

# Early Help Remodelling

## Consultation Analysis

Date: January 2017

### 1. Introduction

#### Consultation approach

- 1.1. The Education and Children’s service undertook a 12 week public consultation, from the 6 September to the 6 December 2016, on its proposals to remodel early help services and adventure play. This report presents the results of the consultation analysis to aid decision making and is therefore a detailed analysis. We have also produced a summary report, which will be published following the Executive’s consideration of consultation feedback and the final service proposals, (expected to take place March 2016).
- 1.2. In undertaking the consultation we took advice from the council’s communication, legal and equality services and feedback is that the consultation process meets the local authority’s statutory duties set out in the Childcare Act 2006 and revised Best Value Guidance. The consultation contained 26 questions overall, 22 of which presented proposals that were specifically for the public/service users. Three questions presented proposals that were for stakeholders only as they concerned functions that support front line early help services and are not directly used by the general public, (e.g. parents or children). One further question was provided to allow people to make any other comments.
- 1.3. We developed a communication plan with the aim of identifying and reaching key groups who could be impacted by the proposals and may have wanted to take part in the consultation. The communication plan included council members, council staff, key partner organisations (e.g. partners based in the children centres, Children’s Trust, Leicester City Children’s Improvement Board, Leicester Education Strategic Partnership, Schools Forum, Early Help Locality Partnerships, Leicester Safeguarding Children’s Board and key parent and child service user groups).
- 1.4. We provided three main ways for people to take part in the consultation:
  - 1.4.1. Online – for everyone (service users, staff and stakeholders)
  - 1.4.2. Paper questionnaire – for service users only
  - 1.4.3. Focus Group Toolkit – for everyone (service users, staff and stakeholders).
- 1.5. To allow for a wider reach, we also included comments submitted by email, letters and social media (e.g. Facebook).

- 1.6. Focus groups included: work with 23 parent forums in each of the 23 ‘Children, Young People and Family Centres’; children and young people (e.g. Young People’s Council, Children’s Council and young people participation groups); and stakeholders (e.g. Early Help Locality Partnerships).
- 1.7. The consultation focused on **one proposal** for each of the commissioned services<sup>1</sup> but made a **range of proposals** for the services delivered from the councils early help service.

There are a number of reasons for this difference in number and approach. First, the council is not responsible for the aims and objectives, or the delivery arrangements, of the adventure play providers, so we can only make commissioning and funding proposals here. Secondly, in relation to the other commissioned services, the proposal was to either end or continue commissioning/funding arrangements and this could be set out in one proposal per service. By contrast, the early help services are **directly provided or delivered** by the council through the Children, Young People and Families (CYP&F) centres and we are therefore required, for clarity and to meet our statutory duty to provide a fair and transparent consultation, to set out our proposals in line with the range of services accessed by parents and children through the centres.

## How we analysed the data

- 1.8. The analysis was undertaken in Excel and was split into two parts: analysis of a ‘tick box option’ and analysis of the written statements made by respondents.
- 1.9. In the first part, the ‘tick box option’, we asked respondents to tell us how they felt each proposal would affect them – e.g. negatively, positively, no affect, not applicable. We counted the number of responses to each and the results are presented in the following sections, cross referenced by respondent type, (e.g. parent, young person, member of staff etc.).
- 1.10. For the second part, we read all the written statements made in response to each proposal and identified a range of **key messages**. We also identified that these key messages fell into **four key themes**:
- a. **Comments about the services, proposals and consultation** – e.g. supportive of the proposal, not supportive of the proposal, identification of how children, young people and parents benefit from a service. When highlighting key benefits, respondents may have implied that these benefits may be lost as a result of the proposal, where the proposal was to reduce or end something. A number of comments were made about the consultation process, which will be included in a lessons learned log.
  - b. **Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)** – e.g. impact on children with additional needs, impact on early prevention. In contrast to respondents who highlighted a benefit of a service, some respondents chose to focus on impacts (e.g. what may be lost) as a result of a proposal.
  - c. **Suggestions concerning the services and proposals** – e.g. prepared to pay more council tax, alternative proposals

---

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Adventure Play Providers, Bookstart, Welfare Rights, Workforce Development, Parenting Programmes. The Adventure Play Providers were treated as a group. Commissioned services here means services delivered through grant funding arrangements, service level agreements and service contracts.

- d. **Questions** – things that people are unclear about. Questions will be responded to in a FAQ document and posted on Citizen Space, and will inform future communication plans.

1.11. It should be noted that the 1,224 people taking part in the consultation did not answer all 26 questions. Some took part in the ‘tick box option’ only, some provided a written response only and some did both.

1.12. The results of the analysis were considered by the project lead and a council response is presented for each proposal below for consideration and endorsement by the Executive.

## Report layout

1.13. The council’s proposed responses to consultation feedback are presented for each service proposal against the four key themes set out in 1.7 above.

1.14. The consultation analysis is presented in the following sections, which include:

- a) Section 1 (this section) – introduction and summary, (page 3 to 5).
- b) Section 2 – summary of who took part in the consultation and how they took part, (page 6 to 8).
- c) Section 3 to section 27 – analysis of consultation responses for the 26 questions/proposals, including ‘any other comments’, (page 9 to 68)
- d) Section 28 – appendix 1 (Equality monitoring, page 69 to 74).

## Summary analysis

1.15. In total, **1,224** people took part in the consultation:

- a) 640 people (52%) took part in the consultation through focus groups, 374 (31%) took part on line and 210 (17%) took part through a paper booklet.
- b) Parents/carers were the largest group to take part in the consultation (**452/1224, 37%**), followed by referral agencies/organisations (**375/1224, 31%**) and children and young people aged 19 or under (**138/1224, 11%**). The remaining 21% were made up of other respondent types. For further details of who and how people took part in the consultation please refer to section 2 below.

1.16. Ethnic monitoring of the responses to the consultation is presented in appendix 1. In summary, 46% of respondents who took part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet were white British, followed by 15% who were Indian (Asian or Asian British). For the focus group consultation, 73% did not provide any ethnic monitoring data. Of the 27% that did provide data: 10% reported an ethnic category of White British, followed by 9% Indian. The majority of respondents were female (63% online/paper booklet). Eight percent of respondents who took part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet reported a disability, whereas 3% taking part in the focus groups reported a disability.

1.17. The council also received a petition that met the threshold for a debate at full council, i.e. greater 1,500 signatures. This was submitted by Playfair on 9 November 2016. The petition asked the council to withdraw the proposed cuts affecting 9 of the 10 adventure play providers represented by Playfair.

1.18. For 15 of the 25 proposals we asked respondents to tell us how the proposal would affect them and provided a tick box option for them to do this (e.g. it will affect us negatively/positively/not at all). A summary of majority answers is provided below:

Consultation response	Proposals
For 5 proposals a majority of both the public and stakeholders were in agreement that the proposal would <b>negatively affect me/us/my clients</b> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adventure Play</li> <li>• Children Centres</li> <li>• Bookstart</li> <li>• Stay and Play</li> <li>• Welfare Rights</li> </ul>
For one proposal a majority of stakeholders were in agreement that the proposal would <b>negatively affect me/my clients</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early Help Response – only stakeholders were presented with this proposal for comment (because it is a function that involves stakeholders to support front line delivery with service users).</li> </ul>
For 8 of the proposals members of the public said the proposal ' <b>would not affect me/us</b> ' but stakeholders responded to say the proposal <b>would negatively affect 'me/my clients'</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cluster Advice Points</li> <li>• Early Years Learning and Development</li> <li>• Family Support Service</li> <li>• Home Learning Service</li> <li>• Parenting Groups and Crèche</li> <li>• School Holiday Events</li> <li>• Toy and Book Library</li> <li>• Volunteering, Employment, Education and Training</li> </ul>
For one proposal both the public and stakeholders said the proposal ' <b>would not affect me/us/clients</b> '.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weekly Parent Engagement.</li> </ul>
For 11 proposals, respondents were not provided with a tick box response, because the proposals were for no change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adult and family learning and crèche</li> <li>• Antenatal courses</li> <li>• Children centre teachers</li> <li>• Domestic violence groups and crèche</li> <li>• Family support service (traded with schools)</li> <li>• Health child programme</li> <li>• Parenting programmes</li> <li>• Targeted services</li> <li>• Interface with social care</li> <li>• Partnership and workforce development</li> </ul>

1.19. For a summary of **the comments made by respondents**, please refer to the following sections where we present our analysis of comments under the relevant proposal. We analysed the comments and grouped them into 'comments about the service/proposal' (1,428 comments), 'suggested potential impacts of the proposal' (1,516), 'suggestions concerning the service/proposals' (519) and questions (298).

## The council's response to consultation feedback – at a glance

1.20. The following sections of this report present the council's **proposed responses** to consultation feedback. The council's responses set out in this report are presented as **proposals** because the Executive has yet to consider and endorse them.

1.21. The table below provides a list of the initial proposals that featured in the consultation and highlights if consideration of consultation feedback has led the council to propose a change to the initial proposal. The council is proposing to update 12 of the 25 initial proposals that featured in the consultation.

**Table 1: List of initial proposals that featured in the consultation and the council's proposed responses to consultation feedback**

Q	Proposal name	Did consideration of consultation feedback lead to a change to the initial proposal? (y/n)	Where to find full details in this report.
1	Adventure Play	Yes	See page 11
2	Children Centres	No	See page 15
3	Adult and family learning and crèche	No	See page 16
4	Antenatal courses	No	See page 17
5	Bookstart	Yes	See page 20
6	Children centre teachers	Yes	See page 22
7	Cluster advice points	No	See page 25
8	Domestic violence groups and crèche	No	See page 26
9	Early years, learning and development	Yes	See page 29
10	Family support service	No	See page 32
11	Family support service (traded with schools)	Yes	See page 34
12	Health child programme	No	See page 35
13	Home learning service	No	See page 38
14	Parenting groups and crèche	No	See page 41
15	Parenting programmes	Yes	See page 42
16	School holiday events	Yes	See page 45
17	Stay and Play	Yes	See page 48
18	Targeted services	No	See page 50
19	Toy and book library	No	See page 53
20	Volunteering, employment, education and training	Yes	See page 56
21	Weekly parent engagement	Yes	See page 59
22	Welfare rights	Yes	See page 62
23	Early help response	No	See page 64
24	Interface with social care	Yes	See page 66
25	Partnership (multi-agency) and workforce development	No	See page 67
26	Any other comment	Not applicable/points considered elsewhere.	See page 68

## 2. Summary of who took part in the consultation and how they took part

**Table 2: How did people take part in the consultation?**

Type of response	How many responses were submitted?	Comment
Online questionnaires	374 online questionnaires	Completed by service users and stakeholders
Paper booklet questionnaires	210 paper booklet questionnaires	Completed by service users only
Focus group toolkit questionnaires	62 focus group toolkit questionnaires	Completed by service users and stakeholders. More than one person took part in each focus group.
<b>Total</b>	<b>646 individual and group responses</b>	

**Table 3: How many people responded, by respondent type**

Respondent type	Online questionnaire	Paper booklet questionnaire	Focus group toolkit questionnaires (more than one person per group)	Total
member of public / service user	231	210	276	717 (59%)
member of staff / service provider / partner organisation / referral agency	143	n/a	364	507 (41%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>374 (31%)</b>	<b>210 (17%)</b>	<b>640 (52%)</b>	<b>1224 (100%)</b>

**Table 4: Who responded and how many, (members of public/service user)**

Respondent type (public)	Online questionnaire	Paper booklet questionnaire	Focus group toolkit questionnaires	Total
A young person aged 19 or under	45	8	85	138 (19%)
A parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	141	128	177	446 (62%)
A parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant	4	2	n/a	6 (1%)
A Leicester resident	35	35	14	84 (12%)
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)	2	0	n/a	2 (0.5%)
Other	3	1	n/a	4 (1%)
Not selected (+1)	1	36	n/a	37 (5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>231 (32%)</b>	<b>210 (29%)</b>	<b>276 (38%)</b>	<b>717 (100%)</b>

**Table 5: Who responded and how many, (stakeholders)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	Online questionnaire	Paper booklet questionnaire	Focus group toolkit questionnaires	Total
A member of staff (LCC or other)	99	Completed by service users only	n/a	99 (20%)
A service provider / partner organisation	18		n/a	18 (4%)
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	9		n/a	9 (2%)
A referral agency / organisation	6		255	261 (51%)
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	3		109	112 (22%)
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre	2		n/a	2 (0.5%)
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre	2		n/a	2 (0.5%)
Other	3			3 (1%)
Not selected	1			1 (0.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>143 (28%)</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>364 (72%)</b>

2.1. A guide has been produced to aid the reading of the tables in the following sections that set out **how members of the public/stakeholders responded to the proposals**, for example table 6, page 9 and table 7, page 10.

