs of the community in RBWM- including the children's centre users.
Achieving for Children Annual Equalities Report 2018-19	Annual report setting out how Achieving for Children met the public sector equality duty in 2018-19.

3. Analysis of Impact

Protected Group	Impact (mark with an 'X')			Include Data and Analysis
	Positive	Negative	None	
<p>Data presented below mainly relates to users of children's centres and youth centres. Where additional information is known about the users of the others services included within the proposed changes, this has been noted.</p> <p>Children's centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During 2018-19, there were 20,266 attendees to the centres across the boroughs. <p>Youth Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are expected to be over 28,000 attendees to youth provision during 2019-20 (predicted based on data up to quarter 3 2019-20). Of these, over 7,000 are expected to be individuals regularly attending activities. There have been 4,234 participants at training delivered by the youth service with 90% rating it as beneficial to them. 				
Age	X	X		<p>Data</p> <p><u>Background</u> There are 36,198 children and young people in Windsor and Maidenhead with the largest group within the 0-19 population being those aged five to nine years old.</p> <p><u>Service users</u></p>

			<p>Data relating to the age of children’s centre attendees and youth centre users is not routinely collected. However, the data that is available shows that in relation to children’s centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the Windsor and Datchet area (which includes the following children’s centres: Lawns; Little Cygnets in Ascot, Datchet, Eton Wick and Old Windsor; Poppies; and the Manor) there is a 0-4 population of 4,209. On average, 86% of children and within the reach areas for these centres are registered (3,627 out of 4,209). • in the Maidenhead area (which includes the following children’s centres: Larchfield; Pinkneys; Riverside; and Woodlands Park) there is a 0-4 population of 4,586. On average, 72% of children within the reach areas for these centres are registered (3,295 out of 4,586). <p>Given that centres are aimed at children aged 0 to five, the assumption can be made that children in attendance are in that age bracket.</p> <p>For the youth service, available data and anecdotal evidence indicates that there is an equal split between users who are aged between eight and 16. It is also worth noting that currently the service holds specific sessions depending on age- separate youth club sessions are held for seven to 12 year olds and for young people aged 13 to 19 years old.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Given that children’s centre provision is aimed at children aged 0-5, the proposals will impact on this age group. Similarly, youth services are primarily aimed at children and young people aged eight to 16 so they too will be impacted.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Should the proposals be approved, there would likely be a negative impact on the children and young people and families who attend universal sessions at the children's centres or youth centres and those that attend centres that may not be retained. We would mitigate against some of the impact of these changes by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adopting a new, more responsive and flexible service. ● Providing more services through outreach at alternative venues in the community. ● Working more closely with community and voluntary sector groups to help them build resilience. ● Signposting young people or families who may no longer be able to access universal services to alternative providers. <p>In addition, it is worth noting that there are currently no planned changes to the universal health provision that is currently delivered. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Full Healthy Child Programme, offering every family 5 health reviews in the first 3 years (crucial first 1000 days) of their child's life and a range of support services in the community, i.e. drop in clinics, new baby groups. ● School nursing service which provides support with long term conditions and universal support for pupils in school. ● Home visiting support for families whose child is developmentally delayed, socially isolated or living with other vulnerabilities. <p>This would ensure that all families receive some level of support from the Family Hub model, even if they do not receive targeted services.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>There is not likely to be any impact on those children or young people and families who attend the centres that would remain or who access targeted services via outreach in the community or at home.</p> <p>Overall however, the preferred model would offer significant benefits to children, young people and families who are considered disadvantaged and who will receive a more holistic service that better meets their needs. For example, currently, there is a waiting list for families wanting to access targeted support. The strengthened focus on those who most need support as proposed in the Family Hub model would contribute to reducing these waiting lists, meaning help can be offered at an early stage. This could help to reduce the number of families experiencing more entrenched difficulties, thus requiring statutory intervention at a later date.</p> <p>Relevance to consultation</p> <p>Across both stages of the consultation, the majority of respondents are within the age range of 25-49 years and 2.7% of respondents are aged under 16.</p> <p>For the first stage of consultation, most respondents said they have children aged under five years old. For the second stage, most respondents have children aged between 0 and 14 years old.</p>
Disability	X		<p>Data</p> <p><u>Background</u></p> <p>There are 933 children and young people with a Statement of Special Educational Need (SEN) or Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) in Windsor and Maidenhead. In terms of primary need, in Windsor and Maidenhead, 35.7% have Autistic Spectrum Disorder</p>

