

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS (EqIAA)

Youth Budget Review

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

Background

The universal youth budget was established following a major review of youth services in 2012 (implemented from April 2013). The key policy decisions made as an outcome of that review (together with the current position) were:-

To transfer the operation and control of council owned youth centre buildings to locally based organisations where possible.

Five youth centres at Winterbourne, Hanham, Little Stoke, Patchway and Wickwar have been transferred to a community, voluntary or social enterprise organisation or parish council.

The Made for Ever youth centre in Kingswood has not been transferred and remains in the control of the council.

Thornbury youth centre is leased by the council from a community run building, Turnberries.

Activities there are now delivered by a community organisation.

The original Cadbury Heath Youth Centre has now closed and has moved into The Batch – a new Trustee managed community centre.

Oldland Youth Centre is due to be demolished with an agreement that the Parish Council will rebuild it and continue running youth activities from the site.

Organisations that have taken control of youth centre buildings have each received some level of funding support from Property Services for building related expenses. This was for a maximum 3 year period and ceases on 31 March 2016.

To fund some part time open access youth provision in each of the six priority neighbourhoods and additional three sessions per week specifically for young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities. (£230k)

There are a total of 14 centre based sessions funded by the council each week. These are made up of:

11x Priority Neighbourhood (PN) centre based youth sessions per week - seven of these are delivered directly by the council and four by two other providers).

Three centre based sessions per week for young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities (LDD) - all delivered by the Local Authority.

To establish a community grant fund called the Positive Activities Subsidy (PAS) set at £437.7k per annum for an initial three years (until March 2016). To distribute these funds to each of the five Area Forum areas using the following formula: £237,700 distributed on the basis of a weighting of 50% of the population of young people within an area, 50% on deprivation and £200,000 to be focused in targeted support for individuals distributed on a population basis. It was agreed that 10% of the total should be held back for administration.

The purpose of the Positive Activities Subsidy (PAS) community grant was to enable distribution of funding for youth activities to a much wider group of community based providers and youth groups. It is distributed following decisions made at each of the five Local Area Forums. This includes funds for one, two or three years for some projects (including to organisations who have taken control of council youth centre buildings) alongside one off payments to groups for specific activities or equipment.

An equality impact assessment in relation to this review in 2012 was completed and continues to be monitored. <http://www.southglos.gov.uk/documents/Review-of-Integrated-Services-for-Young-People-CAH2012.pdf>

APPENDIX 3

At the Children and Young People Committee on 23 September 2015 members resolved 'That officers consult on protecting the priority neighbourhood and learning difficulties and disabilities element of the Universal Youth Budget and on not renewing the Positive Activities Subsidy.

Analysis of consultation responses, including equalities analysis via a full EqIAA, were reported to the Children and Young People Committee on 2 March 2016 and members resolved:

1. That the Positive Activity Subsidy be renewed at a reduced level of £250k in year 1, £225k in year 2 and £150k in year 3 from 1 April 2016 until 31 March 2019 as a three year funding agreement, subject to annual Council budget approval;
2. That £11k be included from the available budget from 2017/18 for an additional priority neighbourhood session in Yate;
3. That the provision of interim funding from 1 April 2016 from the reduced Positive Activity Subsidy fund be approved;
4. That authority be delegated to the Director for Children, Adults and Health as of 1 April 2016, in consultation with the Committee Lead Members, to allocate the interim funding referred to in resolution (3) above, such allocations to be made in accordance with the following criteria (not in any priority order):
 - a) Organisations that have control of Council owned or leased buildings who currently receive Positive Activity Subsidy (PAS) funds to deliver open access activities and are at risk of closure or significant reduction in provision if those funds are removed;
 - b) Organisations who provide PAS funded open access centre based youth sessions in non-council owned buildings in 2015/16 and are at risk of closure or significant reduction in provision if those funds are removed;
 - c) Other open access youth provision such as detached or outreach youth work funded by PAS in 2015/16 and are at risk of closure or significant reduction in provision if those funds are removed.

For applications that meet the criteria, funding to be limited to essential need and not exceed current levels of PAS funding in 2015/16. In determining interim funding arrangements other sources of funding (including those made in the last round of PAS funding during February/March 2016) to be taken into account. The total amount of funding paid must not exceed the budget available (pro rata for the term of interim funding).

5. That authority be delegated to the Director for Children Adults and Health, in consultation with the Lead Members of the Committee, to agree the eligibility criteria for the allocation for the reduced Positive Activity Subsidy from the end of the transition period in 2016 to 31 March 2019;
6. That authority be delegated to the Director for Children, Adults and Health in consultation with the Lead Members of the Committee to allocate the reduced Positive Activity Subsidy in accordance with the agreed allocation criteria from the end of the transition period in 2016 to 31 March 2019, subject to annual Council budget approval;
7. That officers continue to investigate alternative models of youth provision in South Gloucestershire working with youth providers and Lead Members of the Committee.

APPENDIX 3

SECTION 2 –RESEARCH AND CONSULTATION

Following the Children and Young People’s Committee decision on 2 March 2016 no changes will be made to the Priority Neighbourhood and Learning Difficulties and Disabilities element of the universal youth budget. However, from 2017/18 an additional priority neighbourhood session will be funded at a cost of £11k from the available PAS budget.

The distribution of PAS funds by Area Forums is monitored by the council’s Equalities and Third Sector Team within the Environment and Community Services Department. In total 46 organisations have benefitted from PAS funding to support a wide range of activities for young people.

Funding streams of one, two or three years have been agreed for these organisations. Those organisations in receipt of two or three year funding which is due to end in March 2016 are likely to be the most impacted if the PAS was not renewed. These organisations are shown in table 1 below.