## Table guide

**Follow the numbers to find out how to read the tables: how members of the public (or stakeholders) responded to the consultation (table 6 page 9 used here as an example).**

<b>1</b>							<b>2</b>			<b>3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The public were given the following options below to tell us who they were.</li> <li>Some people did not select a respondent type ('not selected') but still took part in the consultation – however they had to tell us if they were a member of the public or a stakeholder.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondents were asked how the proposal would affect them and we provided them with a 'tick box' option that included <u>five responses</u>.</li> <li>Respondents were also given two free text boxes – one to tell us how the proposed change would affect them and the second for any other comments. This information is not shown here. Note that people taking part in focus groups were not given a 'tick box' option to complete because they provided a group response.</li> <li>Some people completed the tick box option only, some completed the tick box option and the free text boxes and some completed the free text boxes only. Those that completed the free text boxes only are highlighted below in the statement only column (<u>see (*)</u>).</li> <li>We can see, by way of an example, that 215/349 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklets (62%) said the adventure play proposal would affect them in a negative way.</li> </ul>						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>349 (79%) of the 441 members of the public that took part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to the Adventure Play proposal.</li> </ul>			
<b>Respondent type (public) online</b>	<b>(1) I have no opinion</b>	<b>(2) It will affect me/us in a negative way</b>	<b>(3) It will affect me/us in a positive way</b>	<b>(4) It won't affect me / us</b>	<b>(5) Not applicable</b>	<b>(*) Statement only</b>	<b>Numbers of responses</b>	<b>Response rate (online/paper booklet)</b>		
A Leicester resident	1	29	0	11	8	10	59 (17%)	<b>79%</b> <b>349 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.</b>		
A parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	6	109	1	46	17	13	192 (55%)			
A parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant	0	4	0	1	0	0	5 (1%)			
A young person aged 19 or under	0	46	1	2	1	1	51 (15%)			
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)	0	2	0	0	0	0	2 (1%)			
Other	0	3	0	0	0	1	4 (1%)			
Not selected	2	22	2	2	0	8	36 (10%)			
<b>Total</b>	<b>9 (3%)</b>	<b>215 (62%)</b>	<b>4 (1%)</b>	<b>62 (18%)</b>	<b>26 (7%)</b>	<b>33 (9%)</b>	<b>349 (100%)</b>			



### 3. Question 1 - Adventure playgrounds

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are currently ten adventure playgrounds that provide a range of indoor and outdoor supervised play activities for children aged 5 – 15.</li> <li>These are run by different service providers who in total receive a £1.1 million grant from the council each year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A gradual reduction in the grant, starting in spring 2017, leading to an eventual reduction of 50% (£550,000) by 2020.</li> <li>The council will work with adventure play providers to determine initial and eventual reduction levels, help them source alternative funding, expand their current range of services and provide volunteers with new skills training.</li> <li>The transfer of buildings to adventure playgrounds' ownership is also being considered.</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Adventure play)

**Table 6: How members of the public responded to the adventure play proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
A Leicester resident	1	29		11	8	1	59 (17%)	<b>79%</b> <b>349 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.</b>
A parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	6	19	1	46	17	13	192 (55%)	
A parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant		4		1			5 (1%)	
A young person aged 19 or under		46	1	2	1	1	51 (15%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)		2					2 (1%)	
Other		3				1	4 (1%)	
Not selected	2	22	2	2		8	36 (10%)	
<b>Total</b>	9 (3%)	215 (62%)	4 (1%)	62 (18%)	26 (7%)	33 (9%)	349 (100%)	

**Table 7: How stakeholders responded to the adventure play proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	5	68	5	9	7	4	98 (70%)	98% 140 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.
A referral agency / organisation	1	4					5 (4%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		3					3 (2%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		2					2 (1%)	
A service provider / partner organisation		15		1	1	1	18 (13%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	1	7		1			9 (6%)	
Other		2			1		3 (2%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>7 (5%)</b>	<b>103 (74%)</b>	<b>5 (4%)</b>	<b>11 (8%)</b>	<b>9 (6%)</b>	<b>5 (5%)</b>	<b>140 (100%)</b>	

**Table 8: How members of the public responded to the adventure play proposal, by adventure playground most frequently visited (Online/paper booklet)**

Response online	Belgrave	Braunstone	Goldhill	Highfields	Mowmacre	New Parks	Northfields	St Andrews	What Cabin	Woodgate	Playground information not available	Total
I have no opinion			2		1						6	9 (2%)
It will affect me/us in a negative way	5	11	43	39	14	27	7	1		28	4	215 (49%)
It will affect me/us in a positive way			3			1						4 (1%)
It won't affect me/us	3	1	3			1	1		1	1	5	62 (14%)
Not applicable			1				1				24	26 (6%)
Statement only		1	1		5				2		15	33 (7%)
Not answered	5	1	2	13			4				67	92 (21%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>13 (3%)</b>	<b>15 (3%)</b>	<b>64 (15%)</b>	<b>52 (12%)</b>	<b>2 (0%)</b>	<b>29 (7%)</b>	<b>13 (3%)</b>	<b>1 (0%)</b>	<b>3 (1%)</b>	<b>29 (7%)</b>	<b>202 (46%)</b>	<b>441</b>

**Table 9: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Adventure Play)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Service information:</b> e.g. service is frequently used and popular, other funding streams are reducing, service should be viewed as an asset.	144	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 88 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 35 could not be implemented because they would not be cost effective; 45 are already a feature of the proposed service offer; and 8 cannot be implemented by the early help service and will be forwarded to the appropriate service provider for their attention. A proposal was received from one provider of AP which is specific to their provision and will be considered.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) Service suggestions will be forwarded to the Adventure Play (AP) providers for information and consideration. These providers are independent of the council and are responsible for their business and operational delivery. The council provides a grant to AP's to support the delivery of services but has no influence on the service.</p> <p>2) Maintaining the level of funding or reducing further services within the council's early help service to fund more AP provision is not an option as it would not be achieve the savings required or meet service user demands or the council's statutory requirements.</p> <p><b>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</b></p> <p>1) Adventure Playgrounds may not be able to continue in their current format with reduced revenue funding from the council. Further analysis to be undertaken, no reduction in grant funding at this time.</p> <p>2) The Council's Service Analysis Team will undertake a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the use of the grant, which may inform future funding.</p> <p>3) Development of strategic Play Commission will invest in embedding good principles for play across all services operating throughout the city.</p> <p>4) Play Development Officer role will continue to provided dedicated support for AP's to develop a sustainable business model with income generation and good quality practice.</p> <p>5) Explore opportunities to develop Community Asset Transfer and long term lease arrangements for land and buildings occupied by the AP's.</p>
	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. statements such as 'please do not cut the service', concerned about cuts to those in need, service provision is already not sufficient.	14	
	<b>Service user benefits:</b> e.g. children make new friends and learn new skills, play is important, service provides more than just play.	212	
	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. understand the need to make cuts locally, following central government cuts.	18	
	<b>Provides a safe place to play and keeps children occupied</b>	185	
	<b>Comments about staff providing an excellent service</b>	35	
	<b>Comments about the consultation:</b> e.g. involve service users directly.	12	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	273	
	<b>Impact on staff:</b> e.g. Job losses	27	
	<b>Impact on the community:</b> e.g. increase in anti social behaviour, social cohesion	80	
	<b>Impact on service provision:</b> e.g. service may close if the proposal is implemented, opportunities for play will be reduced, service quality may be affected.	217	
	<b>Impact on access to adventure play if some centres close:</b> e.g. travel options, cost	28	
	<b>Impact on partners:</b> e.g. police, schools and children centres	1	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery</b> (feedback to the providers of adventure play): e.g. expand range of services, evaluate effectiveness of the service, join up work with other services.	8	
	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery,</b> (feedback for the council): e.g. more money not less, commission services differently (bring services in-house for the council to deliver, divert funding from other council services, increase council tax, children should be involved in decision making, more activities for disabled children).	80	
Questions	Various questions	14	

## 4. Question 2 - Children Centres

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are currently 23 Children, Young People and Family Centres (also known as children’s centres) across Leicester.</li> <li>• They are located in six different ‘cluster areas’, though people can access services at any of the centres, regardless of where they live in the city.</li> <li>• Each centre has different opening hours, offering a number of different services / activities each week.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twelve of the centres will continue to provide council-run services (such as health visiting, school nursing services, etc).</li> <li>• Six main centres will offer the full range of early childhood services and family support, Monday to Friday, 8.30am - 5pm, and six satellite centres will offer a limited range of services, depending on need.</li> <li>• External organisations will be charged a fee for using the centres, though community groups will still be able to deliver services from centres at no cost.</li> <li>• We will look at different options for the remaining 11 centres, including the possibility of transferring them to external organisations who deliver childhood services (such as childcare providers).</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Children Centres)

**Table 10: How members of the public responded to the children centre proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident	2	27	1	8	2	1	41 (20%)	47% 207 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	1	19		3	7	3	150 (72.5%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant		2		2			4 (2%)	
a young person aged 19 or under		1		4	1		6 (3%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)		2					2 (1%)	
Other	1	2					3 (1%)	
Not selected				1			1 (0.5%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4 (2%)</b>	<b>143 (69%)</b>	<b>1 (0%)</b>	<b>45 (22%)</b>	<b>10 (5%)</b>	<b>4 (2%)</b>	<b>207 (100%)</b>	

**Table 11: How stakeholders responded to the children centre proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	4	72	4	5	5	2	92 (70%)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>92%</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>131 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.</b></p>
A referral agency / organisation		4		1			5 (4%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		2				1	3 (2%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1		1			2 (2%)	
A service provider / partner organisation		8	1	2	2	1	14 (11%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre	1	2					3 (2%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		8					8 (6%)	
Other		1	1		1		3 (2%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5 (4%)</b>	<b>99 (76%)</b>	<b>6 (5%)</b>	<b>9 (7%)</b>	<b>8 (6%)</b>	<b>4 (3%)</b>	<b>131 (100%)</b>	

**Table 12: How members of the public responded to the children centre proposal, by children centre most frequently visited (Online/paper booklet)**

Statement	Central	East	North	North West	West	South	Cluster information not available	Total
I have no opinion		2			1		2	5 (1%)
It will affect me / us in a negative way	5	27	9	34	39	19	10	143 (32%)
It will affect me / us in a positive way				1				1 (0.5%)
It won't affect me / us		4	4	2	5	4	26	45 (10%)
Not applicable				1	1		8	10 (2%)
Statement only		1		2				3 (1%)
Not answered	38	7	20	12	5	9	143	234 (53%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>43 (10%)</b>	<b>41 (9%)</b>	<b>33 (7%)</b>	<b>52 (12%)</b>	<b>51 (12%)</b>	<b>32 (7%)</b>	<b>189 (43%)</b>	<b>441 (100%)</b>

