

## Equality and Community Cohesion Impact Assessment

AIP R24 and R27 – Reduce funding for Connexions by 15% and release one-off funding for the “January Guarantee”

### Assessing impact on Customers

Theme	Risk assessment
Disability equality	<p data-bbox="517 499 1343 757">Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people) and not by non-disabled people? For example, does it affect disabled people’s access to or take up of services, or impact on their independence or day to day living?</p> <p data-bbox="517 757 1007 797"><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p data-bbox="517 831 1343 1014">Within mainstream education there will be no negative impact on young people with LDD, as these young people will still receive a priority service. The service will ensure that S139 assessments are completed and there is appropriate attendance at SEN reviews.</p> <p data-bbox="517 1055 1343 1928">The specialist Learning Difficulties and/or Disability Team in the City will explore the loss of one FTE Senior Personal Adviser and 1.9 FTE Personal Advisers. These advisers work primarily with Special Schools, Young People educated on Statement ‘out of authority’ and learners requiring specialist SEN/LDD provision as well as some young people in mainstream establishments with higher levels of need. There will be some minor impacts with regards to attendance at Person Centred Reviews in academic years 10 and 11. Usually if we know young people are remaining at the same special school in year 12 and beyond we will not be attending the year 10 and 11 reviews. Partners within LDD arena and special school heads have been informed about this. Heads will ‘flag’ up to us young people in years 10 &amp; 11 if they feel review needs attending. We will still support these young people outside of the review process. We will also have less capacity to support learners from other authorities placed in City Schools as well as a possible reduction in support to mainstream establishments. We will control these risks by ensuring that we increase the support continuous professional development (CPD) to mainstream colleagues in order so that they can support these clients when we as a team have less capacity to do so.</p>

<p>Gender equality ('Sex equality' in the Equality Act 2010)</p>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? For example, are more women reliant on the service because of their family responsibilities?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>Impact of service reductions will equally affect male and female clients.</p>
<p>Gender reassignment (New)</p>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by people who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing, or have undergone a process to change their gender?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>Young people will be supported regardless of any gender reassignment</p>
<p>Pregnancy and maternity (New)</p>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by women who are pregnant or new mothers? For example, does it reduce opportunities to access the service flexibly or remove available support or training?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>Although clients will continue to receive IAG from advisers to help them access employment, education and training, unless there is additional external funding support activities will be reduced. This will result in an increase in referrals to other specialist services e.g. Sure Start and Children's Centres to access sexual health services.</p>
<p>Race equality</p>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? (Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups.) For example, will it impact on areas of the city which have more BME than White residents, or vice versa?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>In the city there is a planned reduction of 1.3 FTE staff who directly work with a small proportion of BME clients and Unaccompanied Asylum Seekers. . However young people from all racial groups will continue to receive support from Personal Advisers. Unaccompanied Asylum seekers will be supported by a Personal Adviser working alongside the Children In Care team. There may be an increase in referrals to specific community groups offering specialist support e.g. 'Two Halves one Whole' or to 'Ek Awaaj' etc</p>

	<p>If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area? If you are not sure, go to the 3 questions in the Negative Impacts section, below.</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>Impact is across the city.</p>
<p>Sexual orientation equality</p>	<p>Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by lesbian, gay or bisexual people and not by heterosexual people? For example, is it likely to reduce access to the service or to reduce or remove services focussed on LGB people?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>Impact of service reduction will not affect this group more than others.</p>
<p><b>Community Cohesion</b> (Relates to duty to promote good relations)</p>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city? For example, will it affect the outer estates more and not the inner city?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>Universal services are currently available to all within the city. Impact of service reduction will affect all areas across the city equally. Targeted services are resourced based on need and will continue to be so.</p>