

Equality Impact and Needs Analysis (EINA) Template

Directorate:	Education, Children's and Cultural Services
Service Area:	Children's Workforce Development Team and Workforce Development Strategy
Name of service/ function/ policy/ being assessed:	Professional development for practitioners working with children and young people
Officer leading on assessment:	Gillian Goouch
Other staff involved:	N/A

PREPARATION FOR THE EQUALITY IMPACT AND NEEDS ANALYSIS

1. Briefly describe the service/ function/ policy:

The Children's Workforce Development Team provides targeted professional development to practitioners who work with children and young people in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.

The Children and Young People's Plan 2009-13 (CYPP) set out a single, clear ambition: to ensure that all children and young people in Richmond upon Thames, whatever their background, lead safe, happy and healthy lives, with opportunities to learn, develop and fulfil their potential.

To ensure that the targets outlined in the CYPP are delivered there needs to be a confident, competent and highly-skilled children's workforce that understands each other's responsibilities and works together to deliver relevant, responsive and high quality services for children and their families.

Therefore, the Children's Workforce Development Strategy sets out the department's commitment to the children's workforce by ensuring that its members have the support, information and skills they need. It provides the strategic framework and our priorities for developing and supporting the children's workforce over two years.

Training provided includes: multi-agency safeguarding provision, curriculum specific training for schools and early years providers as well as multi-agency training focusing on emotional wellbeing, mental health awareness and risky behaviour. All of our training is available to those working with children and young people within the borough. Training is mostly held at the Twickenham Training Centre in Grimwood Road or in other accessible venues around the borough.

2. Why is the equality impact and needs analysis being undertaken?

The Workforce Development Team was identified as requiring an EINA as part of the screening for relevance exercise in 2011.

The Workforce Development Strategy also needs to be reviewed and needs to be reflective of the new CYPP priorities and Richmond Council's commitment to join services with Kingston Council and the EINA will contribute towards the development of it.

3. Has this service/ function/ policy undertaken a screening for relevance?

If so, which protected characteristics and parts of the duty were identified as of high or medium relevance and why? Please attach screening for relevance as an appendix to this EINA.

If not, make an assessment of which protected characteristics and parts of the duty are of high or medium relevance and explain why:

The Workforce Development Team underwent the screening for relevance exercise in 2011/12. The team was considered of relevance to all nine of the protected characteristics but especially to age, disability, gender, race, ethnicity and religion.

4. What sources of information have been used in the preparation of this equality impact and needs analysis? For example, this could include equalities monitoring information, performance data, consultation feedback or needs assessment. Please provide the details in the table below:

Information source	Description and outline of the information source
Registration, attendance and evaluation at training	Analysis of course attendance.
Workforce Equalities Report- February 2012	<p>Each year the Council produces a Workforce Equalities Report to meet the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and to enable the organisation to manage staff, enabling decisions to be made based on information provided by the analysis. In February 2012, a snapshot of the workforce was produced which contains information allowing comparison between Richmond Council overall and Education, Children's and Cultural Services (ECCS). The information presented in the EINA relates to the protected characteristics of staff.</p> <p>As of February 2012, there were 765 staff working in Education, Children's and Cultural Services. These staff work across four main areas: Culture which includes the Arts Service, Libraries and the Sports Service; Education and Early Help which includes the Early Years and Children's Centres team, Education and Inclusion, the Educational Psychology team, the Inspectorate, Integrated Youth Services and the Single Point of Access; Specialist Children's Services which includes the Children Looked After and Leaving Care team, the Disabled Children's Service, the Multi-Agency team and the Safeguarding and Family Support team; and Standards and Improvement which includes Information Systems Support, Policy, Performance and Communications, and Workforce</p>

Information source	Description and outline of the information source
	Development.