**Table 13: How respondents usually travel to the children centre (public only)**

Travel type	Central	East	North	North West	South	West	Cluster information not available	Total
Walk	23	16	16	24	17	28	10	134 (30%)
Car	5	9	7	12	9	6	13	61 (14%)
Walk, car	4	9	7	4	1	9	1	35 (8%)
Walk, bus	6	2	1	4	1	2		16 (4%)
Bus	3	1	1	3	2			10 (2%)
Car, mobility			1	1	1		1	4 (1%)
Walk, bus, car		1		2	1			4 (1%)
Bus, car				1		1		2 (0.5%)
Motorcycle	1							1 (0.5%)
Walk and cycle						1		1 (0.5%)
Walk, bus, cycle		1						1 (0.5%)
Walk, car, cycle						1		1 (0.5%)
Walk, car, taxi, cycle	1							1 (0.5%)
Not answered		1		1		3	165	170 (39%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>43 (10%)</b>	<b>40 (9%)</b>	<b>33 (7%)</b>	<b>52 (12%)</b>	<b>32 (7%)</b>	<b>51 (12%)</b>	<b>190 (43%)</b>	<b>441 (100)</b>

**Table 14: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Children Centre Buildings)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Service user benefits:</b> e.g. benefits children, parents, new arrivals, additional needs.	178	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 56 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 5 could not be implemented because they would not be cost effective; 2 would not be viable/practicable to implement; and 49 are already a feature of the proposed service offer.
	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. makes sense to concentrate resources, 12 centres will be more manageable.	21	
	<b>Service information:</b> e.g. service users struggle to understand opening times.	1	
	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. statements such as 'please do not cut the service', concerned about cuts to those in need, service provision is already not sufficient.	47	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Comments about the consultation:</b> e.g. more information required about the proposal and how the council determined which centres should be proposed for alternative uses.	11	
	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, vulnerable families, carers, children with additional needs/disabilities, low income families, working parents.	193	
	<b>Impact on access to children centres/early help:</b> e.g. service users may struggle to travel to the 12 children centres proposed to remain open, services may become over subscribed	180	
	<b>Impact on partners:</b> e.g. not enough space for co-location, nursery provision may close or struggle to relocate, other services may see an increase in demand for their services.	25	
	<b>Impact on the local community:</b> e.g. local businesses near to centres proposed for disposal/alternative uses	13	
	<b>Impact on early intervention:</b> e.g. families will not receive support early enough, leading to an escalation of need before support is provided.	12	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Impact on staff:</b> e.g. Job losses	13	
	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. work more closely with schools, deliver from variety of venues, allow some staff to work part time, increase council tax, divert money from other service areas	27	
	<b>Suggestions concerning children centre building proposals:</b> e.g. suggestions to re-look at which buildings should remain.	29	
Questions	Various questions	19	<b><u>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</u></b>

## 5. Question 3 – Adult/Family learning, crèche (non-council provider)

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adult learning and family learning courses delivered from some children's centres.</li> <li>Three courses are available per week in each cluster.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to this service will not be affected as a result of the proposed changes to the location and number of children centres (see section 2 – Buildings).</li> </ul>

**Respondents were only asked if they wanted to make any comments about this proposal and the responses they provided are detailed in the following table.**

**Table 15: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Adult and family learning, and crèche)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Service user benefits:</b> e.g. supports key groups such as young and single mums	8	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 26 service suggestions submitted to the consultation; 9 could not be implemented because they would not be cost effective; 1 would not be viable/practicable to implement; 12 are already a feature of the proposed service offer; and 4 cannot be implemented by the early help service and will be forwarded to the appropriate service provider for their attention.
	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. to retain the service, service reduces demand for other services.	38	
	<b>Comments about the consultation:</b> e.g. more information required about the proposal and how the council determined which centres should be proposed for alternative uses.	2	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on access to the service :</b> e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	36	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Service suggestions:</b> e.g. cut the service, increase availability, make available in more areas, maintain a database of opportunities to aid referrals, increase council tax.	17	
	<b>Commission differently:</b> e.g. not a priority service, allow other providers to deliver (e.g. NHS).	9	
Questions	Various questions	7	<b>Comments on service suggestions</b> 1) Service suggestions will be forwarded to the Adult Learning service for information and consideration.  <b><u>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</u></b>



## 6. Question 4 – Antenatal courses (e.g. Bump to Baby)

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A four-week course for expectant parents, delivered by the council's children centre service and the NHS (midwifery team).</li> <li>Courses are run on a rota basis, with one course being available in each cluster at any given time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change to this service</li> </ul>

**Respondents were only asked if they wanted to make any comments about this proposal and the responses they provided are detailed in the following table.**

**Table 16: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Antenatal courses)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of the proposal: e.g. as it benefits expectant and new parents, and children.	94	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 34 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 5 would not be viable/practicable to implement; and 29 are already a feature of the proposed service offer. <b>Comments on service suggestions</b> 1) These courses are already delivered in partnership with early years and health professionals. Suggestions will be fed into the planning process regarding operating at different times to respond to demand and delivering from other suitable venues. 2) Promotional materials will be reviewed to ensure they are accessible and widely distributed. <b><u>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</u></b>
	Service user benefits: e.g. benefits expectant and new parents.	94	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on access to the service : e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	13	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. target the service at vulnerable users, deliver at time suited to working parents, deliver from community venues/adventure play buildings, deliver at weekends, advertise more.	30	
	Commission differently: e.g. not a priority service, allow other providers to deliver (e.g. NHS).	4	
Questions	Various questions	9	

## 7. Question 5 – Book Start (council run)

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bookstart is for priority families with children aged 18 months - 2 years.</li> <li>The service encourages parents to use books and language with their children, to help them develop a love of books and reading. The service also provides book packs for children.</li> <li>Up to 72 sessions are delivered each year across Leicester.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bookstart service will end in Spring 2017, although advice and information about how to access similar support will still be available from children centres, voluntary organisations, libraries and the online Family Information Directory <a href="http://families.leicester.gov.uk">families.leicester.gov.uk</a></li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Bookstart)

**Table 17: How members of the public responded to the book start proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident	4	17		8	4	3	36 (20%)	41%  182 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	11	53		61	4	4	133 (73%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant		3		1			4 (2%)	
a young person aged 19 or under		1		3			4 (2%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)		2					2 (1%)	
Other		2					2 (1%)	
Not selected				1			1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	15 (8%)	78 (43%)	0 (0%)	74 (41%)	8 (4%)	7 (4%)	182 (100%)	

**Table 18: How stakeholders responded to the book start proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	9	47	1	20	2	3	82 (73%)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>79%</b> <b>113 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.</b></p>
A referral agency / organisation	1	2		2			5 (4%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		2					2 (2%)	
A service provider / partner organisation		7		2		1	10 (9%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	1	4		3	1		9 (8%)	
Other		1			1		2 (2%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>11 (10%)</b>	<b>66 (58%)</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>	<b>27 (24%)</b>	<b>4 (4%)</b>	<b>4 (4%)</b>	<b>113 (100%)</b>	

**Table 19: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Bookstart)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Service user benefits: e.g. supports parents and children's development, route into other services	53	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 34 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 2 could not be implemented because they would not be cost effective; and (31) are already a feature of the proposed service offer. One service suggestion is recommended for consideration.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>e1) Opportunities will be explored with interested parties who have similar objectives for the delivery of childhood services to take on ownership of the buildings we will no longer deliver services from. This will be part of a separate programme of work alongside the service completing their transition. In addition, we will negotiate opportunities where possible to deliver services from those buildings and continue to seek to deliver services from other community venues that are accessible e.g.) libraries</p> <p>e2) Discussions took place with the affected service area to understand more about the benefits of this service, the impact of proposed reductions and discuss alternative proposals. This resulted in an alternative proposal which been accepted for recommendation as outlined below.</p> <p><b>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</b></p> <p>The council will no longer fund this service.</p> <p>However in the event that early help funding ceases, the affected service explored alternatives and secured funding from the Schools Forum via the Dedicated Schools Grant (Early Years Block) until April 2018, therefore there will be no change to this service delivery.</p> <p>The Bookstart service will continue to work closely with and operate from the Children, Young People and Family Centres. In addition both services will work together to develop a stronger evidence base to demonstrate impact and secure longer term funding for this and other early years initiatives.</p>
	Supportive of the proposal: e.g. other options are available to support reading.	27	
	Not supportive of the proposal: e.g. statements such as 'its dangerous get rid of the service', 'a step backwards'.	44	
	Comments about the consultation: e.g. more information required about the proposal.	7	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service users: e.g. children, parents, vulnerable families, carers, children with additional needs/disabilities, low income families, working parents, English as an additional language.	122	
	Impact on partners: e.g. not enough space for co-location, nursery provision may close or struggle to relocate, other services may see an increase in demand for their services.	4	
	Impact on access to the service : e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	8	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Impact on reading and school readiness.	25	
	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. service needs to be available in local areas, look at meeting this need differently, keep for first time parents.	34	
Questions	Various questions	10	

## 8. Question 6 – Children Centre Teachers

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children centre teachers provide support to children and parents through one to one and groupwork sessions. They also provide direct teaching and learning support to pre-schools and influence the delivery of stay and play sessions.</li> <li>• Some of this work is in the family's home and is intended to raise awareness of child development (children learn from their parent(s) at this early age).</li> <li>• Children centre teachers also complete personal education plans for all Looked After Children aged under 3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The government is planning to change the way this service is funded and this may affect it in the future.</li> <li>• This service is currently funded until March 2017.</li> <li>• Family support will still be available from existing childhood services.</li> </ul>

**Respondents were only asked if they wanted to make any comments about this proposal and the responses they provided are detailed in the following table.**

**Table 20: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Children Centre Teachers)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of retaining the service: e.g. valuable in supporting families	75	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 32 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: (31) are already a feature of the proposed service offer. One service suggestion concerning a focus on summer born children is recommended for consideration.
	Not supportive of retaining the service: e.g. Should be provided by other services	8	
	Comments about the value of the team's skills and strengths	10	
	Service user benefits: e.g. supports parents and children's development, route into other services	11	
	Comments about the consultation: e.g. more information required about the proposal.	8	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service users: e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families, safeguarding, prevention.	47	<b>Comments on service suggestions</b> 1) This service area already has a dedicated role to work with external early years settings which has been identified as requiring support to improve practice.
	Impact on partners: e.g. PVI settings and foster carers.	3	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. move the service into schools or nurseries, work can be done by other staff members	32	<b>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</b> 1) Funding has been secured from the Schools Forum via the Dedicated Schools Grant (Early Years Block) until April 2018. The work of this service area will be aligned to the new early help service offer and will have a concentrated focus on developing a stronger evidence base to demonstrate impact so as to secure longer term funding. The service will also include a focus on summer born children to improve school readiness. If funding is not secured post April 18, this service will cease.
Questions	Various questions	16	

## 9. Question 7 – Cluster Advice Points

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is currently one advice point in each of the six clusters across the city, providing advice, short term support and signposting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is to create one central advice point across the city.</li> <li>This would mean that there would be one number to telephone for advice, guidance and requesting support. However, advice, short term support and signposting to other services will still be available in any one of the remaining 12 centres.</li> <li>Face to face support would continue to be provided in the cluster area where you live.</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Cluster advice points)