Table 1: Organisations in receipt of two or three year PAS funding ending in March 2016

Organisation	Project / activity	Area Forum	Total Award received
Bitton Parish Council	For a sports, arts and democracy project at Oldland Youth Centre	Kings Forest	£24,306
Bradley Stoke Town Council	Towards the costs of a range of activities for young people with a focus on sport	Southern Brooks	£27,065
	Two Day Skate Park Event	Southern Brooks	£4,800
	Detached Youth Work Project	Southern Brooks	£8,242
	Youth Participation Worker Post	Southern Brooks	£16,067
Creative Youth Network	To continue youth work at the Hanham Youth Centre	The Chase	£28,635
	For a programme of arts activities for young people based at the Kingswood Estate Project	The Chase	£57,423
	To continue youth work at the Hanham Youth Centre	Kings Forest	£114,546
Frampton Cotterell Parish Council	For activities for young people on a regular basis	Frome Vale	£12,000
Krunch	For youth work at the Turnberries	Severn Vale	£79,245
Pucklechurch Parish Council	For one evening a week youth work at the Community Centre	Kings Forest	£17,724
Pyramid Youth Club	For youth work with young people 13-19 at their Centre in Filton	Southern Brooks	£15,000
	For youth work with young people 13-19 at their Centre in Filton	Southern Brooks	£20,000
Southern Brooks Community Pnship	Towards the costs of delivery creative youth activities from Patchway Youth Centre	Southern Brooks	£42,518
The You Foundation (formerly Staple Hill Methodist Youth Project)	For the music project for young people at the centre	The Chase	£23,614

APPENDIX 3

Organisation	Project / activity	Area Forum	Total Award received
Stoke Gifford Parish Council	For youth work at the Little Stoke Youth Centre	Southern Brooks	£63,000
Transitions Skate CIC	For activities at the Fromeside Youth Centre including skateboarding, cafe and outdoor games	Southern Brooks	£13,376
	For activities at the Fromeside Youth Centre including skateboarding, cafe and outdoor games	Frome Vale	£4,459
Wickwar Youth Centre	To provide a youth service at Wickwar Youth Centre	Frome Vale	£44,820
Yate Town Council	For a programme of outreach activities for young people age 13-18 across Yate	Frome Vale	£45,000
	For regular youth work to be provided by the Town Council	Frome Vale	£26,137
Yate Town Council (previously awarded to South Gloucestershire Youth Initiative)	For the provision of youth work at the St Nicholas Youth Centre in Yate	Frome Vale	£17,169
Young People United Youth Forum	For activities decided by the young people	Frome Vale	£3,480
	For activities decided by the young people	Southern Brooks	£3,480
	For activities decided by the young people	The Chase	£3,480
Youth in Sodbury	For youth work at Chipping Sodbury Youth Centre	Frome Vale	£36,000

A ten week public consultation was conducted from 2 November 2015 to 11 January 2016 which identified the following key stakeholders:

- Young people
- Parents/ Carers
- Wider community
- Youth workers
- PAS recipients
- Community, voluntary and social enterprise sector
- Town and Parish Councils
- Local Area Forums
- Public services (council, health, police, ambulance and fire)
- Schools

Stakeholder consultation was conducted through a survey (paper based and on-line) tailored for specific stakeholder groups. Youth workers were engaged to ensure young people were aware of the survey and given the opportunity to respond. Focus sessions with young people facilitated by a youth participation officer were also held at Bradley Stoke Community School and Castle School. A facilitated session was also held for members of the Youth Board. Response rates were as follows:-

APPENDIX 3

- Young people's survey: 352 surveys were completed. There were 17 online responses and a further 335 paper copies of the survey were also returned. 183 completed surveys were received from a single youth activities provider; Hanham Youth Club.
- Parents, carers and residents survey: 81 online responses were received.
- Providers' survey: eight online surveys and one paper survey were completed.
- Other representations: six comments were left in the consultation mailbox plus five group responses were received.

In addition to the above, providers were specifically engaged (through a PAS monitoring exercise) in respect of protected characteristics. Recipient organisations responded to provide information (where available) in relation to the protected characteristic groups impacted by PAS funding. The data emerging from this exercise is as follows:

Table 2: Table to show participants in PAS funded activity as disaggregated by protected characteristic group (South Gloucestershire population data is shown to allow for comparison).

Group	Participants in PAS	South Gloucestershire Population*
Female	36.4%	50.5%
Male	63.6%	49.5%
Gender Reassignment	0.1%	(5-7% LGBT)**
Disabled People	5.6%	15.6%
Arab	0.1%	0.1%
Asian/Asian British	2.6%	2.5%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	3.6%	0.9%
Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	1.7%	0.1%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups	4.3%	1.5%
White English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	74.3%	91.9%
White – Irish	0.6%	0.5%
White – Other	2.1%	2.5%
Other ethnic group	0.3%	0.2%

* Data taken from the Census 2011

**Stonewall estimate of the population of LGBT people in the UK

In addition to protected characteristic groups, data was also provided in respect of other factors and this shows that the following groups participate in PAS funded activity:

Table 3: Table to show participants in PAS funded activity as disaggregated according to a range of relevant factors (as described in the table)

PN resident	64.9%
NEET	3.3%
Care	1.9%
Young Carer	1.6%
Young Offender	7.0%
Refugee	0.0%
Low income	13.4%
Excluded from education	7.9%

APPENDIX 3

The tables show that:-

- There are more *Males* than *Females* participating in PAS funded projects/activities (63.6% and 36.4%);
- There are less *Disabled People* participating when compared to the overall population (however, it should be noted that the occurrence of disability increases with age – in the UK, around 1 in 20 children are disabled, compared to around 1 in 7 working age adults and almost 1 in 2 people over state pension age¹);

There are more young people from the following groups participating when compared to the South Gloucestershire population.

- *Black/African/Caribbean/Black British*
- *Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage*
- *Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups*
- *PN residents*

Additionally, it is noted that ceasing funding may have a proportionately greater impact for some protected characteristic groups, as some organisations serve a high number of people from particular protected groups (e.g. an individual organisation may serve a high proportion of Disabled People). Therefore, the following tables investigate this issue:-

Sex

Table 4: Table to show percentage (and number) of Females & Males participating in PAS activities.
NB. Cells with a significantly higher percentage of participants have been highlighted.