ANALYSING IMPACT, NEEDS AND EFFECTS

[It is important that the analysis addresses each part of the duty assessed as relevant to the area being examined \(see further Guidance on RIO\).](#)

5. Key questions to consider:

- a. What does the data tell you about the groups identified as relevant to the area being assessed?**
- b. What does customer feedback, complaints or discussions with stakeholder groups tell you about the impact of the service/ function/ policy on the protected characteristic groups, where assessed as relevant to area being examined?**

Other questions to consider:

- How well are diverse needs met?
- Have any differences in access to services/functions been identified for any group?
- Has the area identified any disadvantages experienced by groups, which need to be addressed?
- Have there been any complaints about a failure to receive an appropriate and fair service?
- Is there any other evidence of differential impact or different outcomes which needs to be addressed?
- Is there any evidence that participation in areas of public life is disproportionately low for any particular relevant protected characteristic group?
- Have the needs of disabled people been identified and addressed where these are different from the needs of non-disabled people?
- Have you identified any need to tackle prejudice or promote understanding between different relevant protected characteristic groups?

Remember that equality analysis is not simply about identifying and removing negative effects of discrimination but it is also an opportunity to identify ways to advance equality of opportunity and to foster good relations.

Protected Group	Findings
Age	<p><u>Background and context</u></p> <p>Overall, ECCS staff are younger than Council staff as a whole.</p> <p>30.5% of the staff in ECCS are aged 16-30 which is 10.4% more than the 20.1% in the Council as a whole. The percentage of staff aged 31-49 in</p>

ECCS is 42.9% which is similar to the overall Council figure of 44.6%. The percentage of ECCS staff who are aged 50-64 is 25%, slightly below the overall Council figure of 31.6%. The percentage of ECCS staff aged 65 + is 1.7% which is slightly below the overall Council figure of 3.6%.

	Total number	16-30	31-49	50-64	65+
Richmond upon Thames Council	2030	409 20.1%	906 44.6%	642 31.6%	73 3.6%
Education, Children's and Cultural Services	765	233 30.5%	328 42.9%	191 25%	13 1.7%

Age in relation to workforce development

Continuing Professional Development (CPD) opportunities are open to all colleagues regardless of age.

Borough data does suggest that there is an ageing workforce among many sectors. A succession planning pathway is being produced for school based staff. This will identify a clear progression plan for those entering the workforce. The hope is that this will support retention to the profession.

Disability

Background and context

The percentage of staff with a disability in ECCS is slightly lower than the Council as a whole.

5.2% of the staff in ECCS declared themselves as disabled compared to 6.3% for the Council as a whole. 94.8% of staff declared themselves non-disabled which is slightly higher than the Council figure of 93.7%.

	Total number	Disabled	Non-disabled
Richmond upon Thames Council	2030	128 6.3%	1902 93.7%
Education, Children's and Cultural Services	765	40 5.2%	725 94.8%

Disability in relation to workforce development

Local data tells us that the children's workforce in Richmond Council share similar characteristics across all sectors, including a low level of disclosure of a disability among employees. Twickenham Training Centre is DDA compliant along with all other venues used. The WFD team ensure that the learning activities meet the needs of users.

Gender (Sex)

Background and context

Overall, there are more females as a proportion of ECCS staff than in the Council as a whole.

70.2% of ECCS staff are female, compared to 62.4% of overall Council staff. 29.8% of ECCS staff are therefore male, compared to 37.6% in the Council as a whole.

	Total number	Female	Male
Richmond upon Thames Council	2030	1266 62.4%	764 37.6%
Education, Children's and Cultural Services	765	537 70.2%	228 29.8%