**Table 21: How members of the public responded to the cluster advice points proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident	4	7	4	9	4	2	30 (17%)	<b>86%</b> <b>180 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.</b>
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	26	24	8	55	2	4	137 (76%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant	1			3			4 (2%)	
a young person aged 19 or under		1		3	1		5 (3%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)				1			1 (1%)	
Other		2					2 (1%)	
Not selected				1			1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>31 (17%)</b>	<b>34 (19%)</b>	<b>12 (7%)</b>	<b>72 (40%)</b>	<b>25 (14%)</b>	<b>6 (3%)</b>	<b>180 (100%)</b>	

**Table 22: How stakeholders responded to cluster advice points proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	8	45	11	13	10	2	89 (74%)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>85%</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>121 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.</b></p>
A referral agency / organisation		2		3			5 (4%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre				1			1 (1%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		2					2 (2%)	
A service provider / partner organisation		5	1	3		1	10 (8%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre	1	1					2 (2%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	3	3		2			8 (7%)	
Other	1	1			1		3 (2%)	
Not selected	1						1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>14 (12%)</b>	<b>59 (49%)</b>	<b>12 (10%)</b>	<b>22 (18%)</b>	<b>11 (9%)</b>	<b>3 (2%)</b>	<b>121 (100%)</b>	



**Table 23: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Cluster advice points)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. Dedicated central line will be helpful and free up staff time.	70	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 25 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 23 are already a feature of the proposed service offer. One service suggestion concerning the promotion of the advice point and provision of local knowledge is recommended for consideration.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) Consideration was given to having an answer machine service for out of hours, however this would increase the workload to work through any calls that are logged. Therefore, the Advice Point will be open each weekday and during working hours. If there are any concerns about a child, callers can still access the Duty and Advice service which is 24 hours, 7 days per week.</p> <p>2) ) Changes to staff working arrangements will be considered as part of the separate organisational staff review.</p> <p>3) Using the councils principles for Channel Shift, there will be a greater emphasis on providing a range of information using a range of formats, which are accessible to all. Anyone who is multi lingual and accessing the Advice Point will be supported through the council's Language Line service if required.</p> <p><b><u>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</u></b></p>
	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. Face to face is better than a telephone service.	18	
	<b>Service information:</b> e.g. phone lines can be a poor service, prefer face to face contact	19	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on access to the service :</b> e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access; vulnerable service users may find it difficult to access the service by phone	20	
	<b>Impact on staff:</b> e.g. staff may not have sufficient knowledge of the	21	
	<b>Impact on service provision:</b> e.g. impact on service quality and relationships with families	47	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. sufficient staff, knowledgeable staff, automated out of hours service, opening times responsive to needs, good publicity concerning service offer and opening times, provide advice for multiple languages, provide low level advice in each centre too.	25	
Questions	Various questions	21	

## 10. Question 8 – Domestic violence groups and crèche

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group support for families experiencing domestic violence, including crèche facilities whilst the group meets.</li> <li>One group is available each week in each cluster area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change to this service</li> </ul>

**Respondents were only asked if they wanted to make any comments about this proposal and the responses they provided are detailed in the following table.**

**Table 24: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Domestic violence groups and crèche)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of the proposal: e.g. DV support needed, essential service.	76	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 14 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 14 are already a feature of the proposed service offer.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) Service suggestions will be forwarded to the commissioner of Domestic Violence services for information and consideration. Work has already commenced to strengthen partnership links with services to reduce duplication and improve practice.</p> <p>2) Co-delivery with partners will be strengthened to ensure a consistent offer across the city.</p> <p>3) The commitment to provide one DV programme per cluster at any one time remains. However, there will be circumstances where there will not be the need due to demand, this will be regularly assessed and influence future planning.</p> <p><b><u>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</u></b></p>
	Service information: e.g. DV rising therefore support is essential, services need to be kept local, concerned the service will be cut in the future.	12	
	Service user benefits: e.g. supports and protects children	9	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on access to the service : e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	3	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. support teenage victims, separate staff to deliver crèches, quality checks, better promotion, liaise with secondary schools, train all staff to run these courses.	10	
	Commission differently: e.g. community providers could deliver for less money, increase the range of venues where this is delivered.	4	
Questions	Various questions	4	

## 11. Question 9 – Early Years Learning

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Groups for parents and children. The key aims are to encourage learning through play, the development of speech and language skills (and learning and development in general) and to prepare children for school.</li> <li>Four sessions are currently available each week in each cluster area.</li> <li>(some people may know this service as PEEP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three sessions per week in each cluster area.</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Early Years Learning)

**Table 25: How members of the public responded to the early years learning proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident	3	9	1	12	4	1	30 (17%)	<b>39%</b> <b>173 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.</b>
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	16	37	2	57	13	6	131 (76%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant		2		2			4 (2%)	
a young person aged 19 or under		1		3			4 (2%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)		2					2 (1%)	
Other		1					1 (1%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	19 (11%)	53 (31%)	3 (2%)	74 (43%)	17 (10%)	7 (4%)	173 (100%)	

**Table 26: How stakeholders responded to the early years learning proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	14	36	7	13	6	4	80 (71%)	<p><b>78%</b></p> <p><b>112 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.</b></p>
A referral agency / organisation	1	1	1	2			5 (4%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		1		1			2 (2%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
A service provider / partner organisation	1	4	2	4			11 (10%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	2	2		1	2	1	8 (7%)	
Other		1					1 (1%)	
Not selected		1			1	1	3 (3%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>18 (16%)</b>	<b>48 (43%)</b>	<b>10 (9%)</b>	<b>21 (19%)</b>	<b>9 (8%)</b>	<b>6 (5%)</b>	<b>112 (100%)</b>	

**Table 27: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Early years, learning and development)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. happy that some sessions are proposed.	34	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 31 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 3 could not be implemented because they would not be cost effective; and 27 are already a feature of the proposed service offer. One service suggestion concerning the group work sessions is recommended for consideration.
	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. cutting down isn't the answer,	22	
	<b>Service user benefits:</b> e.g. service valued and frequently used, supports children, parents and families.	36	
	<b>Comments about the consultation:</b> e.g. more information required about the proposal.	6	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	70	<b>Comments on service suggestions</b> 1) There will continue to be a commitment to developing parent volunteers to support delivery. 2) Where possible, we will seek to deliver provision from alternative venues within local communities e.g.) libraries 3) Changes to staff working arrangements will be considered as part of the separate organisational staff review.
	<b>Impact on early intervention:</b> e.g. families will not receive support early enough, leading to an escalation of need before support is provided.	4	
	<b>Impact on service provision:</b> e.g. capacity, service may become over-subscribed.	17	
	<b>Impact on access to the service :</b> e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	10	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. reduce further, parent volunteers instead of reductions, assess effectiveness, open group with targeted element, work with the VCS to promote the service, deliver from multiple venues.	31	<b><u>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</u></b> 1. There will be at least 2 x targeted group work session/courses per cluster per week for children who meet our eligibility criteria. The 3rd weekly session per week will be flexible to respond to demand either as a universal stay and play or as a targeted group work session.
Questions	Various questions	14	

## 12. Question 10 – Family support service

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short and long-term support (one to one and group work) with any children, young people and families who require help to prevent any problems they have from getting worse and requiring more specialist intervention (for example,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Families / individuals will need to meet specific criteria to receive support under this service</li> </ul> <p>(see ‘targeted services’ section)</p>

### Consultation responses (Family support service)

**Table 28: How members of the public responded to the family support service proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident	3	8	1	11	7	2	32 (18%)	<b>40%</b> <b>178 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.</b>
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	1	27	1	62	26	8	134 (75%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant		1		3			4 (2%)	
a young person aged 19 or under				3		1	4 (2%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)					1		1 (1%)	
Other		2					2 (1%)	
Not selected				1			1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	13 (7%)	38 (21%)	2 (1%)	80 (45%)	34 (19%)	11 (6%)	178 (100%)	

**Table 29: How stakeholders responded to the family support service proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	7	53	5	8	8	6	87 (73%)	<p>83%</p> <p><b>119 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal</b></p>
A referral agency / organisation		3	1	1			5 (4%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		1		1			2 (2%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
A service provider / partner organisation		6		1	1	1	9 (8%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		2					2 (2%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	1	4	1	2	1		9 (8%)	
Other		2			1		3 (3%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>8 (7%)</b>	<b>73 (61%)</b>	<b>7 (6%)</b>	<b>13 (11%)</b>	<b>11 (9%)</b>	<b>7 (6%)</b>	<b>119 (100%)</b>	

**Table 30: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Family support service)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. agree with the change, not much of a change	34	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 16 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 1 could not be implemented because it would not be cost effective; 14 are already a feature of the proposed service offer; and 1 does not meet service user needs as identified through service data. One service suggestion is recommended for consideration, which concerns how to better manage service capacity to meet demand.
	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. should not change, how will families cope.	21	
	<b>Service information:</b> e.g. families should support themselves, not affective, targeted services can have a stigma attached to them, support should be available to all.	49	
	<b>Comments about the consultation:</b> e.g. more information required about the proposal.	3	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	55	<b>Comments on service suggestions</b> 1) The management structure will be reduced in line with the requirements to support frontline staff. 2) Consideration was given to having an answer machine service for out of hours, however this would increase the workload to work through any calls that are logged. Therefore, the Advice Point will be open each weekday and working hours. If there are any safeguarding concerns, callers can still access the Duty and Advice service which is 24 hours, 7 days per week. 3) Groupwork sessions will remain for 'targeted' families, however we will review this through our equality impact assessment and may amend service delivery to have mixed groups with non eligible families if required. 4) Staff will be provided with adequate training opportunities to fulfil their role 5) Using the councils principles for Channel Shift, there will be a greater emphasis on providing a range of information using a range of formats, which are accessible to all. 6) Changes to staff working arrangements will be considered as part of the separate organisational staff review. 7) A partnership allocations hub will be developed and facilitated by the council to strengthen multi agency working to provide support to families who require multi agency support and do not meet social care thresholds. This hub will have a flexible response for families within each agency's remit and will have a simplified process which includes reviewing current processes, eligibility criteria and paperwork. Scrutiny will be provided by the Children's Trust. 8) There will be one telephone number and one route to access social care and early help.
	<b>Impact on access to the service :</b> e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	7	
	<b>Impact on staff:</b> e.g. Job losses	4	
	<b>Impact on partners:</b> e.g. PVI settings and foster carers.	9	
	<b>Impact on early intervention:</b> e.g. families will not receive support early enough, leading to an escalation of need before support is provided.	42	
<b>Impact of cumulative cuts to the service.</b>	3		
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. more group work with mixed families, work with partners re new service, effective screening and signposting, make savings from management not frontline, provide brief interventions.	15	<b><u>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</u></b>
	<b>Funding options:</b> e.g. increase council tax		
Questions	Various questions	13	



## 13. Question 11 – Family Support - schools

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short and long-term support (one to one and group work) with any children, young people and families who require help to prevent any problems they have from getting worse and requiring more specialist intervention (for example, social care).</li> </ul> <p>(this is the same service as outlined in section 10 but purchased by schools to work directly with their students and families).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council proposes to continue this service with schools that choose to purchase this service.</li> </ul>

**Respondents were only asked if they wanted to make any comments about this proposal and the responses they provided are detailed in the following table.**

