

MTEP/EIA Checklist

Number of proposal		MTP Proposal 20					
Name of proposal and description		Reduction in child care development team					
Responsible AD		Jenni Cooke		EIA Member		Janet Walke/John Bosson	
Financial Resources Identified		£30k pa from 2012/13		Finance Contact		Brett Nielson	
Has the data quality been checked?			Y	N	Data Contact		
Protected Characteristics	Impact Y/N		Level of Impact				Explanation of decision Level of impact
			H	M	L	nil	
Age	Y	N				nil	None identified
Race	Y	N				nil	None identified
Sex	Y	N				nil	None identified
Gender Reassignment	Y	N				nil	None identified
Disability	Y	N				nil	None identified
Religion or belief	Y	N				nil	None identified
Sexual Orientation	Y	N				nil	None identified
Pregnancy or maternity	Y	N				nil	None identified
Marriage/ Civil Partnership	Y	N				nil	None identified
Will the proposal help to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation? Not applicable							
Will the proposal help to advance equality of opportunity? Not applicable							
Will the proposal help to promote good relations between groups? Not applicable							

Other Groups to consider	Impact Y/N		Level of Impact				Explanation of decision Level of impact
	Y	N	H	M	L	nil	
Unemployed/low income	Y	N	H	M	L	nil	
Carers	Y	N	H	M	L	nil	
People with criminal convictions	Y	N	H	M	L	nil	
Refugees & Asylum seekers	Y	N	H	M	L	nil	
Gypsies & Travellers	Y	N	H	M	L	nil	
Young People leaving care	Y	N	H	M	L	nil	
Geographical Impact	Y	N	H	M	L	nil	

Are there any potential impacts on partners e.g. Providers, Health, Police etc. Please detail

The implications for this proposal relates to the implications for private sector providers of child care, child minders and the voluntary and community provision. CDOs provide support to these providers to improve their quality of provision. The team consists of 3 CDO, 3 FSAT and 3 EYIS. More work will be targeted at settings requiring support and there is a possibility of the team adjusting its formation to absorb the reduction across all posts or for a post holder to opt for ERVR.

Have any other options been explored Y N **If yes please detail**

The implications for this proposal relates to the implications for maintained, private, voluntary, independent and childminder providers of early years foundation stage provision. The Early Years Team provide support to these providers to improve the quality of provision for children from birth to the end of reception. The team consists of 3 CDO, 3 FSAT and 3 EYICs. Officer work will be targeted at settings requiring intensive support and there is a possibility of the team adjusting its formation to absorb the reduction across all posts or for a post holder to opt for ERVR. The Early Years Team has made reductions to their working hours which equates to the proposed reduction in budget. This has been instigated with immediate effect - so in effect we will have a small out turn from the 2011 - 12 budgets.

The service has prioritised the following areas to provide Early Years services targeted at the areas of greatest need.

- Sustaining the working model with the intensive providers.
- Sustaining the Child Development Programme as this is preventative work which is beginning to reduce the targeted requirements.
- Re-alignment of the targeted work in order to address those prioritised by current circumstance for support.
- Continue a reduced model of drop-in sessions in order to ensure all other providers receive the advice and support to sustain their good/outstanding grades.

- There are impacts for the number of settings that we can work with which is reduced - when an unexpected event/incident occurs which requires immediate officer attention the number of settings we can work with effectively reduces further. So capacity to address the unforeseen is stretched to the limits.

Ongoing service management will monitor impacts of the service and ensure that it is focused on the areas of greatest need.