Gender in relation to workforce development

	<p>Local data tells us that the children’s workforce in Richmond Council share similar characteristics across all sectors, including a predominately female workforce. CPD opportunities are open to all colleagues regardless of gender.</p>																									
Gender reassignment	<p><u>Background and context</u></p> <p>The Workforce Equalities Report does not capture data relating to gender reassignment.</p> <p><u>Gender reassignment in relation to workforce development</u></p> <p>Data relating to gender reassignment and staff is not collected as part of the attendance, registration or evaluation. However, the WFD team are confident that the CFD opportunities and buildings on offer are accessible to all.</p>																									
*Marriage and civil partnership (*only in relation to first part of the duty: eliminate discrimination and harassment)	<p><u>Background and context</u></p> <p>The Workforce Equalities Report does not capture data relating to marriage and civil partnership.</p> <p><u>Marriage and civil partnership in relation to workforce development</u></p> <p>Data relating to the marriage or civil partnership status of staff is not collected as part of the attendance, registration or evaluation. However, the WFD team are confident that the CFD opportunities on offer are accessible to all.</p>																									
Pregnancy and maternity	<p><u>Background and context</u></p> <p>The Workforce Equalities Report does not capture data relating to pregnancy and maternity.</p> <p><u>Pregnancy and maternity in relation to workforce development</u></p> <p>Data relating to the pregnant staff is not collected as part of the attendance, registration or evaluation. However, the WFD team are confident that the CFD opportunities on offer are accessible to all.</p>																									
Race/ethnicity	<p><u>Background and context</u></p> <p>Overall, ECCS has a higher percentage of White staff than the Council as a whole, and therefore a lower percentage of BME staff.</p> <p>81.4% of ECCS staff are White, compared to a Council figure of 76%. However, 14.3% of staff are BME, which is only 1.5% lower than the Council figure of 15.8%. This is because the ethnicity of 8.2% of overall Council staff is unknown, compared to just 4.3% of staff in ECCS.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total number</th> <th>White</th> <th>BME</th> <th>Unknown</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Richmond upon Thames Council</td> <td>2030</td> <td>1543</td> <td>320</td> <td>167</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>76%</td> <td>15.8%</td> <td>8.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Education, Children’s and Cultural Services</td> <td>765</td> <td>623</td> <td>109</td> <td>33</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>81.4%</td> <td>14.3%</td> <td>4.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Race and ethnicity in relation to workforce development</u></p> <p>Local data tells us that the children’s workforce in Richmond Council share</p>		Total number	White	BME	Unknown	Richmond upon Thames Council	2030	1543	320	167			76%	15.8%	8.2%	Education, Children’s and Cultural Services	765	623	109	33			81.4%	14.3%	4.3%
	Total number	White	BME	Unknown																						
Richmond upon Thames Council	2030	1543	320	167																						
		76%	15.8%	8.2%																						
Education, Children’s and Cultural Services	765	623	109	33																						
		81.4%	14.3%	4.3%																						