Group	Female	% Female	Male	% Male
Banjo Island Community and Sports Association (Total)	51	53%	45	47%
Get Active at the Batch	51	53%	45	47%
Bitton Parish Council (Total)	42	47%	47	53%
New Tracks Youth Club	42	47%	47	53%
Bradley Stoke Town Council (Total)	130	23%	425	77%
Additional hours for youth development and participation worker post	50	9%	150	27%
Detached/street youth work project sessions	10	2%	45	8%
Two day skate park event/festival	20	4%	80	14%
Youth Work Project Developments	50	9%	150	27%
Children's Playlink (Total)	4	33%	8	67%
What's Next'	4	33%	8	67%
Creative Youth Network	422	44%	533	56%
Hanham Youth Centre	402	42%	512	54%
Urban Arts Space	16	2%	10	1%
Volunteers accreditation	4	0%	11	1%
Kingswood Bus Project (Total)	194	33%	391	67%
Kingswood bus project	194	33%	391	67%
Krunch South West (Total)	94	43%	126	57%
Krunch South West	94	43%	126	57%
Oldland Parish Council (Total) (Project not completed)	16	62%	10	38%
Youth Academy	16	62%	10	38%
Pucklechurch Youth Club (Total)	21	47%	24	53%
Monthly term-time sessions	21	47%	24	53%

¹ Source: Office for Disability Issues (ODI)

APPENDIX 3

Group	Female	% Female	Male	% Male
Pyramid Youth Club (Total)	12	32%	25	68%
Pyramid youth Club	12	32%	25	68%
Southern Brooks Community Partnerships (Total)	29	52%	27	48%
Activate	6	11%	8	14%
Chase Social Action Youth Project	16	29%	2	4%
Creative Youth Night Acoustic Café	7	13%	17	30%
Stoke Gifford Parish Council (Total)	73	51%	70	49%
The Stokes Youth Club	73	51%	70	49%
The You Foundation (formerly Staple Hill Methodist Youth Project) (Total)	41	48%	45	52%
Music Studio	6	7%	25	29%
Residential	9	10%	1	1%
SHOPS	26	30%	19	22%
Transitions Skate CIC (Total)	127	20%	515	80%
Activities at Fromeside Youth Centre inc. skateboarding, cafe & outdoor games	127	20%	515	80%
Wickwar Youth Centre (Total)	24	55%	20	45%
Wickwar Youth Centre	24	55%	20	45%
Yate Town Council (Total)	160	42%	220	58%
Detached youth work for 13-19 across Yate	70	18%	80	21%
For the provision of youth work at the St Nicholas Youth Centre in Yate	40	11%	80	21%
Regular youth work across Yate	50	13%	60	16%
Young People United Youth Forum - via St Andrews MYC (now FACE) (Total)	13	59%	9	41%
LDD youth forum residential trips	13	59%	9	41%

APPENDIX 3

Race

Table 5: Table to show percentage (and number) of ethnic groups participating in PAS activities.

NB. Cells with a proportionately higher percentage when compared to the South Gloucestershire population (Census 2011 data) have been highlighted.

Group	White British	% White British	Arab	% Arab	Asian / Asian British	% Asian / Asian British	Black, African / Caribbean / Black British	% Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	% Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	White – Irish	% White – Irish	White Other	% White Other	Other ethnic group	% Other ethnic group	Mixed / multiple ethnic groups	% Mixed / multiple ethnic groups
Banjo Island Community and Sports Association (Total)	93	97%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Get Active at the Batch	93	97%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Bitton Parish Council (Total)	88	99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
New Tracks Youth Club	88	99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Bradley Stoke Town Council (Total)	109	44%	0	0%	32	13%	36	15%	30	12%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	36	15%
Additional hours for youth development and participation worker post	0	0%	0	0%	12	5%	12	5%	10	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	12	5%
Detached/street youth work project sessions	34	14%	0	0%	2	1%	6	2%	5	2%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	6	2%
Two day skate park event/festival	75	31%	0	0%	6	2%	6	2%	5	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	2%
Youth Work Project Developments	0	0%	0	0%	12	5%	12	5%	10	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	12	5%
Children's Playlink (Total)	10	83%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%
What's Next'	10	83%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%
Creative Youth Network	828	87%	0	0%	12	1%	44	5%	6	1%	10	1%	0	0%	0	0%	49	5%
Hanham Youth Centre	794	83%	0	0%	12	1%	44	5%	6	1%	10	1%	0	0%	0	0%	48	5%
Urban Arts Space	19	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%
Volunteers accreditation	15	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

APPENDIX 3

Group	White British	% White British	Arab	% Arab	Asian / Asian British	% Asian / Asian British	Black, African / Caribbean / Black British	% Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	% Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	White – Irish	% White – Irish	White Other	% White Other	Other ethnic group	% Other ethnic group	Mixed / multiple ethnic groups	% Mixed / multiple ethnic groups
Kingswood Bus Project (Total)	561	96%	0	0%	4	1%	12	2%	2	0%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%
Kingswood bus project	561	96%	0	0%	4	1%	12	2%	2	0%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%
Krunch South West (Total)	106	89%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	4	3%	0	0%	0	0%	6	5%
Krunch South West	106	89%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	4	3%	0	0%	0	0%	6	5%
Oldland Parish Council (Total) (Project not completed)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Youth Academy	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Pucklechurch Youth Club (Total)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	44	98%	1	2%
Monthly term-time sessions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	44	98%	1	2%
Pyramid Youth Club (Total)	24	65%	0	0%	3	8%	6	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%
Pyramid youth Club	24	65%	0	0%	3	8%	6	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%
Southern Brooks Community Partnerships (Total)	39	68%	0	0%	6	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	9	16%	2	4%	1	2%
Activate	13	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%
Chase Social Action Youth Project	10	18%	0	0%	6	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	2	4%	0	0%
Creative Youth Night Acoustic Café	16	28%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	14%	0	0%	0	0%
Stoke Gifford Parish Council (Total)	118	82%	2	1%	4	3%	4	3%	2	1%	3	2%	1	1%	5	3%	5	3%
The Stokes Youth Club	118	82%	2	1%	4	3%	4	3%	2	1%	3	2%	1	1%	5	3%	5	3%
The You Foundation (formerly Staple Hill Methodist Youth Project) (Total)	74	86%	0	0%	2	2%	3	3%	3	3%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%
Music Studio	23	27%	0	0%	2	2%	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%

