

Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form

(Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance when completing this form)



| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Name of proposal | Executive Safeguarding / Safety Board - working title ' Bristol Executive Board' |
| Directorate and Service Area | People – all Service Areas |
| Name of Lead Officer | Jacqui Jensen |

Step 1: What is the proposal?

Please explain your proposal in Plain English, avoiding acronyms and jargon. This section should explain how the proposal will impact service users, staff and/or the wider community.

1.1 What is the proposal?

The creation of a new partnership Board consolidating the statutory functions of the four existing boards (Safer Bristol Board, Bristol Safeguarding Adults Board (BSAB), Bristol Safeguarding Children's Board (BSCB) and the Children and Families Partnership Board (CFPB)). This is to comply with new statutory provisions in relation to Children's Boards.

This model proposes to take a life-course, whole-system approach to safeguarding and safe communities by integrating the functions of the four Boards. This approach would bring together the whole system across universal, early intervention and prevention and child protection/adult safeguarding and combine oversight and assurance functions of the Safeguarding Boards with the commissioning functions of the Children and Families Partnership Board, and crime reduction strategy of Safer Bristol to facilitate and model a framework for creative partnership solutions.

The model is formulated on the hypothesis that Bristol's safeguarding arrangements could be improved for children, adults and families if the structural arrangements facilitated quicker, more effective opportunities for partnership leadership and shared decision-making by senior strategic leads across the partnership. Currently opportunities for coordinated partnership leadership are impacted by the high level of delegation at meetings, infrequent quarterly meeting structures held in silos across the system and a disparate strategic partnership structure. The model suggests that fewer meetings, with a greater focus on decision-making rather than information provision, attended by leaders in the city with the capacity to make robust change in safeguarding will promote impactful systemic change. This hypothesis is at the core of this proposal.

The landscape of Safeguarding is changing; the focus is moving from interfamilial abuse to include very complex contextual safeguarding concerns which present high risk. The traditional board models do not facilitate innovative solutions to high risk complex situations.

The Bristol proposal for a local 'place' based option offers a solution which facilitates cross working based on local risks and fits well with the One City approach typified by the One City Plan .

Step 2: What information do we have?

Decisions must be evidence-based, and involve people with protected characteristics that could be affected. Please use this section to demonstrate understanding of who could be affected by the proposal.

2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

While safeguarding and safety can affect all citizens there are certain cohorts who are particularly vulnerable including refugees, children and young people, disabled people and frail elderly.

Bristol has the tenth largest population and is the eighth largest city in the country. The proportion of the population who are BAME is 22% in the 2016 census. The proportion of people living in Bristol who were not born in the UK is 15% of the total population. In Bristol, there are now at least 45 religions, at least 187 countries of birth represented and at least 91 main languages spoken. Furthermore, the new Working Together 2018 Draft guidance sets out the expectation of the safeguarding arrangements to engage with education settings in the city: Bristol has a large diverse education sector with 172 schools, not including a significant number of alternative education providers. In respect of health services, Bristol has five hospitals and a range of private hospitals, dental hospital and eye hospital services accepting patients from across the region. The local authority received over 22,800 contacts to First Response in the last twelve months. Its size and the complexity of its provider sector mean that safeguarding arrangements need significant reach to create impact and to ensure robust scrutiny.

There are considerable and growing overlaps in the issues of concern to the respective Boards (and sub groups); additionally there are gaps and shortfalls as a result of the silos that the Boards (and sub groups) inadvertently create.

There is an increasing growth in connectivity between the various boards e.g. sexual exploitation, hate crime, modern slavery, serious violence and gang crime and mate crimes, sexual and criminal exploitation of vulnerable adults which makes the differential agendas for the existing board structure less relevant with issues or concerns falling between the various remits these include:

- Youth offending team funding / PCSO funding and Safer Bristol
- Impact of Domestic abuse on children / Safer Bristol and LSCB
- Strategic commissioning / vision setting and all boards;
- Contextual safeguarding (the risk in the environment rather than the traditional risk in the home) is testing all service areas and consequently all boards / groups and requires a

collective, coordinated focus.