	similar characteristics across all sectors, including a low level of Black and Minority Ethnic staff, this is reflected in the borough resident profile. However, all CPD opportunities are open to all colleagues regardless of race and ethnicity.																																																			
Religion and belief including non-belief	<p><u>Background and context</u></p> <p>Overall the religion and belief of staff in ECCS is similar to the religion and belief of all Council staff.</p> <p>The largest religious group in ECCS is Christian at 38.3%, which compares to 40.9% of all Council staff. The next largest group is 'no religion' which constitutes 25.1% of ECCS staff, compared to 24.5% of all Council staff. The religion or belief of 29.9% of ECCS staff and 28.6% of all Council staff is either unknown or they chose not to say. Other religious groups make up 4% of ECCS staff and 6% of all Council staff.</p>																																																			
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total number</th> <th>Buddhist</th> <th>Christian</th> <th>Hindu</th> <th>Jewish</th> <th>Muslim</th> <th>No religion</th> <th>Other</th> <th>Sikh</th> <th>Prefer not to say/unknown</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Richmond upon Thames Council</td> <td rowspan="2">2030</td> <td>14</td> <td>831</td> <td>21</td> <td>3</td> <td>36</td> <td>497</td> <td>23</td> <td>26</td> <td>579</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.7%</td> <td>40.9%</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0.1%</td> <td>1.8%</td> <td>24.5%</td> <td>1.1%</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>28.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Education, Children's and Cultural Services</td> <td rowspan="2">765</td> <td>6</td> <td>293</td> <td>9</td> <td>1</td> <td>9</td> <td>192</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>229</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.8%</td> <td>38.3%</td> <td>1.2%</td> <td>0.1%</td> <td>1.2%</td> <td>25.1%</td> <td>0.3%</td> <td>0.4%</td> <td>29.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total number	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion	Other	Sikh	Prefer not to say/unknown	Richmond upon Thames Council	2030	14	831	21	3	36	497	23	26	579	0.7%	40.9%	1%	0.1%	1.8%	24.5%	1.1%	1.3%	28.6%	Education, Children's and Cultural Services	765	6	293	9	1	9	192	2	3	229	0.8%	38.3%	1.2%	0.1%	1.2%	25.1%	0.3%	0.4%	29.9%
		Total number	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	No religion	Other	Sikh	Prefer not to say/unknown																																									
	Richmond upon Thames Council	2030	14	831	21	3	36	497	23	26	579																																									
0.7%			40.9%	1%	0.1%	1.8%	24.5%	1.1%	1.3%	28.6%																																										
Education, Children's and Cultural Services	765	6	293	9	1	9	192	2	3	229																																										
		0.8%	38.3%	1.2%	0.1%	1.2%	25.1%	0.3%	0.4%	29.9%																																										
<p><u>Religion and belief in relation to workforce development</u></p> <p>Data relating to the religion of belief of staff is not collected as part of the attendance, registration or evaluation. However, the WFD team are confident that the CFD opportunities on offer are accessible to all.</p>																																																				
Sexual orientation	<p><u>Background and context</u></p> <p>Overall the sexual orientation of ECCS staff is in line with all Council staff.</p> <p>51.8% of ECCS staff are heterosexual compared to 48.6% in the Council as a whole. 0.7% of ECCS staff are gay men which is slightly lower than the figure of 1.5% of all Council staff. 0.4% of ECCS staff are gay women compared to 0.5% of all Council staff. 0.5% of ECCS staff and all Council staff are bisexual. The sexual orientation of 39% of ECCS staff and 48.8% of all Council staff is either unknown or they preferred not to say.</p>																																																			
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total number</th> <th>Bisexual</th> <th>Gay Man</th> <th>Gay Woman</th> <th>Heterosexual</th> <th>Prefer not to say/unknown</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Richmond upon Thames Council</td> <td rowspan="2">2030</td> <td>11</td> <td>30</td> <td>10</td> <td>987</td> <td>992</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.5%</td> <td>1.5%</td> <td>0.5%</td> <td>48.6%</td> <td>48.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Education, Children's and Cultural Services</td> <td rowspan="2">765</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> <td>396</td> <td>298</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.5%</td> <td>0.7%</td> <td>0.4%</td> <td>51.8%</td> <td>39%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total number	Bisexual	Gay Man	Gay Woman	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say/unknown	Richmond upon Thames Council	2030	11	30	10	987	992	0.5%	1.5%	0.5%	48.6%	48.8%	Education, Children's and Cultural Services	765	4	5	3	396	298	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%	51.8%	39%																				
		Total number	Bisexual	Gay Man	Gay Woman	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say/unknown																																													
	Richmond upon Thames Council	2030	11	30	10	987	992																																													
0.5%			1.5%	0.5%	48.6%	48.8%																																														
Education, Children's and Cultural Services	765	4	5	3	396	298																																														
		0.5%	0.7%	0.4%	51.8%	39%																																														

	<p><u>Sexual orientation in relation to workforce development</u></p> <p>Data relating to the sexual orientation of staff is not collected as part of the attendance, registration or evaluation. However, the WFD team are confident that the CFD opportunities on offer are accessible to all.</p>
--	--

6. Have you identified any data gaps in relation to the relevant protected characteristics and relevant parts of the duty? If so, how will these data gaps be addressed?