			<p>(ASD); 18.0% have Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN); and 12.4% have Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) needs. ASD is the most common primary need nationally.</p> <p><u>Service users</u> Data relating to families with disabled children and families with a disabled parent/ carer accessing children’s centres is not routinely collected. However, currently the centres provide a range of support aimed at families with a child with SEND. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● School nursing services including enuresis clinics and support with long term conditions i.e. asthma, epilepsy; ● Specific services and groups for children with additional needs and their families, i.e. Joey Nurture Group; ● links to the voluntary or charitable sector to provide specialist family support i.e. parenting special children organisation which provides parenting support for parents of children with autism or attention deficit disorder. <p>These sessions are well-attended so it can be assumed that a proportion of users do have children with a disability.</p> <p>In the youth service, available data and anecdotal evidence suggests that universal services are not accessed by many children and young people with a disability. However, specific sessions held for those with a disability are usually well-attended.</p> <p>Impact The Family Hubs would continue to provide support for families with children with special needs. This would see a continuation of the services currently delivered in</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>children’s centres, as set out above. In addition, by focusing on those most in need, more families who have children with SEND or families with parents with a disability, may be able to access services.</p> <p>For example, this could include sessions specifically targeted at families who have a child with a disability, or parents receiving support for mental health issues.</p> <p>Staff will work with any families who may attend children’s centres that may not be retained to identify alternative accessible venues to attend sessions- either in other centres or in outreach sites including their home. This will take into account any mobility issues relating to the parent or child. It should also be noted that in developing proposals for retaining or discontinuing leases on buildings, criteria considered included accessibility, parking for those with a disability and proximity to public transport.</p> <p>The youth service will continue to provide specialised sessions for children and young people with disabilities. Any children and young people with disabilities who regularly attend universal services will be supported to identify other activities to participate in.</p> <p>Given the established link between disability and poverty (research in 2016 indicates that half of people in poverty are disabled or live with a disabled person), the strengthened focus on the most vulnerable families and hard to reach families is likely to have a positive impact on those families with a parent or carer who has a disability.</p> <p>Relevance to consultation 18.4% of respondents to the first stage of the consultation and 10.7% for the second stage said that they or a member of their family have a disability. This compares to 22.0% of the overall population of the UK that have a disability. This suggests the consultation</p>
--	--	--	--

			has been reasonably successful engaging with families with a family member with a disability, who have traditionally been considered hard to reach.
Gender (Sex)	X	X	<p>Data</p> <p><u>Background</u> The gender breakdown of males and females aged 0-19 is almost 50/50 across the borough.</p> <p><u>Service users</u> Data relating to the gender of parents/ carers and the children and young people that attend children’s centres is not routinely collected. However, it can be assumed that the largest majority of parents and carers attending are female as they generally remain the primary carer.</p> <p>In terms of youth service participants, available data and anecdotal evidence suggests that around 75% are male and 25% are female.</p> <p>Impact Potential changes to the children’s centre service are likely to have more of an impact on females as these services are predominantly taken up by women as the primary carers as set out above. It is worth noting however that fathers are actively encouraged to engage in services and additional groups for fathers are run. Staff would work with any families who may attend children’s centres that may be closed, to identify alternative venues to access services- either in other centres or at outreach sites.</p> <p>The potential changes to youth centres are more likely to impact on males given the</p>

			<p>gender split in terms of users. Again, support would be provided to identify other participation opportunities available to children and young people should the universal provision be discontinued.</p> <p>Although it is recognised that there will be some negative impact on gender- both male and female- due to the reduction in universal services, overall the impact is expected to be positive given the proposed mitigation i.e. greater involvement of the community and voluntary sector in the delivery of services; and greater use of outreach and community venues. In addition, the strengthened focus on those who are most in need of support, such as single parent families and young people engaging in risk behaviour at locally identified hotspots, will ensure the new model is contributing to increasing equality of opportunity for those who have struggled to access provision previously.</p> <p>Relevance to the consultation Across both stages of the consultation the vast majority of respondents to the survey are female.</p>
Gender reassignment		X	<p>Data The children’s centres and youth centres do not collect information relating to gender reassignment.</p> <p>However, the youth service does provide support to young people who may be transgender. For example, transgender young people have been part of residential trips organised by youth workers to build confidence and self-esteem.</p>

			<p>In addition, the service delivers gender and identity training. Between April and December 2019, 187 participants attended this training and 82% felt the training was beneficial to them.</p> <p>Impact Gender reassignment is considered of low relevance to this equality assessment. However this will be kept under review.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the youth service would continue to work with young people who may be transgender or considering transitioning. This would not change as a result of the proposed new model.</p> <p>There would also be an expectation that all staff within early help have an understanding of transgender and gender identity when working with users accessing services.</p> <p>Relevance to consultation The consultation did not ask respondents any questions in relation to gender reassignment.</p>
<p>Marriage and civil partnership</p>		<p>X</p>	<p>Data Information relating to marriage and civil partnership is not collected by any of the services proposed to undergo change.</p> <p>Impact Marriage and civil partnership is considered of low relevance to this equality assessment. However this will be kept under review.</p>

			<p>Relevance to consultation The consultation did not ask respondents about their marital status.</p>
Pregnancy and maternity	X		<p>Data Children’s centres provide services to expectant and new parents although data is not available in relation to numbers.</p> <p>Impact Although the services that may be affected by the proposed changes are considered to be of high relevance to pregnancy and maternity, the impact of the changes is not likely to be significant. Children’s centres would continue to offer post-natal health services to parents. For example, as part of the Full Health Child Programme, families will be offered five health reviews in the first three years (crucial first 1,000 days) of their child’s life and a range of support services in the community, i.e. drop in clinics , new baby groups. It is worth noting the location of some sessions may alter and may be accessible via outreach or community venues rather than children’s centres.</p> <p>In addition, specific services and groups for first time or young or vulnerable parents i.e. Baby Incredible Years programme would continue to be offered regardless of whether the proposed changes are implemented. In addition, support for care leavers, including those who are parents, would continue to be provided.</p> <p>Overall then, given that the majority of pregnancy and maternity services would continue, albeit potentially in different locations, and there would be increased focus on those most in need such as young or vulnerable parents, the overall impact is expected to be positive.</p>