APPENDIX 3

Group	White British	% White British	Arab	% Arab	Asian / Asian British	% Asian / Asian British	Black, African / Caribbean / Black British	% Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	% Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	White – Irish	% White – Irish	White Other	% White Other	Other ethnic group	% Other ethnic group	Mixed / multiple ethnic groups	% Mixed / multiple ethnic groups
Residential	10	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
SHOPS	41	48%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Transitions Skate CIC (Total)	547	85%	0	0%	27	4%	14	2%	5	1%	0	0%	0	0%	12	2%	37	6%
For activities at the Fromside Youth Centre including skateboarding, cafe and outdoor games	547	85%	0	0%	27	4%	14	2%	5	1%	0	0%	0	0%	12	2%	37	6%
Wickwar Youth Centre (Total)	44	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Wickwar Youth Centre	44	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Yate Town Council (Total)	94	64%	0	0%	5	3%	11	7%	13	9%	0	0%	0	0%	15	10%	9	6%
Detached youth work for 13-19 across Yate	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	3%	8	5%	0	0%	0	0%	10	7%	5	3%
For the provision of youth work at the St Nicholas Youth Centre in Yate	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	5	3%	2	1%
Regular youth work across Yate	94	64%	0	0%	3	2%	5	3%	4	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%
Young People United Youth Forum - via St Andrews MYC (now called FACE) (Total)	18	86%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%
LDD youth forum residential trips	18	86%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%

Gender Reassignment

and

Disability

Table 6: Table to show percentage (and number) of Trans People and Disabled People participating in PAS activities.

NB. Cells with an equivalent or higher proportion of participants than average have been highlighted.

Group	Transgender	%Transgender	Young Disabled People	%Young Disabled People	Long term health condition or disability	%Long term health condition or disability
Banjo Island Community and Sports Association (Total)	0	0%	40	42%	40	42%
Get Active at the Batch	0	0%	40	42%	40	42%
Bitton Parish Council (Total)	0	0%	1	1%	3	3%
New Tracks Youth Club	0	0%	1	1%	3	3%
Bradley Stoke Town Council (Total)	0	0%	65	73%	65	73%
Additional hours for youth development and participation worker post	0	0%	20	22%	20	22%
Detached/street youth work project sessions	0	0%	15	17%	15	17%
Two day skate park event/festival	0	0%	10	11%	10	11%
Youth Work Project Developments	0	0%	20	22%	20	22%
Children's Playlink (Total)	0	0%	12	100%	12	100%
What's Next'	0	0%	12	100%	12	100%
Creative Youth Network	2	0%	13	1%	9	1%
Hanham Youth Centre	2	0%	8	1%	8	1%
Urban Arts Space	0	0%	5	1%	1	0%
Volunteers accreditation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Kingswood Bus Project (Total)	0	0%	4	1%	4	1%
Kingswood bus project	0	0%	4	1%	4	1%
Krunch South West (Total)	0	0%	0	0%	5	2%
Krunch South West	0	0%	0	0%	5	2%
Oldland Parish Council (Total) (Project not completed)	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
Youth Academy	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
Pucklechurch Youth Club (Total)	0	0%	2	4%	0	0%
Monthly term-time sessions	0	0%	2	4%	0	0%

Group	Transgender	%Transgender	Young Disabled People	%Young Disabled People	Long term health condition or disability	%Long term health condition or disability
Pyramid Youth Club (Total)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Pyramid youth Club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Southern Brooks Community Partnerships (Total)	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%
Activate	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Chase Social Action Youth Project	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%
Creative Youth Night Acoustic Café	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Stoke Gifford Parish Council (Total)	1	1%	13	9%	10	7%
The Stokes Youth Club	1	1%	13	9%	10	7%
The You Foundation (formerly Staple Hill Methodist Youth Project) (Total)	0	0%	4	5%	0	0%
Music Studio	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%
Residential	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
SHOPS	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
Transitions Skate CIC (Total)	0	0%	5	1%	0	0%
For activities at the Fromside Youth Centre including skateboarding, cafe and outdoor games	0	0%	5	1%	0	0%
Wickwar Youth Centre (Total)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Wickwar Youth Centre	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Yate Town Council (Total)	0	0%	25	7%	0	0%
Detached youth work for 13-19 across Yate	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
For the provision of youth work at the St Nicholas Youth Centre in Yate	0	0%	10	3%	0	0%
Regular youth work across Yate	0	0%	15	4%	0	0%
Young People United Youth Forum - via St Andrews MYC (now called FACE) (Total)	0	0%	22	100%	22	100%
LDD youth forum residential trips	0	0%	22	100%	22	100%
Grand Total	3	0%	207	5%	172	4%

Other Characteristics

Table 7: Table to show percentage (and number) of a range of groups participating in PAS activities.

NB. Cells with an equivalent or higher proportion of participants than average have been highlighted.

Group	NEET	% NEET	Low income	% Low income	Young Carer	% Young Carer	Excluded from education	% Excluded from education	PN resident	% PN resident	Care	% Care	Young Offender	% Young Offender	Refugee	% Refugee
Banjo Island Community and Sports Association (Total)	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Get Active at the Batch	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Bitton Parish Council (Total)	1	1%	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
New Tracks Youth Club	1	1%	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Bradley Stoke Town Council (Total)	30	5%	60	11%	18	3%	60	11%	100	18%	18	3%	75	14%	0	0%
Additional hours for youth development and participation worker post	10	2%	20	4%	6	1%	20	4%	35	6%	6	1%	20	4%	0	0%
Detached/street youth work project sessions	5	1%	10	2%	3	1%	10	2%	10	2%	3	1%	15	3%	0	0%
Two day skate park event/festival	5	1%	10	2%	3	1%	10	2%	20	4%	3	1%	20	4%	0	0%
Youth Work Project Developments	10	2%	20	4%	6	1%	20	4%	35	6%	6	1%	20	4%	0	0%
Children's Playlink (Total)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
What's Next'	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Creative Youth Network	4	0%	13	1%	6	1%	51	5%	417	44%	13	1%	30	3%	0	0%