The threshold decision making regarding adult and children's serious case reviews have proved to be effective, however this is not necessarily always the case in relation to Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs). The Governmental approach does not currently enable nuanced learning. The new arrangement will seek to mitigate this.

2.2 Who is missing? Are there any gaps in the data?

Our diversity data is dependent on the quality of equalities monitoring from referring agencies. There are gaps in data for some protected characteristics citywide, especially where this has not historically been included in statutory reporting e.g. for gender reassignment.

2.3 How have we involved, or will we involve, communities and groups that could be affected?

Consultation is now under way to seek the views of youth participation groups, education providers, the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector, health providers, adult care providers, service users and the public on what the priorities of the new board should be. Contributions will be collected through a range of mediums including an online survey (also available in an easy read format), public consultation events, professional focus group events, participation group events, youth event / questionnaire. This activity closes on 13th May 2019.

In 2017 The BSCB Shadow Board sent a survey out to all young people attending secondary education within Bristol seeking their views on their priorities for safeguarding. Ten areas of concern were identified and which will be reflected in the strategic plan of the new Board. The young people identified eight key messages about safeguarding which will inform awareness-raising and communication work of the new Board. The survey identified concerns about the representation of certain groups including young people from Black and Ethnic groups and deprived areas of the city.

In 2018 the BSAB published a public consultation asking 'what we should do in 2018-2021', six priorities were identified and the need for advocacy to ensure that those who were not able to represent themselves independently are supported to do so.

Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts on people with protected characteristics must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts in this section, referring to all of the equalities groups as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?

We are not aware of any adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics from this proposal, as is intended to improve overall safeguarding arrangements in Bristol. A function of the existing safeguarding Boards is to take positive steps to tackle hate crime, discriminatory abuse, honour-based violence, FGM and carry out positive action to promote equality where possible. We will ensure that this remains a priority and is not overlooked in

through the merger. Additionally, partners including the Director of Adult Social Services, have stressed the need to maintain a focus on frail elderly vulnerabilities. The new model will ensure it supports scrutiny of provision and service delivery across all four statutory functions. This includes the need to maintain oversight of safeguarding and safety issues impacting minority groups and issues which do not cross the four functions such as the care and support needs of older adults. The issue of older people with care and support needs and the safeguarding needs of older people particularly in residential accommodation are a key focus of the adult safeguarding board and this focus must be maintained in any new structure, this will be mitigated by clarity of plan and Independent Chair's role. An Independent Chair has been recruited to support the Executive Board and provide robust oversight that all functions are being discharged.

The safeguarding policies for specific groups i.e. children and adults will remain in publication and will be reviewed as appropriate.

Disengagement of smaller community groups – Sector engagement events have developed clear lines of representation and engagement with the new approach. An annual consultation event will be held open to all partners across the city. The new Task and Finish model will enable wider engagement with opportunities with less of a resource burden.

3.2 Can these impacts be mitigated or justified? If so, how?

Yes, as described this proposal sets out to improve Bristol's safeguarding arrangements for children, adults, families and communities and thereby the intention is to reduce adverse impact on citizens of Bristol and people with protected characteristics. Further mitigations in place include an independent chair, representation from VCSE and public consultation.

3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected characteristics?

Yes, the proposal sets out to better safeguard all people including equalities groups.

3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?

Yes, by contributing to in the development of the strategic plan and participating in reference groups which will be established to inform, support, and challenge the Board on the delivery of the plan.

Step 4: So what?

The Equality Impact Assessment must be able to influence the proposal and decision. This section asks how your understanding of impacts on people with protected characteristics has influenced your proposal, and how the findings of your Equality Impact Assessment can be measured going forward.

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?

It has reinforced the importance of taking a new approach and of working collaboratively across the partnership to improve safeguarding arrangements in the city.


4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?

There is a project plan in place. Further consultation responses will be used to update this impact assessment and inform the strategic direction of the Board. This will include consideration of the diversity of Board members.

4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured moving forward?

There will be an annual report published.

Service Director Sign-Off:



Jacqui Jensen

Date: 01/05/2019

Equalities Officer Sign Off:



Duncan Fleming

Date: 29/4/2019