			<p>Relevance to consultation</p> <p>The consultation did not ask respondents to the survey whether they were pregnant. However, in the responses, the importance of services to support those who are pregnant and new parents were highlighted.</p>
Race/ethnicity	x		<p>Data</p> <p><u>Background</u></p> <p>20.0% of children and young people from Windsor and Maidenhead (this total includes ‘White Other’) are from a Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic (BAME) background. 80.0% of children and young people in Windsor and Maidenhead are White British. In Windsor and Maidenhead the 0-19 population is less diverse than the overall population with 22.0% of the overall population from a BAME background.</p> <p><u>Service users</u></p> <p>Children’s centres and the youth service do not routinely collect data relating to race/ethnicity.</p> <p>However, in recognition that some BAME groups in the community are hard to reach and may not be accessing services, the children’s centres service have established specific and targeted sessions to engage with families from a BAME background. This has included, for example, working with 108 Asian women in Maidenhead to celebrate and build on their achievements in overcoming barriers to achieve better outcomes for their children; and successfully organising a beach trip in the summer of 2018 for 136 asian women and children from the borough. These services will continue should the new proposed model be implemented.</p>

In terms of the youth service, available data and anecdotal evidence suggests that the majority of users are White British with a small number from an Afro-Caribbean background or from other BAME ethnic groups.

Impact

The new proposed model, with a greater targeted approach for families most in need, would have a positive impact on those from a BAME background given the proven link between ethnicity and poverty. Research has shown that poverty is higher among all black and minority ethnic groups than among the majority white population (<https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/poverty-ethnicity-evidence-summary.pdf>). The proposals recognise this as the intention is to maintain centres located close to the areas with the highest levels of deprivation in the borough. As families from a BAME background are more likely to be vulnerable and are more likely to live in areas of deprivation, the increased focus on those most in need would help to ensure these families receive the support they require. The intention is also to continue to deliver the sessions targeted at specific hard to reach groups in the BAME community to ensure they are able to access services.

If any BAME families are impacted by the proposed closures, the service would work in a culturally sensitive way to identify opportunities to access services at other centres or at outreach sites.

In terms of the youth service, as with children's centres, given the link between ethnicity and poverty, the continued focus on vulnerable young people should ensure those from a BAME background receive the additional support that they need, as they are statistically more likely to need help. For example, nationally it is known that BAME young people are disproportionately represented amongst the children in care cohort. As

			<p>part of the offer going forward, the youth service will continue to deliver 1-2-1 support to children in care.</p> <p>More generally, the new Family Hubs would be delivered in such a way that the needs of families from diverse ethnic backgrounds can be met, based on demographic information in the local area.</p> <p>Relevance to the consultation 29.4% of respondents to the first stage of consultation were from a BAME background. The respondents to the second stage of the consultation were even more diverse with over half of respondents from a BAME background, with the majority being from a Pakistani background. The BAME population in RBWM is 22.0% so the survey respondents are more diverse than the overall population. This suggests that for both stages, but particularly the second consultation, we have engaged families who traditionally have been considered hard to reach.</p>
<p>Religion and belief including non-belief</p>		<p>X</p>	<p>Data Data relating to religion and belief is not collected by the children’s centres or youth centres.</p> <p>Impact Religion and belief is considered to be of low relevance to the proposals. However this will be kept under review.</p> <p>The children’s centres and youth centres are open to all religious backgrounds and staff are expected to understand and respect a range of religions and beliefs and what they may mean for families i.e. diet. Achieving for Children would continue to take into</p>

				<p>account the use of certain local buildings for outreach services in relation to religion to ensure people do not feel unable to take part.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that we would continue to deliver events to celebrate the diversity of our communities. For example, the intention is to repeat successful events held previously:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In the summer of 2018, over 100 families attended Riverside Children's Centre Family Fun Day to celebrate Eid in Windsor and Maidenhead. The Mayor and Mayoress joined in the festivities and families celebrated with food, Bollywood dancing and a mini-farm. The health visiting team also delivered a quiz highlighting the importance of home safety and accident prevention. ● During the past 2018-29, 250 participants from the Muslim community attended personal development and parenting groups linked to Islamic values for both men and women. The aim has been to improve engagement with multi-faith communities. Work has also been undertaken with the community to set up Muslim youth groups and work alongside local and national Christian and Jewish leaders to organise multi-faith events for women. <p>Relevance to the consultation For the first stage of consultation, 42.3% of respondents stated their religion as Christian. For the second stage of the consultation, almost half of the respondents stated they were Muslim. This suggests the consultation enabled people from a range of religious backgrounds to participate.</p>
Sexual orientation			X	Data

			<p>Data relating to sexual orientation is not collected by the children’s centres or youth centres.</p> <p>However, anecdotal evidence from the youth service suggests around 10% of participants are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender (LGBT).</p> <p>Impact Sexual orientation is considered to be of low relevance to the proposals. However this will be kept under review.</p> <p>In addition, there will be an expectation that children’s centre and youth work staff have an understanding and respect the sexual orientation of users of the children’s centres and youth service provision. If there was a need to deliver a bespoke group, this will be considered.</p> <p>Relevance to consultation The consultation did not ask respondents to the survey for their sexual orientation.</p>
Other i.e. carer, or those on a low income	X		<p>Data shows that there are 9.3% of children in Windsor and Maidenhead who are living in poverty (compared to the national average of 19.9%). By targeting services at vulnerable families in or close to the areas of deprivation in the borough, the Family Hubs would be accessible by those who most need support. This may include lone parent families, families from a workless household and families who receive benefits.</p> <p>Relevance to consultation Across the two stages of consultation, 45.0% of respondents declared a household income under £15,000 or between £15,001 and £30,000. The Office for National</p>

				Statistics states that the average annual household income in March 2020 was £30,800. This therefore suggests that the consultation has engaged families with a lower than average household income who would be more likely to receive the targeted services.
--	--	--	--	--

What consultation have you undertaken in the development of this policy/ project or with stakeholders or critical friends?