Group	NEET	% NEET	Low income	% Low income	Young Carer	% Young Carer	Excluded from education	% Excluded from education	PN resident	% PN resident	Care	% Care	Young Offender	% Young Offender	Refugee	% Refugee
Hanham Youth Centre	4	0%	0	0%	6	1%	50	5%	414	43%	12	1%	30	3%	0	0%
Urban Arts Space	0	0%	13	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Volunteers accreditation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Kingswood Bus Project (Total)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	585	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Kingswood bus project	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	585	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Krunch South West (Total)	2	1%	20	9%	0	0%	33	15%	15	7%	0	0%	16	7%	0	0%
Krunch South West	2	1%	20	9%	0	0%	33	15%	15	7%	0	0%	16	7%	0	0%
Oldland Parish Council (Total) (Project not completed)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	14	54%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Youth Academy	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	14	54%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Pucklechurch Youth Club (Total)	0	0%	19	42%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	7	16%	0	0%
Monthly term-time sessions	0	0%	19	42%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	7	16%	0	0%
Pyramid Youth Club (Total)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	23	62%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Pyramid youth Club	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	23	62%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Southern Brooks Community Partnerships (Total)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	41	73%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Activate	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	14	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Chase Social Action Youth Project	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Group	NEET	% NEET	Low income	% Low income	Young Carer	% Young Carer	Excluded from education	% Excluded from education	PN resident	% PN resident	Care	% Care	Young Offender	% Young Offender	Refugee	% Refugee
Creative Youth Night Acoustic Café	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	24	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Stoke Gifford Parish Council (Total)	6	4%	57	40%	0	0%	12	8%	43	30%	2	1%	17	12%	1	1%
The Stokes Youth Club	6	4%	57	40%	0	0%	12	8%	43	30%	2	1%	17	12%	1	1%
The You Foundation (formerly Staple Hill Methodist Youth Project) (Total)	12	14%	28	33%	0	0%	0	0%	40	47%	2	2%	9	10%	0	0%
Music Studio	4	5%	10	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	5	6%	0	0%
Residential	3	3%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
SHOPS	5	6%	15	17%	0	0%	0	0%	40	47%	1	1%	3	3%	0	0%
Transitions Skate CIC (Total)	10	2%	0	0%	0	0%	12	2%	0	0%	3	2%	2	1%	0	0%
For activities at the Fromeside Youth Centre including skateboarding, cafe and outdoor games	10	2%	0	0%	0	0%	12	2%	0	0%	3	2%	2	0%	0	0%
Wickwar Youth Centre (Total)	0	0%	22	50%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%
Wickwar Youth Centre	0	0%	22	50%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%
Yate Town Council (Total)	18	5%	120	32%	15	4%	29	8%	380	100%	7	2%	24	6%	0	0%
Detached youth work for 13-19 across Yate	15	4%	50	13%	5	1%	15	4%	150	39%	5	1%	10	3%	0	0%
For the provision of youth work at the St	3	1%	50	13%	10	3%	10	3%	120	32%	2	1%	10	3%	0	0%

Group	NEET	% NEET	Low income	% Low income	Young Carer	% Young Carer	Excluded from education	% Excluded from education	PN resident	% PN resident	Care	% Care	Young Offender	% Young Offender	Refugee	% Refugee
Nicholas Youth Centre in Yate																
Regular youth work across Yate	0	0%	20	5%	0	0%	4	1%	110	29%	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%
Young People United Youth Forum - via St Andrews MYC (now called FACE) (Total)	2	9%	4	18%	0	0%	0	0%	6	27%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%
LDD youth forum residential trips	2	9%	4	18%	0	0%	0	0%	6	27%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%
Grand Total	85	2%	346	9%	40	1%	202	5%	1669	42%	50	1%	180	5%	1	0%

The above tables show that some providers serve a significantly greater proportion of particular protected characteristic groups and below, table 8 shows the individual providers serving significantly greater proportions of a particular protected characteristic group.

Table 8: Table to show providers serving a significantly greater proportion of a particular protected characteristic group (table also includes PN residents information).

Group	Males	Females	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	Mixed / Multiple Ethnic Groups	Asian / Asian British	White - Irish	White Other	Other Ethnic Group	Disabled young people	PN residents
Banjo Island Community and Sports Association			✓							✓	
Bitton Parish Council											
Bradley Stoke Town Council	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
Children's Playlink	✓				✓					✓	✓
Creative Youth Network			✓	✓	✓		✓				✓
Kingswood Bus Project	✓		✓								✓
Krunch South West	✓			✓	✓		✓				
Oldland Parish Council		✓									✓
Pucklechurch Youth Club											
Pyramid Youth Club	✓		✓		✓	✓					✓
Southern Brooks Community Partnerships					✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
Stoke Gifford Parish Council			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
The You Foundation (formerly Staple Hill Methodist Youth Project)			✓		✓						✓
Transitions Skate CIC	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		
Wickwar Youth Centre		✓									
Yate Town Council	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓
Young People United Youth Forum - via St Andrews MYC (now FACE)		✓	✓		✓					✓	✓

Consultation Surveys

Full details of the information emerging from the consultation surveys is contained within the full consultation report which includes the information below. The following information is shown in order to highlight consultation responses which relate to equalities.

Young People's Survey

352 surveys were completed and the following information shows respondent protected characteristics:-

Gender

Female	54%
Male	46%

Age

Under 13	88%
13 to 16	6%
17 to 18	1%
19 to 25	5%
Prefer not to say	1%

NB. Numbers do not sum because of rounding.

Ethnicity

White - English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	89%
White - Irish	1%
White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.3%
White Unspecified	3%
Any other White Background	3%
White and Black Caribbean	1%
White and Asian	0.3%
Any other Mixed / Multiple ethnic background	1%
Chinese	0.3%
Any other Asian background	0.3%
Black Caribbean	0.3%
Any other Black background	2%
Any other ethnic group	0.3%

NB. Numbers do not sum because of rounding.