Gaps in data	Action to deal with this
N/A	

SUMMARY OF THE KEY FINDINGS

7. Set out the key findings from the equality impact needs analysis of the service/ function/ policy. Key questions to consider when completing this section:

- *Are there findings of unlawful discrimination?*
- *Can you address any identified adverse impact?*
- *Can you mitigate any negative impact?*
- *Please provide rationale if you are unable to address any adverse impact.*
- *Have you identified any ways of advancing equality in this area? For example, meeting diverse needs?*
- *Is there a need for any actions to promote understanding between different protected groups?*

The EINA has shown that there are no findings of unlawful discrimination in relation to the WFD and the WFD Strategy.

The WFD team are working with partners and with colleagues in Kingston Council as well as external providers to identify where support needs to be improved.

An audit of need will be carried out for internal front line practitioners and results will inform training from September onwards.

CPD opportunities are commissioned on need and cover a variety of factors including; outcomes of the children and young people’s survey and risky behaviour and the emotional behaviour and mental health needs analysis.

CONSULTATION ON THE KEY FINDINGS

8. What consultation have you undertaken with stakeholders or critical friends about the key findings? What feedback did you receive as part of the consultation?

We regularly feedback to key stakeholders. Practitioners have opportunities to evaluate provision and to meet with their relevant Professional Development lead within the team. The current needs analysis will inform the commissioning process and feedback will be provided to all those involved as well as the wider workforce. Recent feedback from multi-

agency safeguarding training includes:

We regularly feedback to key stakeholders. Practitioners have opportunities to evaluate provision and to meet with their relevant Professional Development lead within the team. The current needs analysis will inform the commissioning process and feedback will be provided to all those involved as well as the wider workforce.

Recent feedback from multi-agency safeguarding training

The following data has been aggregated. Out of the 275 candidates who attended training 245 (89%) completed an evaluation form – the results are as follows:

Overall, how would you rate the course?					
Excellent (1)	Good (2)	OK (3)	Less than Average (4)	Poor (5)	No Answer (0)
72%	28%	2%	1%	0%	2%

Some of the comments received include:

- Good learning opportunities - with the interaction with different professionals;
- I now have an understanding of how my role fits into the overall shared responsibility in relation to the safeguarding of children, having an understanding of this was my objective and
- It met my objectives in every way. I want to come back when the child protection update starts.

Overall, how would you rate the trainer?					
Excellent (1)	Good (2)	OK (3)	Less than Average (4)	Poor (5)	No Answer (0)
87%	6%	10%	0%	0%	2%

Some of the comments received include:

- Covered all areas- very knowledgeable;
- Very clear, I feel more confident in safeguarding;
- Gave reassurance;
- Helpful and thorough. Good to have a clear picture of the process. Good explanation of terminology; and
- Very well - A good balance of discussion/info giving.

ACTION PLANNING

9. What issues have you identified that require actions? What are these actions, who will be responsible for them and when will they be completed?

Issue identified	Planned action	Lead officer	Completion Date
Identify gaps in training provision	To work with team managers/ the LSCB safeguarding sub-group and other partners to better identify areas of support not currently being provided.	Gillian Goouch	To follow the commissioning process – 3 times annually

Procuring new database	Better collection of data to inform planning	Gillian Goouch	September 2013
------------------------	--	----------------	----------------

MONITORING AND REVIEW

10. How will the actions in the action plan be monitored and reviewed? For example, any equality actions identified should be added to business, service or team plans and performance managed.

Stakeholders and participants of activities will continue to be surveyed on the provision of services delivered by the WFD team.
--

PUBLISHING THE COMPLETED ANALYSIS

11. When completed, the equality impact and needs analysis should be approved by a member of DMT and published on the Council’s website. Please provide details below:

Approved by	ECS Equalities Working Group
Date of approval	October 2013
Date of publication	December 2013

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

12. Has a copy of this EINA or summary of key findings been provided to key decision-makers to help inform decision making, for example as an appendix to a Cabinet or Committee report?

- **If so please provide the details including the name of the report, the audience i.e. Cabinet/ Committee, the date it went, and the report author.**
- **Please also outline the outcome from the report and details of any follow up action or monitoring of actions or decision taken:**

N/A