**Table 31: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Family support service - traded with schools)	Numbers of statements	
<b>Comments about the service, proposals and consultation</b>	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. should be offered in all schools.	51	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 14 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 11 are already a feature of the proposed service offer; and 2 cannot be implemented by the early help service and will be forwarded to the appropriate service for their attention. One service suggestion concerning the provision of a city wide team is recommended for consideration.
	<b>Service information:</b> e.g. well placed in schools, well placed in early help.	7	
	<b>Service user benefits:</b> e.g. supports disabled children in schools.	1	
<b>Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)</b>	<b>Impact on service provision:</b> e.g. requirement to pay for the service could lead to service fragmentation; not all schools can afford to pay for hi, schools could provide it more cheaply.	16	<b>Comments on service suggestions</b> 1) Opportunities are being explored to develop a supervision and support package for schools where they have their own staff delivering family support services but do not purchase. 2) There is already a costed model in place. 3) If traded services are no longer required, this area of work will need to be reviewed.
	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	8	
<b>Suggestions concerning the service and proposal</b>	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. manage service city wide not by cluster	12	<b>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</b> 1) A citywide team will be developed so that it can provide a consistent offer to schools across the city, respond to demand without balancing the needs of the cluster delivery and with overarching management oversight. If there is capacity due to schools not purchasing the service, support will be provided to families from cluster areas. 2) Schools purchasing traded Family Support services will not be restricted by the council's eligibility criteria as it will be for all students they identify to receive this service.
	<b>Commission differently:</b> e.g. join up funding streams for the service and save time and money.	2	
<b>Questions</b>	Various questions	11	

## 14. Question 12 – Healthy Child Programme

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health visiting service for all children aged 0-5, and parenting support for first time mothers under the age of 20.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to these services will not be affected as a result of the proposed changes to the location and number of children centres (see section 2 - Buildings).</li> </ul>

**Respondents were only asked if they wanted to make any comments about this proposal and the responses they provided are detailed in the following table.**

**Table 32: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Healthy child programme)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Supportive of the proposal</b>	31	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 6 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 6 cannot be implemented by the early help service and will be forwarded to the appropriate service provider for their attention.
	<b>Service user benefits:</b> e.g. supports parents and children's development, route into other services	24	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Service information:</b> e.g. there is some service duplication between the HCP and EH.	1	
	<b>Impact on access to the service :</b> e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	17	
	<b>Impact on staff:</b> e.g. space to work in the children centres	7	
	<b>Impact on service provision:</b> e.g. impact on partnership work.	1	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Impact on partners:</b> e.g. requirement to pay accommodations costs.	2	<b>5 Comments on service suggestions</b> 1)The Healthy Child Programme (HCP - Health Visiting and School Nursing) is a universal service. 2) Discussions will take place with the HCP provider to assess requirements for the location of staff across the 12 centres. Delivery space within the proposed remaining 12 centres will be protected.
	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	5	
Questions	Various questions	2	<b>No change to the initial proposal recommended.</b>

## 15. Question 13 – Home Learning

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short-term support for a maximum of 12 weeks, delivered in the home by dedicated child learning staff who help some parents support their children’s learning, establish routines and manage behavior.</li> <li>Six families are supported at any one time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current service will end although Public Health’s Healthy Child Programme (HCP) will continue to provide home learning services, offering appropriate support for families in need.</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Home Learning)

**Table 33: How members of the public responded to the home learning proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident	1	3	1	15	5	4	29 (18%)	<b>37%</b> 163 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	12	11	2	68	21	5	119 (73%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant				4			4 (2%)	
a young person aged 19 or under				3	1	1	5 (3%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)					1		1 (1%)	
Other		2				1	3 (2%)	
Not selected				1		1	2 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>13 (8%)</b>	<b>17 (10%)</b>	<b>3 (2%)</b>	<b>91 (55%)</b>	<b>28 (17%)</b>	<b>12 (7%)</b>	<b>163 (100%)</b>	

**Table 34: How stakeholders responded to the home learning proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	18	38	2	12	9	2	81 (74%)	76%  109 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.
A referral agency / organisation	2	1		2			5 (5%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	1						1 (1%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
A service provider / partner organisation	1	2		2	1	2	8 (7%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre	1						1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	3	1		3	1		8 (7%)	
Other		2			1		3 (3%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>26 (24%)</b>	<b>46 (42%)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>19 (17%)</b>	<b>12 (11%)</b>	<b>4 (4%)</b>	<b>109 (100%)</b>	

**Table 35: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Home learning service)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
<b>Comments about the service, proposals and consultation</b>	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. there is currently overlap in service provision.	19	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 29 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 9 could not be implemented because they would not be cost effective; 2 would not be viable/practicable to implement; 19 are already a feature of the proposed service offer.
	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. Should not end, how will families cope.	22	
	<b>Service information:</b> e.g. not used to full capacity,	2	
	<b>Service user benefits:</b> e.g. benefits children and parents, vulnerable families, early intervention/prevention.	26	
<b>Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)</b>	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	28	<b>Comments on service suggestions</b> 1) Mapping work was undertaken with commissioners of the HCP which identified that both the council and Leicestershire Partnership Trust were delivering similar services for families with young children within the home environment. This led to an opportunity to review both services, reduce duplication and develop a clearer pathway for families with young children to access services within the home, on a one to one basis and within group work sessions in the community. The HCP has a mandatory requirement to provide 4 levels of service for all children aged under 5, which covers the same type of services currently delivered by council early years' staff. 2) There has been feedback concerning the quality of provision, which will be fed back to the provider of HCP services. 2) Using the council's principles for Channel Shift, there will be a greater emphasis on providing a range of information including signposting to other services using a range of formats which are accessible to all. 3) There will continue to be training opportunities for staff from different agencies to train together to improve understanding and practice. 4) We will be exploring widening the remit of our current early years to undertake whole family work where there are children under the age of 8. 5) Changes to staff working arrangements will be considered as part of the separate organisational staff review.  <b>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</b>
	<b>Impact on staff:</b> e.g. space to work in the children centres	11	
	<b>Impact on access to the service :</b> e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	9	
<b>Suggestions concerning the service and proposal</b>	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. should be integral to all early help services.	29	
<b>Questions</b>	Various questions	22	

## Question 15 – Parenting groups/crèche

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group courses for parents that are linked to public health issues and service user demand (for example, positive parenting, stop smoking, health and safety, etc).</li> <li>Two sessions are currently available each week in each cluster area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One session available each week in each cluster area</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Parenting groups/crèche)

**Table 36: How members of the public responded to the parenting groups/ crèche proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident	1	9	1	16	4	1	32 (20%)	<b>36%</b> <b>157 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.</b>
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	10	16		63	20	5	114 (73%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant				4			4 (3%)	
a young person aged 19 or under				3	1	1	5 (3%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)	1						1 (1%)	
Other		1					1 (1%)	
Not selected							0	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>12 (8%)</b>	<b>26 (17%)</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>	<b>86 (55%)</b>	<b>25 (16%)</b>	<b>7 (4%)</b>	<b>157 (100%)</b>	

**Table 37: How stakeholders responded to the parenting groups/ crèche proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	21	29	2	17	11	1	81 (%)	77% 110 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.
A referral agency / organisation	2	2		1			5 (%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre				1			1 (%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (%)	
A service provider / partner organisation	1	3		1	1	2	8 (%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1				1	2 (%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	4	1	1	1		1	8 (%)	
Other		1			1	1	3 (%)	
Not selected	1						1 (%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>29 (26%)</b>	<b>38 (35%)</b>	<b>3 (3%)</b>	<b>21 (19%)</b>	<b>13 (12%)</b>	<b>6 (5%)</b>	<b>110 (100%)</b>	



**Table 38: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Parenting groups and crèche)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. reductions minimal, glad the service is continuing.	26	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 12 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 11 are already a feature of the proposed service offer; and 1 do not meet service user needs as identified through service data.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) We will continue to support parent volunteers so they can support service delivery.</p> <p>2) We will review the nature of our services and develop a consistent range of evidence based programmes which will respond to demand and need.</p> <p>3) Only families who are meet our criteria for eligibility will be able to access targeted parenting groups, however the eligibility criteria will be reviewed annually to reflect changing demographics and need.</p> <p>4) We will seek to maximise opportunities to co-deliver with partners.</p> <p><b>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</b></p>
	<b>Service user benefits:</b> e.g. popular service, preventative service.	14	
	<b>Service information:</b>	4	
	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. Don't reduce the service	13	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	16	
	<b>Impact on the local community:</b> e.g. local businesses near to centres proposed for disposal/alternative uses	5	
	<b>Impact on access to the service :</b> e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	20	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. target service, peer mentoring, prioritise sessions not delivered elsewhere, joint work with HCP	12	
Questions	Various questions	7	

## 16. Question 15 – Parenting programmes

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Courses focusing on parenting techniques for families with teenagers.</li> <li>Up to nine courses across the city each year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> <li>Parenting programmes will continue to be commissioned from a non-council provider.</li> </ul>

**Respondents were only asked if they wanted to make any comments about this proposal and the responses they provided are detailed in the following table.**

**Table 39: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Parenting programmes)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of the proposal: e.g. benefits service users	40	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 12 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 2 could not be implemented because they would not be cost effective; 1 would not be viable/practicable to implement; 6 are already a feature of the proposed service offer; and 2 do not meet service user needs as identified through service data. One service suggestion, concerning the focus of the parenting groups, is recommended for consideration.
	Service user benefits: e.g. benefits children and parents, vulnerable families, early intervention/prevention.	23	
	Service information: e.g. parents unlikely to attend if they have to pay.	6	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service users: e.g. vulnerable families	1	<b>Comments on service suggestions</b> 1) We will continue to develop opportunities for staff to be trained to co-deliver provision with external agencies. 2) It is not cost effective to bring the service in house at this stage as it meets a specific need which cannot be met within a reduced staffing structure. 3) There will be no charge for parents to access this provision as it may disadvantage low income families.
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. training, robust contracts with service providers, joint working	6	
	Commission differently: e.g. council should deliver.	6	
Questions	Various questions	17	<b><u>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</u></b> This service will continue to be commissioned from a non-council provider, but the nature of the provision will be in response to demand and need.

## 17. Question 16 – School holiday events

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an annual programme of activities and campaigns run by the clusters (National Play Day, Book Reading Week, etc).</li> <li>Each cluster also puts on two events for children aged 0-8 each week.</li> <li>These events include outdoor activities, breakfast clubs, 'get up and go' physical activity and work with the National Citizen Service for young people in years 10 and 11.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be no change to the annual programme of activities and campaigns.</li> <li>Each cluster will only put on one event for children aged 0-8 each week during school holidays.</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (School holiday events)

**Table 40: How members of the public responded to the school holiday events proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident		1	2	15	4	2	33 (21%)	<b>36%</b> 160 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	9	3	3	49	14	5	110 (69%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant	2					1	3 (2%)	
a young person aged 19 or under				3	1	6	10 (6%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)			1				1 (1%)	
Other		1				1	2 (1%)	
Not selected				1			1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>11 (7%)</b>	<b>41 (26%)</b>	<b>6 (4%)</b>	<b>68 (43%)</b>	<b>19 (12%)</b>	<b>15 (9%)</b>	<b>160 (100%)</b>	

**Table 41: How stakeholders responded to the school holiday events proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	17	35	4	16	6	4	82 (74%)	78% 111 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.
A referral agency / organisation	2	2		1			5 (5%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
A service provider / partner organisation	1	4		1	1	2	9 (8%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	2	3	2	1		1	9 (8%)	
Other		1			1		2 (2%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>22 (20%)</b>	<b>49 (44%)</b>	<b>6 (5%)</b>	<b>19 (17%)</b>	<b>8 (7%)</b>	<b>7 (6%)</b>	<b>111 (100%)</b>	