Outline the consultation method and what feedback has been received

Background to the consultation

Two public consultations have been undertaken as part of the development of the final proposals for the Family Hub Service. The full consultation findings from both stages can be found in the consultation report that will shortly be published on the AfCInfo website.

In total, we have consulted for 20 weeks and have received 687 responses. This is a relatively strong response rate. By comparison, Buckinghamshire County Council received 752 responses to their own equivalent 12-week public consultation from a population approximately four times the size.

The initial consultation found that existing services were highly valued but that respondents felt that one to one support for families in crisis should be a priority. Over a third of respondents were in favour of the proposed aims for the Family Hub Service model- just less than a third were not in favour and a similar percentage were neutral.

The second stage of the consultation was shaped by, and built upon, the first stage of the consultation. It provided more significantly more detail about what the proposed new service could look like and what changes this would mean to existing services.

Overall, the responses were positive about the proposals. The results show that the significant majority of respondents are in support of the proposed Family Hub Service model and agree with the key principles that underpin it. This includes support for the flexible approach to service delivery with more focus on delivering services where they are needed, rather than in a single location; and for the priorities identified in the first stage of consultation.

Almost twice as many respondents agree with the proposals for which sites to retain and which to discontinue leases for than disagree. The majority of respondents agree with the rationale we used to propose which sites to retain and over half agree with the rationale for which sites propose to discontinue sites for.

Riverside Children's Centre emerges as the most popular site from the consultation in terms of usage and support for retaining it. Respondents support the proposals to retain all the sites we have identified. Respondents do not agree with all the proposals to discontinue leases, however for each site we have proposed to discontinue the lease for, there are some respondents who are in favour. It is also worth noting that for some children's centre satellite sites and youth centres, there is a similar percentage who agree and disagree with the proposal to discontinue the lease. There is also a large proportion of respondents who are neutral about the proposals for each site.

In terms of impact of the proposals, half of respondents do not think there will be a negative impact on them if the changes are implemented. However, almost a third of respondents said they need more information to understand the potential impact.

Both stages of the consultation engaged respondents from a range of backgrounds traditionally considered hard to reach including families with a family member with a disability, those from a BAME background, and families that have an annual household income less than the UK average.

Details of first stage of consultation

Consultation methodology

Following approval at November 2019 Cabinet to undertake a public consultation on the transformation of our early help services into an integrated Family Hub model, a consultation process was undertaken. The consultation process sought to:

- Ascertain the views of the public on transforming early help services into integrated Family Hubs for 0-19 year olds.
- Ascertain the priorities of those likely to be most affected by the proposed changes.

The first stage of consultation took place between January and March 2020 over 12 weeks. RBWM residents were consulted on the proposed changes to the delivery of early help services through a variety of methods:

- A 12-week online survey, which launched on Monday 6 January 2020 and closed on Monday 30 March 2020. Paper copies of the survey were made available at libraries and current early help service sites. Paper copies submitted made up approximately 10% of the overall survey.
- 6 public focus group sessions held at Children’s and Youth Centres across the Royal Borough. It is worth noting that a seventh session was planned to take place in South Ascot on 18 March 2020, but due to the COVID-19 pandemic this had to be cancelled. The list of sessions that were held is below:
 - Woodlands Park Children’s Centre (13 January 2020);
 - Windsor Youth Talk (21 January 2020);
 - Pinkneys Green Youth & Community Centre (3 February 2020);
 - Datchet Children’s Centre (8 February 2020);
 - Riverside Children’s Centre (22 February 2020); and
 - The Manor, Dedworth (4 March 2020)

Consultation findings

During the 12-week consultation, 501 responses were received. This number takes into account paper copy responses. This is a relatively strong response rate. By comparison, Buckinghamshire County Council received 752 responses to their own equivalent 12-week public consultation from a population approximately four times the size.

In addition to the online questionnaire, we held six public consultation focus groups and two staff workshops. While most respondents recognised the need to prioritise one to one support for our most vulnerable families, there were concerns about how other families would find other support.

The vast majority (88%) of responders to the survey identified themselves as female within the age range of 25-49 years (80%). 84% described themselves as ‘parent/carers’ with most (60%) having children under the age of 5. Over three-quarters (79%) were based in Windsor or Maidenhead towns with 42% of respondents declaring a household income of £30,000 or less which is lower than the median annual UK salary of £30,350. 27% declared a household income of over £60,000 a year.

83% of responders confirmed that they had accessed one of the available family services within the last 12 months. Children's centres and parenting support services were the most regularly accessed with 48% saying they accessed these at least once a week. The sites where responders had accessed these services from was mixed, but Riverside Children's Centre in Maidenhead appeared to be the most well-used with almost a third (32%) having attended a session there within the last year.

When respondents were asked to state the maximum amount they would be willing to pay to attend a children's centre or youth centre session, the majority (37%) said they would be willing to spend up to £3. Over a quarter (28%) said they would be willing to spend up to £1.50 and 15% said up to a maximum of £5.00. 20% stated that they would not want to pay any sum to attend a session.