Disability

Yes	3%
No	94%
Prefer not to say	3%

The following information gives details of the key activities regularly used by young people and comments made:

Table 9: Table to show youth activities you regularly used

Youth centre/project	90%
Meet friends/socialise	40%
Sports club/team	26%
Leisure centre	17%
Music activities	14%
Outdoor activities	14%
Arts/drama class	11%
Volunteering	10%
Other	9%
Scouts/guides	8%
Extra-curricular school activities	6%
Duke of Edinburgh	5%
Church based group	3%

The difference these activities make to you and your life:-

- Developing new skills and increased confidence was the most popular difference that youth activities made to those responding. "More sociable, more confident" was a typical comment.
- The chance to meet up with friends was an equally supported positive difference that respondents highlighted with others also adding the chance to meet new friends and experience different cultures.
- Many respondents noted the opportunities to enjoy games, sports and ways to keep fit that youth activities offered.
- A large proportion of respondents said these activities gave them a chance to get out of the house, to do something; "Getting out the house actually making an effort to do something".
- A similar number of comments simply said the youth club or activity was fun and made them happy: "Make me smile and keep me busy" or "Makes me feel happy and social".
- A smaller number of comments said they felt safe at their youth activity with slightly less noting that they were able to forget their problems when engaged.
- Comments also said how the respondent was able to raise their issues or problems with staff at the youth club. A few comments from volunteers also noted the benefits that experience was bring them.
- A small number of comments (under five) said the activities made no difference to their lives: "Nothing" or "No difference to me".

Below is a small selection of comments made:

- Club especially volunteering will give me skills and experience I can put on my CV and also helps me to gain confidence and self-esteem. I take my volunteering very seriously
- Have become more brave because I was shy before
- They make me who I am and help me be what I want to be
- It shows me how a little bit of kindness helps people and goes a long way
- They make me happy, they make me feel loved
- It makes me happier when I get home

Parents, Carers & Residents Survey

81 surveys were completed and the following information shows respondent protected characteristics:-

Gender

Female	62%
Male	39%

Age

Under 18	0%
18 to 25	11%
26 to 35	11%
36 to 45	25%
46 to 55	26%
56 to 65	9%
66 to 75	12%
Over 75	6%

Ethnicity

White - English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	99%
Any other White Background	2%

Disability

Yes	5%
No	94%
Prefer not to say	2%

The following information gives details of the comments received:

Table 10: Table to show the difference respondents thought activities funded by the Positive Activities Subsidy have had in relation to different factors.

	Major positive impact	Slightly positive impact	No impact	Slightly negative impact	Major negative impact	Don't know
All Respondents	75%	18%	1%	0%	1%	4%
Individual young people	89%	7%	0%	0%	1%	3%
Parents / carers	68%	26%	0%	0%	1%	4%
Wider community	63%	28%	5%	0%	2%	3%
Young people's health & wellbeing	85%	10%	0%	0%	1%	4%
Young people's employment & skills	70%	21%	3%	0%	1%	4%

89% of respondents said that PAS funded activities had a major positive impact on individual young people with 85% saying it had a major positive impact on young people's health and wellbeing.

91% of respondents said that PAS funded activities had either a major positive or slightly positive impact on individual young people's employment & skills.

Table 11: Table to show how strongly respondents agreed or disagreed that the youth sessions funded by the Council in priority neighbourhoods and those for young people with learning difficulties or disabilities should be protected

Strongly agree	89%
Tend to agree	4%
Neither agree or disagree	1%
Tend to disagree	3%
Strongly disagree	1%
Don't know	1%

93% of those answering this question agreed the two services mentioned should be protected

In addition, it is worth noting that 74% of respondents said that the removal of the PAS would have a slight/major impact on individual young people with 71% saying it would have a slight/major impact on the wider community.

Comments:

Almost all comments noted the positive impact of the PAS and the benefits these activities brought for young people. Below are some examples of comments made:

- Improvement of self-esteem
- Young are more confident
- Gives youths things to focus on
- Giving children opportunities, experience and direction
- It is a place of independence where they can meet
- The club allows him to have 'non-disabled' social interaction and I have seen a massive increase in his confidence levels

One respondent noted the benefits of having provision where young people with learning difficulties or disabilities mix with non-disabled peers.

Provider's Survey

9 responses were completed and the following gives details of the information emerging:

Table 12: Table to show the impact respondents thought Positive Activities Subsidy funds has had on a range of factors.

	Major positive impact	Slightly positive impact	No impact	Slightly negative impact	Major negative impact	Don't know
All	65%	24%	0%	0%	0%	12%
Individual young people	86%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%
Parents / carers	38%	50%	0%	0%	0%	13%
Wider community	67%	17%	0%	0%	0%	17%
Young people's health & wellbeing	71%	14%	0%	0%	0%	14%
Young people's employment & skills	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%

86% of the organisations responding said the PAS funds had a major positive impact on individual young people

88% said there had been a major positive impact or slightly positive impact on parents and carers

71% of respondents said there had been a major positive impact on young people's health and well-being

67% said there had been a major positive impact on the wider community as a result of PAS funded activities with a further 17% saying this was slightly positive

All of those responding (100%) said the PAS funds had either a major positive impact (67%) or slightly positive impact (33%) on young people's employment and skills

Table 13: Table to show which of the following groups of young people specifically benefit from the activities provided.

From low income families	86%
Not in education, employment or training	57%
In care/or leaving care	57%
Young carers	57%
Young people attending that live in a priority neighbourhood (Yate, Filton, Staple Hill, Patchway, Cadbury Heath and Kingswood)	57%
Excluded from education or at risk of exclusion	43%
Young offenders/at risk of offending	29%
Reduction of isolation through intergeneration interaction	29%
Have a long-term health condition or disability	14%
Refugee or asylum seekers	0%

86% or 6 respondents said that young people from low income families benefitted from the activities they provide.