**Table 42: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (School holiday events)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of the proposal: i.e. no change	31	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 42 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 4 could not be implemented because they would not be cost affective; 1 would not be viable/practicable to implement; 37 are already a feature of the proposed service offer.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) We will ensure that the type of provision is spread across all ages with specific activities for younger and older children/young people.</p> <p>2) Initiatives such as Breakfast Clubs, community events etc. will continue where there is capacity from joint working and responding to demand.</p> <p>3) We will continue to support parent volunteers to co-deliver services.</p>
	Not supportive of the proposal: e.g. should not change	6	
	Service information: e.g. valuable service, low cost	36	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on the local community: e.g. anti social behaviour	10	
	Impact on service users: e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	66	
	Impact on access to the service : e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service.	10	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Funding options: e.g. more savings could be made, service should be increased	17	
	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. increase age range accessing service, more activities not less, co-delivery with parents	23	
	Commission differently: e.g. let the adventure playgrounds/other non-council providers deliver events.	2	
Questions	Various questions	19	<p><b>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</b></p> <p>1) School holiday activities will be for children aged 0 - 12 year olds instead of 0 - 8 year olds.</p>

## 18. Question 17 – Stay and Play

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stay and Play sessions are available in children’s centres to encourage child development, learning, child/parent interaction, bonding and readiness for school.</li> <li>Apart from certain antenatal and baby sessions, these services are available to all families with children aged 0-4 (up to age eight during school holidays).</li> <li>Five sessions are available in most cluster areas each week.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two Stay and Play sessions in each cluster area each week.</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Stay and Play)

**Table 43: How members of the public responded to the stay and play proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident		2	2	11	1	2	36 (20%)	<b>41%</b> <b>180 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.</b>
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	2	84	1	32	8	4	131 (73%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant		4					4 (2%)	
a young person aged 19 or under		1		3	1	1	6 (3%)	
An individual who hires space in a children’s centre (public)		1					1 (1%)	
Other		1					1 (1%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	2 (1%)	112 (62%)	3 (2%)	46 (26%)	10 (6%)	7(4%)	180 (100%)	

**Table 44: How stakeholders responded to the stay and play proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	9	56	2	7	6	4	84 (72%)	82% 117 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal
A referral agency / organisation	1	3		1			5 (4%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		2					2 (2%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
A service provider / partner organisation		7		1	1	2	11 (9%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	2	3	3		1		9 (8%)	
Other		1			1	1	3 (3%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 (10%)</b>	<b>75 (64%)</b>	<b>5 (4%)</b>	<b>9 (8%)</b>	<b>9 (8%)</b>	<b>7 (6%)</b>	<b>117 (100%)</b>	

**Table 45: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Stay and play)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of the proposal: i.e. service under-used.	5	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 25 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 7 could not be implemented because they would not be cost affective; 1 would not be viable/practicable to implement; 15 are already a feature of the proposed service offer. Two service suggestions, one concerning the number of stay and plays and the other concerning co-working with the HCP, are recommended for consideration.
	Not supportive of the proposal: e.g. should not change, how will families cope.	46	
	Service user benefits: e.g. popular service, preventative service, benefits children's development.	130	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service users: e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	148	<b>Comments on service suggestions</b> 1) We will continue to support volunteers to co-deliver services. 2) Using the council's principles for Channel Shift, there will be a greater emphasis on providing a range of information including signposting to other services using a range of formats which are accessible to all. 3) We did consider retaining 5 weekly sessions per cluster and shortening the length but this was not practical due to the same amount of pre time required to set up/close up. The delivery time ranges from 1.5 - 2hrs therefore reducing this would have an impact on how effective it can be for children and families. 4) Terminology will be reviewed to reflect the nature and benefits of this provision. 5) We will not charge service users to access stay and play as the administration costs required would not be cost effective and would disadvantage low income families.
	Impact on staff: e.g. job losses		
	Impact on service provision: e.g. capacity, service may become over-subscribed.	30	
	Impact on access to the service : e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	25	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. charge a fee, alternative mix of stay and play/PEEP sessions, volunteers/peer mentoring.	21	<b>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</b> 1. There will be at least 2 universal stay and play sessions per cluster per week. There will be the option to deliver a 3rd session per week to respond flexibly to demand, either as a universal stay and play or as a targeted group work session. 2. In addition the Healthy Child Programme will co deliver stay and play provision alongside council staff to support children and parents with access to early years health information and support. 3. Children Centre Teachers will also lead the teaching and learning as part of the planning process.
	Commission differently: e.g. schools and parents could deliver this service	4	
Questions	Various questions	9	



## 19. Question 18 – Targeted Services

### Proposal

#### Proposal

We will continue to offer services such as stay and play and antenatal courses to all. However, financial pressures may result in us having to restrict other early help services to children, young people and families who do not meet any of the following criteria:

- Children and young people not attending school
- Families involved in offending behaviour
- Families with health concerns
- Children with an older sibling who is not achieving certain educational goals
- Children who are eligible for two year funded early education entitlement (FEEE) but do not access it
- Children known to children’s social care or family support services
- Children with a special educational need or disability
- Children who live in the top 5% most deprived areas of the city
- Children who are entitled to free school meals
- Lone parents / teen parents / parents with disability
- Low income / unemployed
- Homeless or at risk of being homeless
- Children at risk of or involved in incidents of domestic violence

**Respondents were only asked if they wanted to make any comments about this proposal and the responses they provided are detailed in the following table.**

**Table 46: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Targeted services)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> i.e. support the change	23	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 15 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 3 could not be implemented because they would not be cost affective; 4 would not be viable/practicable to implement; 8 are already a feature of the proposed service offer.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) The eligibility criteria will be reviewed annually to take into consideration changing needs and responses to demand e.g.) summer born children, families affected by substance misuse.</p> <p>2) Careful consideration will be given to how we promote the criteria so that people are aware of who can access targeted services.</p> <p>3) Using the councils principles for Channel Shift, there will be a greater emphasis on providing a range of information using a range of formats which are accessible to all.</p> <p><b>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</b></p>
	<b>Comments about staff providing an excellent service</b>	3	
	<b>Service information:</b> e.g. targeted families do not always access service, some parents unaware of the service, prevention/early intervention important.	59	
	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. Don't implement the proposal	13	
	<b>Comments about the consultation:</b> e.g. more information required about the proposal.	1	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on early intervention:</b> e.g. families will not receive support early enough, leading to an escalation of need before support is provided.	8	
	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	49	
	<b>Impact on staff:</b> e.g. job losses	1	
	<b>Impact on the local community:</b> e.g. anti social behaviour	3	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Impact on partners:</b> e.g. increased referrals to children's social care.	5	
	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. maintain early intervention/prevention, add more groups to the priority list, mixed groups needed to support role modelling.	15	
Questions	Various questions	20	

## 20. Question 19 – Toy and book library

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is currently a toy and book library in each of the 23 children's centres, enabling parents to hire toys and books for free.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current stock of books and toys would be redistributed to the remaining 12 children's centres across the city, providing a wider choice of items in each of these centres.</li> <li>The service will remain free of charge for families.</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Toy and book library)

**Table 47: How members of the public responded to the toy and book library proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident	3	11		13	1	1	29 (18%)	36% 159 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	14	31	4	51	12	6	118 (74%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant	1			3			4 (3%)	
a young person aged 19 or under				3	1	1	5 (3%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)	1						1 (1%)	
Other		1					1 (1%)	
Not selected				1			1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	19 (12%)	43 (27%)	4 (3%)	71 (45%)	14 (9%)	8 (5%)	159 (100%)	

**Table 48: How stakeholders responded to the toy and book library proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	19	28	7	14	7	5	80 (74%)	<p>76%</p> <p>108 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.</p>
A referral agency / organisation	2	2		1			5 (5%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
A service provider / partner organisation		3	1	3	1	1	9 (8%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	4	2	1		1		8 (7%)	
Other		1			1		2 (2%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>25 (23%)</b>	<b>40 (37%)</b>	<b>9 (8%)</b>	<b>18 (17%)</b>	<b>10 (9%)</b>	<b>6 (6%)</b>	<b>108 (100%)</b>	

**Table 49: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Toy and book library)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> i.e. support the change	41	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 14 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 3 could not be implemented because they would not be cost affective; and 11 are already a feature of the proposed service offer.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) Changes to staff working arrangements will be considered as part of the separate organisational staff review.</p> <p>2) Work has already commenced to strengthen partnership links with library services to reduce duplication and improve practice.</p> <p>3) Of the 441 respondents asked about how they travel to the children centres, 30% solely walk. There will be 2 centres open per cluster with a focus for provision to be delivered from venues within the local community where the children centres are no longer operating. Mapping work was undertaken to inform the proposals for which centres were the most utilised. Reviewing updated data, this has not changed.</p> <p>4) We will continue to support volunteers to support service delivery.</p> <p>5) We will review the current arrangements for this service with regards to length of time resources are borrowed. We will not incur a charge as the administration costs required would not be cost effective and this may disadvantage low income families.</p> <p><b>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</b></p>
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Service user benefits:</b> e.g. benefits children and parents, vulnerable families, early intervention/prevention.	15	
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. Don't implement the proposal	9	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	13	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on access to the service :</b> e.g. service users may struggle to travel to the 12 children centres proposed to remain open, services may become over subscribed; children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	50	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. organise books better, involve libraries and the community sector,	14	
Questions	Various questions	12	

## 21. Question 20 – Volunteering, employment, education and training

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volunteering, employment, education and training, advice and support, with at least one activity per week in each cluster area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One activity per month in each cluster area.</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Volunteering)

**Table 50: How members of the public responded to volunteering proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident		6	1	14	3	2	26 (17%)	<b>34%</b> <b>152 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.</b>
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	14	18		61	21	1	115 (76%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant				4			4 (3%)	
a young person aged 19 or under		1		3	1		5 (3%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)	1						1 (1%)	
Other		1					1 (1%)	
Not selected								
<b>Total</b>	15 (10%)	26 (17%)	1 (1%)	82 (54%)	25 (16%)	3 (2%)	152 (100%)	

**Table 51: How stakeholders responded to the volunteering proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	21	29	2	14	11	2	79 (76%)	<p>73%</p> <p><b>104 of the</b> of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal</p>
A referral agency / organisation	2	1		2			5 (5%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre				1			1 (1%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre				1			1 (1%)	
A service provider / partner organisation		3		2	1		6 (6%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre						1	1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	1	2		1	3		7 (7%)	
Other		1			1	1	3 (3%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>24 (23%)</b>	<b>37 (36%)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>21 (20%)</b>	<b>16 (15%)</b>	<b>4 (4%)</b>	<b>104 (100%)</b>	

**Table 52: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Volunteering, employment, education and training)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> i.e. supports the change	16	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 22 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 8 could not be implemented because they would not be cost affective; 13 are already a feature of the proposed service offer; and 1 do not meet service user needs as identified through service data.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) The council is working in partnership with Voluntary Action Leicestershire to host seconded roles from VAL within early help that will have a key focus in supporting adults back into employment and training.</p> <p><b>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</b></p> <p>1. The level of resource is proposed to be reduced as supporting children and families to be involved in decision making and shaping of services is embedded within everyday practice. However, there will continue to be a dedicated role for community development, volunteering and consultation.</p> <p>2. Options are being explored to review the participation roles within different children’s services, developing one citywide participation team. If viable, this will reduce duplication, provide consistency and develop a stronger infrastructure for participation and engagement work. If this option is not viable, the participation role will continue within this service area.</p> <p>2. Changes to staff working arrangements will be considered as part of the separate organisational staff review.</p>
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Service user benefits:</b> e.g. provides work experience and supports employment.	5	
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. Don’t implement the proposal	40	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	19	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on access to the service :</b> e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service; reduced service may impact on access.	8	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on staff:</b> e.g. pressure on volunteers	3	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. streamline the service, consistency across clusters, more activities per month.	22	
Questions	Various questions	13	