As part of the consultation, respondents were shown the proposed aims for its early help services and were asked whether they agreed. 36% confirmed that they did agree with the new family hub proposals set out, while 32% said they disagreed. 32% also stated that they were neutral or did not know.

Other suggestions for a remodelled delivery of services were invited. The key themes to emerge were:

- How highly- regarded the early help services are and how many families consider them invaluable and rate the existing services delivered.
- The need to work more closely with existing charities and volunteer groups and key partners such as local schools.
- The importance of maintaining the focus on vulnerable groups including children and young people with disabilities; Black Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) support groups; those with mental health issues.
- The need to ensure all families are able to access provision and that services are delivered in an accessible way and publicised accordingly.
- The need to clearly define who services will be targeted at.
- Some willingness to accept charges for sessions if that means services can continue.
- Providing more of an offer for teenagers, particularly during school holidays.

When asked to prioritise areas where support should be targeted, the most common answer amongst respondents was 'one-to-one support for families in crisis'. 'Positive parenting groups for parents to help manage their children's behaviour' and 'emotional wellbeing support for new parents' made up the top three. 'Drop-in youth groups in the community' was considered the least priority.

There was a noticeably low response from users of the youth centres. Only 12% of responders said they had accessed a youth service session in the past year and only 8% said they used them on a weekly basis. The most well-attended youth centre by participating responders was Windsor Youth Club.

Details of the second stage of consultation

Consultation methodology

Between 17 July and the 23 September 2020, we carried out a second public consultation to ask for views on our proposed Family Hub Service model. We sought advice and guidance from a number of sources to ensure our approach to the second stage of consultation was robust and comprehensive. This included:

- commissioning an early years and consultation expert from an external consultancy company to provide advice and guidance on the proposed consultation approach and methodology.
- seeking advice from other external consultation experts i.e. previous Non-Executive Independent Director on the Achieving for Children Board provided advice based on experience of delivering public consultation as part of an education consultancy.
- reviewing consultation approaches from other local authorities undertaking similar exercise to identify best practice. This included the Buckinghamshire County Council consultation relating to the transformation of early help services which was subject to Judicial Review but found to be lawful.
- discussions with colleagues in Achieving for Children operational area 1 who have undertaken a similar exercise about lessons learned, best approaches to consultation i.e. engaging hard to reach families, including critical friend challenge of our proposed approach.
- review of the consultation approach by consultation experts in Achieving for Children operational area 1.
- review of consultation approach and methodology by RBWM Communications Team and support given for publicising the consultation when live.

The consultation methodology is set out in the table below. It was devised to take into account COVID-19 in terms of being unable to hold face to face sessions to discuss the proposals in children's centre or youth centres, and the school summer holidays.

Method	Detail
Online survey for eight weeks	<p>We developed a survey setting out the background detail to the consultation; the proposals for the centres; and questions about centre usage and their views on the proposed action for each centre.</p> <p>We originally planned for the consultation to open for eight weeks. Based on feedback from parent groups about difficulties completing the survey while children were still on summer holidays, we extended by an additional six days from the 17 September to the 23 September to allow an extra weekend for it to be completed.</p>
AfCInfo internet page	<p>A specific page was set up for the consultation- this included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Detailed background document. ● Frequently Asked Questions. ● Draft Equality Impact Assessment. <p>The link to the survey is included on the page.</p> <p>Based on feedback from parent groups, we developed an easy read, shorter version of the background document to explain the changes and the implications more concisely. As part of this, we also developed a number of case studies demonstrating what the Family Hub Service could look like in practice.</p>
Social media	<p>AfC and RBWM websites and social media accounts were used to publicise the consultation with a link to the survey. This included both Twitter and Facebook.</p>
Dedicated inbox for questions, queries or comments	<p>A dedicated inbox (familyhubs@achievingforchildren.org.uk) was set up for the consultations. Residents were asked to send any questions or queries about the consultation here.</p> <p>Nine emails were received which included comments or questions. We provided a response to each of these and feedback has been included in the analysis of the consultation.</p>

Virtual drop in sessions	<p>We arranged four virtual drop in sessions (1 hour) with dates advertised on the AfCInfo page- interested parties were asked to email the inbox to request an invite. The sessions were planned for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Friday 7 August 2020 at 5pm until 6pm. ● Friday 21 August 2020 at 1pm until 2pm. ● Friday 4 September 2020 at 9am until 10am. ● Monday 14 September 2020 at 3pm until 4pm. <p>There were no emails to the inbox to request an invitation to any of the sessions.</p>
Direct email to registered children’s centre users who have provided an email address	Registered children’s centre users were emailed directly with a link to the survey to ask them to participate at the beginning of the consultation and in the last four weeks. This enabled us to directly contact over 4,500 local residents.
Direct email to PaCiP	We directly emailed PaCiP, the parent carer forum for RBWM who provide a service for parents and carers of children and young people 0-25 years, with any special educational needs and disabilities, with or without a diagnosis, with or without an EHCP and in any, or no educational placement. PaCiP then shared the information with all their members via social media.
Using RBWM regular communication mechanisms	<p>Information about the consultation was included in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Resident newsletter; ● Borough Bulletin; and ● Members Update. <p>A link to the survey was also emailed out to all registered library users as part of the libraries newsletter. This is emailed to more than 50,000 registered users in RBWM.</p>
Item in the schools	Information included in the schools bulletin which was sent out in September 2020 when the schools returned. The schools were