57% of respondents said their activities benefitted young people not in education, employment or training, those in or leaving care, young carers and those attending from a priority neighbourhood.

Table 14: Table to show which groups of young people specifically benefit from the activities provided that are funded by the Positive Activities Subsidy (question was only for those receiving PAS).

From low income families	83%
Not in education, employment or training	67%
In care/or leaving care	67%
Young carers	67%
Young people attending that live in a Priority Neighbourhood (Yate, Filton, Staple Hill, Patchway, Cadbury Heath and Kingswood)	67%
Young offenders/at risk of offending	50%
Excluded from education or at risk of exclusion	50%
Reduction of isolation through intergeneration interaction	50%
Have a long-term health condition or disability	17%
Refugee or asylum seekers	0%

Table 15: Table to show participant response to the question, “If the Positive Activities Subsidy was unavailable, what impact would this have for the following: the activities that you offer / your organisation?”

The activities that you offer:	None - the service is unaffected	0%
	Minimal - minor changes may be needed	0%
	Medium - reduction of core activities/ opening times	14%
	Significant - risk of closure	71%
	Don't know	14%
Your organisation:	None - the service is unaffected	0%
	Minimal - minor changes may be needed	29%
	Medium - reduction of core activities/ opening times	29%
	Significant - risk of closure	29%
	Don't know	14%

71% or 5 responding organisations said the impact of there being no PAS on the activities that they offer would be significant – risk of closure
 14% said the impact would be medium - reduction of core activities / opening times with a further 14% not able to answer

Table 16: Table to show participant response to the question, “How strongly do you agree or disagree that the youth sessions funded by the councils in priority neighbourhoods and those for young people with learning difficulties or disabilities should be protected?”

Strongly agree	57%
Tend to agree	14%
Neither agree or disagree	29%

71% of respondents strongly or tended to agree that the youth sessions mentioned should be protected.
 29% neither agreed nor disagreed with no responses disagreeing or saying they did not know.

SECTION 3 - IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF EQUALITIES ISSUES AND IMPACTS

The research and consultation information shows that:

Overarching PAS Fund Issues:

- There are more *Males* than *Females* participating in PAS funded projects/activities (63.6% and 36.4%);
- There are less *Disabled People* participating when compared to the overall population (however, it should be noted that the occurrence of disability increases with age – in the UK, around 1 in 20 children are disabled, compared to around 1 in 7 working age adults and almost 1 in 2 people over state pension age);
- There are more young people from the following groups participating when compared to the South Gloucestershire population.
 - *Black/African/Caribbean/Black British*
 - *Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage*
 - *Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups*
 - *PN residents*

Individual Provider Issues:

Some providers serve a significantly greater proportion of particular protected characteristic groups as shown in table 8.

Key Issues

As a result of this information, it is clear to see that some groups would be proportionately more negatively impacted should Positive Activities Subsidy (PAS) funding cease. These groups are:

- *Males*
- *Disabled People*
- *Black/African/Caribbean/Black British*
- *Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage*
- *Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups*
- *PN residents*

In addition, should PAS funding cease, the following groups would be proportionately more negatively impacted by the cessation of funding to particular organisations as these organisations serve a proportion of young people with particular protected characteristics which is significantly greater than that in the overall South Gloucestershire population - as shown in tables 4 to 8:

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| – <i>Males</i> | – <i>Females</i> | – <i>White Other</i> | – <i>Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage</i> |
| – <i>Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups</i> | – <i>Asian / Asian British</i> | – <i>White - Irish</i> | – <i>Black / African / Caribbean / Black British</i> |
| – <i>Other Ethnic Group</i> | – <i>Disabled young people</i> | – <i>PN residents</i> | |

Table 8 shows providers serving a significantly greater proportion of a particular protected characteristic group and also includes PN residents. This information should be used to inform decision-making as it displays impact on protected characteristic groups on an individual provider level.

The consultation information also shows that the vast majority of all respondents have stated an expected negative impact in relation to a range of factors, including:

- Individual young people
- Parents / carers
- Wider community
- Young people's health & wellbeing
- Young people's employment & skills

It is important to note that there are particular issues in relation to some protected characteristic groups and the above factors as detailed within the South Gloucestershire JSNA².

The consultation also showed that 71% of respondents strongly or tended to agree that the youth sessions funded by the Council in priority neighbourhoods and those for young people with learning difficulties or disabilities should be protected; 29% neither agreed nor disagreed with no responses disagreeing or saying they did not know.

Following the Children and Young People Committee decision on 2 March 2016 authority was delegated to the Director for Children, Adults and Health in consultation with the Committee Lead Members, to allocate interim funding from 1 April 2016. Grants paid during 2015/16 have been analysed and recommendations made on the allocation of the interim funding subject to the decision making process.

Table 17 illustrates the impact of the recommended allocation of interim funding on the groups identified in table 8. However, it is noted:

- The PAS funding is paid from the Universal Youth Budget and the interim funding criteria has been agreed for open access provision.
- Budget for the provision of sessions within priority neighbourhoods and for young people with learning difficulty and/or disabilities has been protected.
- Young people from any protected characteristic group can attend the open access sessions for which interim funding has been recommended.

² <http://sites.southglos.gov.uk/oaof/health-and-wellbeing-board/joint-strategic-needs-assessment/>

Table 17: Table to show providers serving a significantly greater proportion of a particular protected characteristic group (table also includes PN residents information) and the impact of the recommended allocation of interim funding for 2016/17

Group	Males	Females	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	Mixed / Multiple Ethnic Groups	Asian / Asian British	White - Irish	White Other	Other Ethnic Group	Disabled young people	PN residents	Impact of recommended interim payments for 2016/17
Banjo Island Community and Sports Association			✓							✓		Significant impact - interim funding is not recommended as this does not meet the criteria of open access provision. Disproportionate impact for Black / African / Caribbean / Black British (2) and disabled young people (40).
Bitton Parish Council												No impact – funding to continue at current level
Bradley Stoke Town Council	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	Potential impact – funding to continue at current level for some grants and for another alternative funding has been found. A residential training programme expected to benefit 36 young people will not be funded as it is not open access.
Children’s Playlink	✓				✓					✓	✓	Significant impact – interim funding is not recommended as this does not meet the criteria of open access provision. During the latest monitoring period 12 young people have benefitted from the service all of whom have declared a disability.