## 22. Question 21 – Weekly parent engagement

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultations, community projects and parent engagement meetings for parents wishing to work with services to influence decision-making and service delivery.</li> <li>• Activities take place on a weekly basis in each cluster.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One parent engagement activity every two weeks in each cluster area.</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Weekly parent engagement)

**Table 53: How members of the public responded to weekly parent engagement proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident	2	5	1	14	3		25 (17%)	<b>33%</b> <b>145 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.</b>
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	17	11	1	59	19	3	110 (76%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant	1			3			4 (3%)	
a young person aged 19 or under				3	1		4 (3%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)				1			1 (1%)	
Other		1					1 (1%)	
Not selected								
<b>Total</b>	20 (14%)	17 (12%)	2 (1%)	80 (55%)	23 (16%)	3 (2%)	145 (100%)	

**Table 54: How stakeholders responded to the weekly parent engagement proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	26	22	3	18	8	1	78 (76%)	71% 102 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.
A referral agency / organisation	2			2			4 (4%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre				1			1 (1%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre				1			1 (1%)	
A service provider / partner organisation		2		4	1		7 (7%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre	1						1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	3			1	3		7 (7%)	
Other		1			1		2 (2%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>32 (31%)</b>	<b>26 (25%)</b>	<b>3 (3%)</b>	<b>27 (26%)</b>	<b>13 (13%)</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>	<b>102 (100%)</b>	

**Table 55: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Weekly parent engagement)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of the proposal: i.e. supports the change	24	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 8 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 1 could not be implemented because they would not be cost effective; and 7 are already a feature of the proposed service offer.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) Using the councils principles for Channel Shift, there will be a greater emphasis on providing a range of information including signposting to other services using a range of formats which are accessible to all.</p> <p>2) The service will seek to connect existing local volunteers who are unable to travel to other centres with other organisations in the local area.</p> <p><b>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</b></p> <p>1. Participation of children and parents in decision making will continue as part of everyday practice rather than prescribed as weekly through the various mechanisms used by staff to influence service improvement.</p> <p>2. The service will be flexible and create opportunities for families to engage in decision making and shaping of services outside of traditional working times e.g.) weekends.</p>
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Not supportive of the proposal: e.g. Don't implement the proposal	8	
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Service information: e.g. parents unlikely to attend if they have to pay.	5	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service users: e.g. impact on participation opportunities.	10	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. work more closely with partners, parent representative, options for working parents, run every 2 weeks.	8	
Questions	Various questions	12	

## 23. Question 22 – Welfare rights

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The welfare rights service provides advice and guidance on a range of issues that include debt management, benefits and financial support.</li> <li>A free weekly welfare rights advice service is currently available in each cluster.</li> <li>Options include drop-in sessions and face to face appointments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council-run welfare rights service in children's centres will end on 31 March 2017.</li> <li>Information will be available on the online Family Information Directory <a href="http://families.leicester.gov.uk">families.leicester.gov.uk</a></li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Welfare rights)

**Table 56: How members of the public responded to the welfare rights proposal (online and paper booklet)**

Respondent type (public) online	I have no opinion	It will affect me/us in a negative way	It will affect me/us in a positive way	It won't affect me / us	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online/paper booklet)
a Leicester resident	2	15	5	14	4	4	44 (18%)	<b>56%</b> <b>249 of the 441 members of the public taking part in the consultation online and through the paper booklet responded to this proposal.</b>
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19	11	94	5	59	17	5	191 (77%)	
a parent or carer of a child / young person aged 0-19 & pregnant		1		3	1	1	6 (2%)	
a young person aged 19 or under				3	1	1	5 (2%)	
An individual who hires space in a children's centre (public)				1			1 (0.5%)	
Other		2					2 (1%)	
Not selected								
<b>Total</b>	13 (5%)	112 (45%)	10 (4%)	80 (32%)	23 (9%)	11 (4%)	249 (100%)	

**Table 57: How stakeholders responded to the welfare rights proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	15	48	2	5	9	6	85 (73%)	81% 116 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.
A referral agency / organisation	1	3		1			5 (4%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		2					2 (2%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
A service provider / partner organisation	1	5		2	1	1	10 (9%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre		5		2	1		8 (7%)	
Other		2			1		3 (3%)	
Not selected		1					1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>17 (15%)</b>	<b>68 (59%)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>10 (9%)</b>	<b>12 (10%)</b>	<b>7 (6%)</b>	<b>116 (100%)</b>	

**Table 58: Consultation feedback – themes and key message**

Themes	Key messages (Welfare rights)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Service user benefits: e.g. popular and frequently used, families whose first language is not English	21	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.                      b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.                      c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.                      d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.                      e) Of the 71 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 50 could not be implemented because they would not be cost affective; 19 are already a feature of the proposed service offer; and 1 do not meet service user needs as identified through service data. One service suggestion, concerning funding and delivery arrangements, is recommended for consideration.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) A meeting took place with the affected service area to understand more about the benefits of this service, the impact of proposed reductions and discuss alternative proposals. This resulted in an alternative proposal which been accepted for recommendation as outlined below.                      2) A range of information was presented from the Welfare Rights service affected which evidenced that the service was delivering from 11 centres, responding to demand but that a significant percentage of those accessing appointments were adults with no children in the household.</p> <p><b>A Change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</b></p> <p>1) An alternative proposal has been submitted by the affected service to reduce the annual funding by 40%. This would result in the service being able to offer appointments from 6 - 8 of the 12 centres spread across the clusters for families who are eligible to access any of the councils early help services.                      2) A 40% reduction to the annual grant is now proposed instead of a 100% reduction which would retain resources to provide welfare rights services from each cluster to families accessing early help services.</p>
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of the proposal: i.e. support provided elsewhere	14	
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Not supportive of the proposal: e.g. Don't cut welfare rights, where will people go.	78	
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Service information: e.g. parents unlikely to attend if they have to pay.	28	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service users: e.g. impact on participation opportunities.	198	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on access to the service : e.g. children centre building proposals will impact on access to the service.	7	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. more not less support, deliver service differently (reduce/by appointment only)	71	
Questions	Various questions	1	

## 24. Question 23 – Early help response team

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The early help response team is a central citywide team that:</li> <li>Screens all requests for targeted early help and allocates them to clusters to pick up work. This includes referrals from children's social care.</li> <li>Undertakes return interviews for children and young people who are not known to social care and have been identified as 'missing'.</li> <li>Completes short term work with families.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The key change is that the team will also become the one central advice point for members of the public and professionals to access telephone support for advice and signposting.</li> <li>This will not stop people being able to access direct support through walking into any of the centres. Return interviews will become the responsibility of the newly developed CSE (child sexual exploitation) and Missing team.</li> </ul>

### Consultation responses (Early help response team) Only stakeholders responded to this question.

**Table 59: How stakeholders responded to the welfare rights proposal (online)**

Respondent type (stakeholder)	I have no opinion	It will affect me/them in a negative way	It will affect me/them in a positive way	It won't affect me/my client(s)	Not applicable	Statement only	Numbers of responses	Response rate (online only)
A member of staff (LCC or other)	13	33	10	16		4	82 (71%)	81% 116 of the 143 stakeholders taking part in the consultation online responded to this proposal.
A referral agency / organisation	1		1	2		1	5 (5%)	
A referral agency / organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre				1			1 (1%)	
A referral agency/organisation & An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre & An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre							0 (0%)	
A service provider / partner organisation	1	3	1	1		1	7 (7%)	
An individual or organisation that hires space in a children's centre		1					1 (1%)	
An organisation that delivers services from a children's centre	2	3		1	1	1	8 (8%)	
Other		1			1		2 (2%)	
Not selected	1						1 (1%)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>18 (18%)</b>	<b>41 (40.5%)</b>	<b>12 (12%)</b>	<b>21 (20.5%)</b>	<b>2 (2%)</b>	<b>7 (7%)</b>	<b>101 (100%)</b>	

**Table 60: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Early help response)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Supportive of the proposal:</b> i.e. Once central advice point	21	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 16 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 1 would not be viable/practicable to implement; and 15 are already a feature of the proposed service offer.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) There will continue to be a reduced Early Help Response team (EHRT) as part of the one front door response, which will provide a citywide telephone advice point and triage all requests for early help services. This will include progressing requests through to a new partnership allocations hub. (refer to interface with social care for more details on the partnership hub)</p> <p>2) The EHRT will develop its multi-agency response by co-locating with the police, mental health and early year's health professionals.</p> <p>3) They will also provide the interface between council early help services and children's social care. Due to capacity, the EHRT will stop doing some of the current work they do which is outlined in proposal 'interface with social care'</p> <p>4) Consideration was given to having an answer machine service for out of hours, however would increase the workload to work through any calls that are logged. Therefore, the Advice Point will be open each weekday and working hours. If there are any concerns, callers can still access the Duty and Advice service which is 24 hours, 7 days per week.</p> <p>4) Changes to staff working arrangements will be considered as part of the separate organisational staff review.</p> <p><b>No change to the initial proposal is recommended.</b></p>
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	<b>Not supportive of the proposal:</b> e.g. service needs to be available in all areas.	9	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on staff:</b> e.g. workload	17	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on service users:</b> e.g. more difficult to engage and get information.	9	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	<b>Impact on partners:</b> e.g. increased referrals to children's social care.	4	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	<b>Suggestions concerning service delivery:</b> e.g. clear criteria and referral process, better partnership with children's social care,	16	
Questions	Various questions	4	



## 25. Question 24 – Interface with children’s social care

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<p>1. Step down of all cases from social care, where targeted early help is still required for a period of time, as an early help assessment with an identified lead worker and partners working together with the family.</p> <p>The aim is to prevent escalation and support family to meet their needs independently with universal services.</p> <p>2. Joint work with social care providing families with support services for a specific piece of work as part of their social care plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This service will continue. However, responses to requests for support may be subject to a delay due to the proposal to reduce and/or prioritisation of the numbers of staff that could support this service.</li> </ul>

**Respondents were only asked if they wanted to make any comments about this proposal and the responses they provided are detailed in the following table.**

Table 61: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages

Themes	Key messages (Interface with social care)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of the proposal: i.e. supports retention of the service	4	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 15 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 1 would not be viable/practicable to implement; and 14 are already a feature of the proposed service offer. Two service suggestions are recommended for consideration, which concerns how to better manage service capacity to meet demand.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) Changes to staff working arrangements will be considered as part of the separate organisational staff review.</p> <p>2. In response to concerns raised by social care professionals regarding the reduced capacity to respond to support social care, a bespoke additional consultation forum was arranged for social care staff to discuss concerns with separate discussions taking place with senior managers of social care services.</p> <p><b>A change to the initial proposal is recommended - details below:</b></p> <p>1) The Early Help Response team will continue to undertake joint work with the Single Assessment Team where it is considered that it may result in early help support.</p> <p>2) The council's early help service will no longer be able to undertake joint work on cases that are open to child protection, child in need or LAC plans, therefore will only take cases that are 'stepped down' (families no longer require statutory social care intervention but still require support to prevent escalation). As one of the six criteria for troubled families are children subject to social care intervention, this falls within the new parameters of the service alongside other eligibility criteria as outlined in our priorities children's list.</p> <p>3) In relation to staff capacity and meeting the needs of families, priority has been given to step down rather than joint work as this will enable a smoother transition for families to meet their needs independently and increase the likelihood of not requiring further high cost and statutory intervention. Data over the period April 15 to March 16 has evidenced that of all cases stepped down from social care to early help, 98% of those did not come back to social care. To date this year, 82% of step downs have not gone back to social care.</p> <p>3)The EHRT will no longer attend initial social care conferences but will attend reviews where 'step down' is being considered.</p> <p>4) The Early Help Partnership Allocations hub will be responsible for picking up direct work with families within their agencies remit as part of a multi agency early help assessment.</p> <p>5) This service will contribute to an 'edge of care response' to prevent children and young people coming into care in a number of ways in addition to the overall service offer:</p> <p>5a)The Family group conferencing service will be located within Early Help to provide specialist mediation and resilience planning at an earlier stage when risk is first identified whilst upskilling early help and social care staff to embed FGC principles within their work to prevent family breakdown.</p> <p>5b) Expand the remit of the multi-agency support panel (MASP) to provide advice and resources for any case across early help and social care that is stuck, high cost and escalating with an interface with the resource and placement panel for children's social care.</p> <p>5c) Utilise Troubled Families funding to spot purchase short term specialist resources for families within the early help threshold but identified as edge of care.</p>
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Not supportive of the proposal: e.g. reduces resources for families	10	
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Service user benefits: e.g. popular and frequently used, families whose first language is not English	2	
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Comments about the consultation: e.g. more information required about the proposal.	4	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service users: e.g. concerned about potential delays in support.	30	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on staff: e.g. capacity	5	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on partners: e.g. demand will increase	13	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service provision: e.g. capacity, service may become over-subscribed.	12	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. clarity around roles and responsibilities.	15	
Questions	Various questions.	9	