bulletin	asked to encourage pupils to participate.
Information included in AfC Staff News	The information was included in AfC's staff news for those staff who live in RBWM who use children's centres or youth centres, or who support families or young people that do.
Engaging young people that we support	Our youth workers were asked to individually engage with young people who use youth centres to encourage them to take part in the consultation.
Directly email to local doctor surgeries and churches	Local doctor surgeries and churches were sent a direct email to ask for their help in distributing the link to the survey and asking them to complete it themselves.
Direct email to voluntary and community sector organisations and any other relevant groups	Direct emails were sent to 30 voluntary and community sector organisations and other relevant groups in the local area to ask for their help in distributing the link to the survey and asking them to complete it themselves. This included some parent groups and established support groups for traditionally hard to reach groups including those from the BAME community and children, young people and families with special educational needs and disabilities.
Awareness raising sessions with key stakeholder groups who may be considered hard to reach	We informed a number of key stakeholder groups about the consultation and encouraged them to participate. For example, we liaised with the lead of the Asian Women's Group who then coordinated the distribution of information about the consultation. This included 70 copies of the easy read document that had been translated into Urdu that were shared with the local Pakistani population. Hard copies of the survey were also sent to local mosques, libraries, and existing sites. 117 were completed and returned.
Universal health clinics	Universal health clinics recommenced in the second week in June 2020. Health visitors were asked to encourage attendees to complete the questionnaire.

Consultation findings

The main findings from the second stage of consultation are set out below. This incorporates feedback via the online survey but also feedback sent directly to the dedicated inbox set up for the consultation period. In total we received 186 responses to the survey and seven emails with feedback.

Overall findings

The significant majority of respondents are in support of the proposed Family Hub Service model and agree with the key principles that underpin it. This includes support for the flexible approach to service delivery with more focus on delivering services where they are needed, rather than in a single location; and for the priorities identified in the first stage of consultation.

Almost twice as many respondents agree with the proposals for which sites to retain and which to discontinue leases for than disagree. The majority of respondents agree with the rationale we used to propose which sites to retain and over half agreeing with the rationale for which sites propose to discontinue sites for.

Riverside Children's Centre emerges as the most popular site from the consultation in terms of usage and support for retaining it. Respondents support the proposals to retain all the sites we have identified. Generally respondents do not agree with the proposals to discontinue leases, although there are a number of respondents in favour of doing this for all the sites, and for some children's centre satellite sites and youth centres, there is a similar percentage agreeing and disagreeing. There is also a large proportion of respondents who are neutral about the proposals for each site.

In terms of impact of the proposals, half of respondents do not think there will be a negative impact on them if the changes are implemented. However, almost a third of respondents said they need more information to understand the potential impact.

The consultation engaged respondents from a range of backgrounds traditionally considered hard to reach including families with a family member with a disability, those from a BAME background, and families that have an annual household income less than the UK average.

Usage of current services

- Riverside Children's Centre is the most popular site with those that responded.
- Most respondents that attend children's centres or youth centres go once or twice a week.
- Most respondents that attend our sites either walk or drive. Only 5.9% said they take public transport.

Support for the proposals

- Almost two thirds of respondents either agree or strongly agree with the overall proposed Family Hub Service model. Less than a fifth disagree or strongly disagree.
- Over four fifths of respondents said they agree with some or all of the key principles behind the proposed Family Hub Service model. Less than a tenth said they disagreed with some or all of them.
- Over two thirds of respondents agree or strongly agree with the proposal to adopt a flexible approach to delivery whereby the focus is more on delivering services where they are needed rather than at a single location. Less than a fifth of respondents disagree or strongly disagree with this.
- Nearly 90% of respondents agree or strongly agree with the priorities for early help services that were identified as part of the first stage of the consultation. Less than 2.0% disagree.

Proposed retention and discontinuing of leases at sites

- Almost three quarters of respondents agree or strongly agree with the rationale we have proposed for deciding which sites to retain. Just 5.0% disagree or strongly agree.
- Just over half of respondents agree or strongly agree with the rationale for deciding which sites to discontinue leases for. Just over 10.0% of respondents disagree or strongly disagree.
- Overall almost twice as many respondents agree or strongly agree with the proposals for which children's centres and youth centres to retain and which to discontinue leases for (39.5%) than disagree or strongly disagree (20.9%). Almost a third of respondents (27.7%) neither agree nor disagree.
- There is a high percentage of respondents who neither agree nor disagree with the proposals for each of the sites.
- For all the sites we have proposed to retain, there are more respondents that agree or strongly agree with the proposals than disagree or strongly agree. Riverside Children's Centre is the most popular site to retain.
- For the majority of sites we have proposed to discontinue leases for, there are more respondents that disagree or strongly disagree than agree or strongly agree. However, for the proposals for the satellite children's centre sites and for Charters Youth Centre, a similar number of respondents agree or strongly agree or disagree or strongly disagree.
- In terms of children's centres, the most respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the proposal to discontinue the lease at Pinkney's Green Children's Centre (36.9%) although 22.4% do agree or strongly agree with the proposals.
- In terms of youth centres, the most respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the proposal to discontinue the lease at Larchfield Youth Centre (36.0%) although 16.0% do agree or strongly agree with the proposal.
- In terms of other sites, the most respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the proposal to discontinue the lease at Maidenhead Project Centre, Reform Road (31.0%). 16.6% of respondents agree or strongly agree with the proposal.