Group	Males	Females	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	Mixed / Multiple Ethnic Groups	Asian / Asian British	White - Irish	White Other	Other Ethnic Group	Disabled young people	PN residents	Impact of recommended interim payments for 2016/17
Creative Youth Network			✓	✓	✓		✓				✓	Some impact – funding allocated in line with amount requested by CYN for youth work at Hanham Youth Centre. However funding is not recommended for a grant originally awarded for activity at the Kingswood Estate and for a 13 month programme covering peer support. Withdrawal of funding for these grants will disproportionately impact disabled young people (5).
Kingswood Bus Project	✓		✓								✓	No impact – funding to continue at current level
Krunch South West	✓			✓	✓		✓					Potential impact – funding to continue at current level for youth work at Turnberries and a new award has been granted for a music project. However funding is not recommended for a step up programme that is not open access and could seek funding from alternative sources eg. schools
Oldland Parish Council		✓									✓	Some impact – interim funding is not recommended as this does not meet the criteria of open access provision disproportionately impacting female young people.
Pucklechurch Youth Club												No impact – no interim funding has been allocated as organisation has successfully bid for PAS funding in latest round of grant allocations to continue the service in 2016/17.

Group	Males	Females	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	Mixed / Multiple Ethnic Groups	Asian / Asian British	White - Irish	White Other	Other Ethnic Group	Disabled young people	PN residents	Impact of recommended interim payments for 2016/17
Pyramid Youth Club	✓		✓		✓	✓					✓	Minimal impact - funding reduced to reflect large number of Bristol YP attending sessions as well as children outside of the age group to qualify for PAS funding.
Southern Brooks Community Partnerships					✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	No impact – funding to continue at current level except for one grant that was for a year long project and is not open access.
Stoke Gifford Parish Council			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	No impact – funding to continue at current level
The You Foundation (formerly Staple Hill Methodist Youth Project)			✓		✓						✓	No impact – funding to continue at current level except for a project to develop the Staple Hill Primary School as a youth centre for which alternative funding will be sought. An additional project to run two residential experiences will not receive interim funding as this is not an ongoing project.
Transitions Skate CIC	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓			No impact – no interim funding has been allocated as organisation has advised it is not required to sustain service.
Wickwar Youth Centre		✓										No impact – funding to continue at current level
Yate Town Council	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓	No impact – funding to continue at current level
Young People United Youth Forum - via St Andrews MYC (now FACE)		✓	✓		✓					✓	✓	Significant impact – interim funding is not recommended as this does not meet the criteria of open access provision. This grant has been used to support 22 young people all of who have declared a disability and will be disproportionately impacted.

SECTION 4a - EqIAA OUTCOME (for CYP Committee decision made on 2 March 2016)

Outcome	Response	Reason(s) and Justification
Outcome 1: No major change required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers or to better promote equality have been identified.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Outcome 3: Continue despite having identified potential for adverse impact or missed opportunities to promote equality.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This EqIAA has shown that some protected characteristic groups would be proportionately more negatively impacted should a decision be made to cease the PAS. These groups are clearly identified in Section 3 of this EqIAA.</p> <p>In mitigation of some these impacts, there is potential to protect youth sessions funded by the Council in priority neighbourhoods and those for young people with learning difficulties or disabilities. This option was highly supported by consultation respondents, and table 8 shows that youth work conducted in Priority Neighbourhoods has a significant level of attendance by those protected characteristic groups identified as being proportionately more negatively impacted by any decision to cease the PAS. This indicates that this action would represent a sound opportunity to work towards the advancement of equality of opportunity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty i.e. The Equality Act 2010 s149(1)(b), and contributing towards the fostering of good relations i.e. The Equality Act 2010 s149(1)(c),</p> <p>There is also a need to balance any decision against financial pressures and the need to continue other essential services for young people.</p>
Outcome 4: Stop and rethink.	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SECTION 4b - EqIAA OUTCOME (for recommended interim funding – subject to decision making process)

Outcome	Response	Reason(s) and Justification
Outcome 1: No major change required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers or to better promote equality have been identified.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Outcome 3: Continue despite having identified potential for adverse impact or missed opportunities to promote equality.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This EqIAA has shown that some protected characteristic groups would be proportionately more negatively impacted should the recommended allocation of interim funding be agreed as shown in table 17.</p> <p>In mitigation of some these impacts, the youth sessions funded by the Council in priority neighbourhoods and those for young people with learning difficulties or disabilities have been protected. This option was highly supported by consultation respondents, and table 8 shows that youth work conducted in Priority Neighbourhoods has a significant level of attendance by those protected characteristic groups identified as being proportionately more negatively impacted by any decision to cease the PAS.</p> <p>Furthermore interim funding has been allocated to those organisations providing open access provision. This is open to all young people including those from protected characteristic groups.</p> <p>Should an organisation present a legitimate challenge to the decisions made regarding interim funding there is some contingency available in the 2016/17 PAS budget.</p> <p>There is also a need to balance any decision against financial pressures and the need to continue other essential services for young people.</p>
Outcome 4: Stop and rethink.	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SECTION 5 - ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN AS A RESULT OF THIS EqIAA

- Implement the protection of youth sessions funded by the Council in priority neighbourhoods and those for young people with learning difficulties or disabilities.
- Continue to monitor the impact of implementation of any decision.
- Co-design workshops to develop the criteria for allocation of PAS funding in 2017/18 and 2018/19.

SECTION 6 - EVIDENCE INFORMING THIS EqIAA

- Consultation results report.
- Data held by the Equalities and Third Sector Team, South Gloucestershire Council.
- Census 2011 data for South Gloucestershire.
- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA).
- Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis (EqIAA) for the 2012 review of integrated services for young people - <http://www.southglos.gov.uk/documents/Review-of-Integrated-Services-for-Young-People-CAH2012.pdf>