- In terms of the impact of the proposals, over 50.0% of respondents said there would be no impact; that they would use new provision that is more local to them; or they would be happy to use another site. 16.7% said they wouldn't use the services as much in the future and may stop entirely; while 29.0% said they do know enough yet to understand the impact.
- For those who responded that they would stop using services or use them less in future, the most commonly selected answer as to why was that they do not have enough information about the new way of delivering these services, such as from community venues. The next most commonly selected answer was that they do not believe the other locations will offer the services that are needed; followed by potential issues with travel if having to go further to other locations.

Details of respondents

- Most respondents are parents and carers; are aged between 25 and 49 years old; are female; and have children aged between 0 and 14 years old.
- 3.3% of respondents were children and young people aged under 16.
- 10.7% of respondents have a disability or a family member with a disability. This compares to 22.0% of the overall population of the UK that have a disability. This suggests the consultation has been reasonably successful engaging with families with a family member with a disability, who have traditionally been considered hard to reach.
- Over half of respondents are from a BAME background, with the majority being from a Pakistani background. Almost half of the respondents are also Muslim. The BAME population in RBWM is 22.0% so the survey respondents are more diverse than the overall population. As with disability, this suggests the consultation has engaged families from a BAME, who traditionally have been considered hard to reach.
- 43.8% of respondents declared a household income under £15,000 or between £15,001 and £30,000. The Office for National Statistics states that the average annual household income in March 2020 was £30,800. This therefore suggests that the consultation has engaged families with a lower than average household income who would be more likely to receive the targeted services.
- Almost all of the respondents are from Maidenhead or Windsor and live in the SL6 or SL4 postcode area.

Themes to emerge from the consultation

There are a number of key themes that emerge from the consultation responses. These are:

- Concern about the loss of services for all families and a desire to maintain all universal services.
- The importance of accessible and local provision with good parking on site.
- The need to work more closely with community and voluntary sector groups, although there is concern about these groups having sufficient capacity to meet need.
- Available services could be promoted and marketed more effectively.

- Parenting programmes and stress management sessions are highly valued.
- Services should be provided in a range of languages.
- Concern about the consultation process, particularly in relation to the ongoing COVID-19 situation and the possible impact of this on the consultation.

Proposed changes as a result of the consultation feedback

The consultation confirmed that overall there is support for the proposals for the Family Hub Service from those who responded. However, a number of areas of concern have emerged. These are addressed below with the action that has been proposed to resolve the issue.

Area of concern	Action
<p>Concern about the loss of services for all families and a desire to maintain all universal services.</p>	<p>There will be no changes to the universal health provision that is currently delivered if the proposals were agreed and implemented. This would mean that all families will continue to receive some level of service from the proposed Family Hub Service but as it represents a progressive universal approach the more services families need, the more they get.</p> <p>The proposals mean an end to the stay and play sessions currently accessible to all. However we will develop a directory of resources which will include local organisations offering universal and targeted support. We are also updating our Local Offer website which will complement this directory. We will use these methods to signpost children, young people and families to the support they need in the wider community. The intention is to make the directory easy to navigate and we would seek to provide additional online resources including self-help tools which have become more prevalent during the current pandemic.</p>
<p>The importance of accessible and local provision with good parking on site.</p>	<p>In deciding what to propose for each existing site we set a number of criteria which included being well placed for transport or with good parking facilities.</p> <p>Although the proposal will mean a reduction in the current number of sites, the proposals to extend our outreach work and focus on delivering services in the community, rather than at a specifically designated children’s centre or youth centre, will enable services to become more accessible to those vulnerable families who need support. For example, we will be able to deliver services in the home more for families who find it hard to travel to a site.</p>

	<p>Interestingly only a very small percentage of respondents said they use public transport- most either walk or drive.</p> <p>As there was feedback about parking issues with some of the sites, we will review the parking arrangements at any sites that are retained to identify if improvements can be made.</p>
<p>The need to work more closely with community and voluntary sector groups, although there is concern about these groups having sufficient capacity to meet need.</p>	<p>The proposal for the Family Hub Service already includes a commitment to strengthen working with community and voluntary sector groups.</p> <p>We will work with the local community and voluntary sector to identify those groups and/or individuals who are willing and able to run universal sessions for children, young people and families. We will provide advice and guidance to enable them to establish sessions accessible by all. This could include supporting parents to deliver sessions and / or support themselves where possible.</p> <p>As part of the second stage of consultation, we asked respondents to provide their details if they would be interested in delivering sessions. A number of respondents expressed interest in this so the intention will be to follow up on these.</p> <p>In terms of the concerns about the community and voluntary sector groups having capacity to deliver sessions, we will work alongside RBWM Council to identify opportunities to support local organisations. For example, the Council have proposed to provide space for a local community group at the Marlow Road site. We will seek other opportunities to join with the community and voluntary sector to widen the support provided to our families.</p>
<p>Available services could be promoted and marketed more effectively.</p>	<p>We will be reviewing our publicity materials and the marketing of our services whether the proposals for the Family Hub Service are agreed or not. It is clear from the consultation feedback that more can be done to ensure our residents are aware of the services that are available to them and how these services can be accessed.</p> <p>If the proposals are agreed, we will create a clear Family Hub Service offer which will be marketed widely across RBWM and with our key partners to ensure that families who need support are aware of how to access it. This is in addition to the development of the directory of resources that has been mentioned previously.</p>

<p>Parenting programmes and stress management sessions are highly valued.</p>	<p>Parenting programmes and stress management sessions will continue to be delivered as part of the Family Hub Service model should it be agreed.</p> <p>We will also look to improve our online resources for families and this will likely include information about parenting and stress management.</p>
<p>Services should be provided in a range of languages.</p>	<p>A number of our services are already provided in multiple languages. For example our Asian parenting programmes are delivered in mother-tongue. Also, the online Solihull parenting support resource is available in a number of languages including Polish, Urdu and Spanish. This will continue should the Family Hub Service proposal be agreed, particularly to ensure we are able to target families from a BAME background who may be experiencing difficulties. We already have a strong relationship with the Asian Women’s Network and the intention will be to continue to work alongside the group to ensure our BAME communities are aware of the services on offer and can access help when it is needed.</p> <p>We worked closely with the Asian Women’s Network as part of the second stage of the consultation to encourage their members to give their views. To achieve this we translated some of the background documents into Urdu and circulated this with hard copies of the survey. As a result, we received responses from a large number of residents from BAME backgrounds.</p>
<p>Concern about the consultation process, particularly in relation to the ongoing COVID-19 situation and the possible impact of this on the consultation.</p>	<p>We sought advice and guidance both internally and externally to ensure that the second stage of the consultation was sufficiently robust. To take into account the ongoing COVID-19 situation we provided a range of means for residents to engage in the consultation process. This is set out in section 8.</p> <p>We also extended the consultation period by additional six days to allow respondents further opportunity to give their views as one resident raised concerns about being able to complete the survey over the school summer holidays. The extended closing date of 23 September meant that children had been back at school for at least two weeks by the time the survey closed.</p> <p>We also adapted our consultation approach while it was ongoing in response to feedback i.e. developing a shorter easy read version of the background document and case studies setting out what the proposed service could look like in practice.</p>

<p>Post- consultation, RBWM Council have confirmed that the Marlow Road Youth Centre site has been given to Maidenhead Community Centre as they have lost their existing site.</p>	<p>AfC will seek to retain use of some space at Marlow Road for Family Hub Service provision to ensure continuity of service for families. Discussions are already ongoing to this end.</p> <p>To mitigate the loss of the space, the proposal is to retain Maidenhead Project Centre, Reform Road as a sub-venue with the aim of increasing usage at the site i.e. evening and weekend Family Hub Service delivery. This will have an impact on the efficiency savings as £30,000 was allocated towards this based on the ceasing of the lease at the site.</p>
--	--

Summary of findings

The assessment has identified that overall the preferred Family Hub Service model would have a positive impact across the protected characteristic groups as it would aim to:

- improve accessibility for those most in need including those who are traditionally considered hard to reach including families with a child or parent with a disability; and children, young people and families from a BAME background.
- provide opportunities for disadvantaged children, young people and families to access provision that will contribute to increasing their equality of opportunity by targeting services at those who most need support; and
- increase the engagement of children, young people and families who do not usually participate in the provision services by delivering targeted sessions via outreach, either in the community or in the home.

The findings from the consultation show that respondents support this approach, with the majority in favour of prioritising support for families in crisis and wanting to ensure there is continued focus on vulnerable groups including: children and young people with disabilities; BAME support groups; and those with mental health issues. The consultation responses also showed that the significant majority of respondents are in support of the proposed Family Hub Service model and agree with the key principles that underpin it. This includes support for the flexible approach to service delivery with more focus on delivering services where they are needed, rather than in a single location; and for the proposed key priorities. The detailed feedback collected as part of the consultation will be used to shape the implementation of the Family Hub Service model should the proposals be approved.

Positively, the information gathered regarding the protected characteristic details of the respondents demonstrates that the consultation engaged with some of those groups traditionally considered to be hard to reach, such as those with a family member with a disability or those from a BAME background. This has ensured that we have captured a range of voices

It must be noted however that the assessment does acknowledge that there would be a negative impact on those users of universal provision delivered through children’s centres services and the youth service. The intention would be to mitigate this through actions such as those set out below which align with the themes to emerge from both stages of the consultation:

- Providing more flexible services through outreach at alternative venues in the community.
- Working more closely with community and voluntary sector groups to identify any groups that could deliver sessions to replace the reduced universal activities, with support from Achieving for Children staff.
- Signposting young people or families who may no longer be able to access universal services to alternative providers such as those identified in the first stage of the consultation e.g. signposting users of Old Windsor Children’s Centre to Old Windsor’s ‘Tiddlers and Toddlers’ playgroup.

In addition, all families would continue to receive some level of service as universal health provision would remain unchanged. This would mean that any families in need of targeted support should be identified at the earliest opportunity and given the help they need as soon as possible.

ACTION PLANNING

What consultation have you undertaken with stakeholders or critical friends about the key findings? Include any identified data gaps.

<i>Issue identified</i>	<i>Planned action</i>	<i>Lead officer</i>	<i>Completion Date</i>
Lack of data relating to protected characteristics of users available to report on.	Improve data collection and reporting in relation to the protected characteristics for users of Family Hubs should the model be implemented.	Rachael Park- Davies, Community Services Manager	From the implementation of the Family Hub Service model, if approved.

PUBLISHING THE COMPLETED ANALYSIS

Completed Date:	June 202; updated October 2020; and then final update November 2020
Lead Officer:	Henry Kilpin
Signed off by (Director level):	Lin Ferguson, Director of Children’s Social Care

Please send your completed EIA to henry.kilpin@achievingforchildren.org.uk or edwina.gregory@achievingforchildren.org.uk for publication.