## 26. Question 25 – Partnership and workforce development

### Proposal

Current situation	Proposed option for consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leicester City Council commissions a voluntary service provider to manage a partnership early help workforce development programme on a range of topics to improve the skills of the workforce to support families in the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workforce development will continue to be commissioned from a non-council provider</li> </ul>

**Respondents were only asked if they wanted to make any comments about this proposal and the responses they provided are detailed in the following table.**

**Table 62: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Partnership and workforce development)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of the proposal: i.e. supportive of the proposal	13	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>a) All comments have been considered and noted.</p> <p>b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making.</p> <p>c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation.</p> <p>d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy.</p> <p>e) Of the 12 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 11 are already a feature of the proposed service offer. One service suggestion concerning the responsiveness of the service is recommended for consideration.</p> <p><b>Comments on service suggestions</b></p> <p>1) We will continue to develop opportunities for staff and external agencies to be trained together , exploring opportunities to co-deliver provision with external agencies.</p> <p>2) It is not cost effective to bring the service in house at this stage as it meets a specific need which cannot be met within a reduced staffing structure.</p> <p><b>No changes to the initial proposal are recommended.</b></p>
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Service user benefits: e.g. popular and frequently used, families whose first language is not English	1	
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Comments about the consultation: e.g. more information required about the proposal.	2	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Commission differently: e.g. deliver in house by the council.	13	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on staff: e.g. workload	1	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service users: e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	1	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on partners: e.g. demand/costs will increase	1	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service provision: e.g. quality and costs	12	
Questions	Various questions	8	

## 27. Question 26 – Any other comments

**Table 63: Consultation feedback – themes and key messages**

Themes	Key messages (Any other comments)	Numbers of statements	Council's response
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Supportive of the proposals overall	6	<b>Feedback</b> a) All comments have been considered and noted. b) Suggested impacts are referenced within the equality impact assessment and will be subject to regular scrutiny to inform future planning and decision making. c) A 'Lessons learnt' log has been developed to take into account processes undertaken for this consultation. d) Where appropriate, questions have been responded to, otherwise, they have informed our future communication strategy. e) Of the 28 service suggestions submitted to the consultation: 13 would not be viable/practicable to implement; and (13) are already a feature of the proposed service offer.
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	No supportive of the proposals overall	31	
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Service user benefits: e.g. services essential for families	4	
Comments about the service, proposals and consultation	Comments about the consultation: e.g. more information required about the proposal.	25	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on staff: e.g. workload	7	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service users: e.g. children, parents, families, carers, children with additional needs, low income families.	22	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on partners: e.g. demand/costs will increase	8	
Suggested potential impacts (of the proposals)	Impact on service provision: e.g. quality and costs	1	
Suggestions concerning the service and proposal	Suggestions concerning service delivery: e.g. charge, make the savings from elsewhere	26	
Questions	Various questions	5	

## 28. Appendix 1 – Equality monitoring

**Table 1: Ethnicity - online and paper booklet (public and stakeholder)**

Ethnicity	Central Cluster	East Cluster	North Cluster	North West Cluster	South Cluster	West Cluster	Cluster information not available	Total
White: British	3	19	9	24	21	38	152	266 (46%)
Asian or Asian British: Indian	30	10	16	7	6	2	18	89 (15%)
White: European		1		4		2	9	16 (3%)
Black or Black British: Caribbean		1		2		2	7	12 (2%)
Black or Black British: African				3			5	8 (1%)
Other ethnic group: Any other ethnic group	2		1				4	7 (1%)
Asian or Asian British: Pakistani	2	3					1	6 (1%)
Asian or Asian British: Any other Asian	1		2				2	5 (1%)
Black or Black British: Any other Black						1	3	4 (1%)
Dual/Multiple Heritage: White & Black Caribbean							4	4 (1%)
Dual/Multiple Heritage: Any other heritage						2	1	3 (1%)
Dual/Multiple Heritage: White & Black African							3	3 (1%)
Somali			1	2			0	3 (1%)
Dual/Multiple Heritage: White & Asian						1	1	2 (0.5%)
White: Any other White background			1		1		0	2 (0.5%)
Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi	1			1			0	2 (0.5%)
Chinese				1			0	1 (0.5%)
White: Irish							1	1 (0.5%)
Prefer not to say	1	2	1		2	5	38	49 (8%)
Ethnicity information not provided	3	3	4	8	5		78	101 (17%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>43 (7%)</b>	<b>39 (7%)</b>	<b>35 (6%)</b>	<b>52 (9%)</b>	<b>35 (6%)</b>	<b>53 (9%)</b>	<b>327 (56%)</b>	<b>584 (100%)</b>

**Table 2: Ethnicity - Focus groups (public and stakeholder)**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Central Cluster</b>	<b>East Cluster</b>	<b>North Cluster</b>	<b>North West Cluster</b>	<b>South Cluster</b>	<b>West Cluster</b>	<b>Cluster information not available</b>	<b>Total</b>
White British	8	8	1	16	14	7	10	64 (10%)
Indian	19	15	17	2			3	56 (9%)
Pakistani	6	4	2					12 (2%)
Any other Asian Background	1	1	3	1				6 (1%)
Caribbean	1	1		4				6 (1%)
White European	2			4				6 (1%)
African	1	2		1				4 (1%)
Chinese	4							4 (1%)
White and black Caribbean		2		2				4 (1%)
Bangladeshi		3						3 (0.5%)
Any other	2							2 (0.5%)
Somali	1		1					2 (0.5%)
White and Asian	2							2 (0.5%)
White Irish		1			1			2 (0.5%)
Any other background		1						1 (0.5%)
No response							466	466 (73%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>47 (7%)</b>	<b>38 (6%)</b>	<b>24 (4%)</b>	<b>30 (5%)</b>	<b>15 (2%)</b>	<b>7 (1%)</b>	<b>479 (75%)</b>	<b>640 (100%)</b>

**Table 3: Gender - online and paper booklets (public and stakeholder)**

Gender	Central	East	North	North West	South	West	Cluster information not available	Total
Female	27	31	23	43	19	43	179	365 (63%)
Male	11	3	6	2	6	2	40	70 (12%)
Prefer not to say	1	0	0	0	1	5	30	37 (6%)
Not answered	4	6	4	7	6	1	84	112 (19%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>43 (7%)</b>	<b>40 (7%)</b>	<b>33 (6%)</b>	<b>52 (9%)</b>	<b>32 (5%)</b>	<b>51 (9%)</b>	<b>333 (57%)</b>	<b>584 (100%)</b>

**Table 4: Gender - focus groups (public and stakeholder)**

Gender	Central	East	North	North West	South	West	Cluster information not available	Total
Female	40	34	21	27	15	5	13	155 (24%)
Male	6	4	3	3		2		18 (3%)
Prefer not to say	1							1 (0.5%)
No answered							466	466 (73%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>47 (7%)</b>	<b>38 (6%)</b>	<b>24 (4%)</b>	<b>30 (5%)</b>	<b>15 (2%)</b>	<b>7 (1%)</b>	<b>479 (79%)</b>	<b>640 (100%)</b>

**Table 5: Disability - online and paper booklets (public and stakeholder)**

Disabled	Central	East	North	North West	South	West	Cluster information not available	Total
Yes	3	3	6	5	5	5	20	47 (8%)
No	35	29	20	39	13	40	171	347 (59%)
Prefer not to say	5	2	5	1	4	3	42	62 (11%)
Not answered	0	6	2	7	10	3	100	128 (22%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>43 (7%)</b>	<b>40 (7%)</b>	<b>33 (6%)</b>	<b>52 (9%)</b>	<b>32 (5%)</b>	<b>51 (9%)</b>	<b>333 (57%)</b>	<b>584 (100%)</b>

**Table 6: Disability - focus groups (public and stakeholder)**

Disabled	Central	East	North	North West	South	West	Cluster information not available	Total
Yes	5	3	2	1	3		2	16 (3%)
No	40	34	20	25	11	7	10	147 (23%)
Prefer not to say			1	2				3 (0.5%)
Not answered	2	1	1	2	1		467	474 (74%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>47 (7%)</b>	<b>38 (6%)</b>	<b>24 (4%)</b>	<b>30 (5%)</b>	<b>15 (2%)</b>	<b>7 (1%)</b>	<b>479 (75%)</b>	<b>640 (100%)</b>



**Table 7: Religion - online and paper booklets (public and stakeholder)**

Religion	Central	East	North	North West	South	West	Cluster information not available	Total
Atheist	1	4	0	1	3	11	23	43 (7%)
Buddhist	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3 (1%)
Christian	3	4	3	16	11	14	62	113 (19%)
Hindu	5	6	12	4	0	0	8	35 (6%)
Jain	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2 (0.5%)
Jewish	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2 (0.5%)
Muslim	28	5	5	3	0	0	14	55 (9%)
Sikh	1	2	1	1	0	0	5	10 (2%)
Any other religion (please specify)	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	6 (1%)
No religion	1	5	1	13	9	20	57	106 (18%)
Prefer not to say	1	6	5	2	2	6	53	75 (13%)
Not Answered	2	7	5	11	5	0	104	134 (23%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>43 (7%)</b>	<b>40 (7%)</b>	<b>33 (6%)</b>	<b>52 (9%)</b>	<b>32 (5%)</b>	<b>51 (9%)</b>	<b>333 (57%)</b>	<b>584 (100%)</b>

**Table 8: Religion - focus groups (public and stakeholder)**

Religion	Central	East	North	North West	South	West	No cluster information	Cluster information not available	Total
Muslim	26	12	13	1			1		53 (8%)
Christian	4	6	4	14	3	3	3		37 (6%)
No religion	3	3		9	8	1	3		27 (4%)
Hindu	2	10	6	1		1	2		22 (3%)
Atheist	4	1	1	2		2	1		11 (2%)
Blank		2		2	2		2		8 (1%)
Sikh	5	2							7 (1%)
Prefer not to say	1	2		1	1		1		6 (1%)
Buddhist	2								2 (0.5%)
Any other religion					1				1 (0.5%)
No answered								466	466 (73%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>47 (7%)</b>	<b>38 (6%)</b>	<b>24 (4%)</b>	<b>30 (5%)</b>	<b>15 (2%)</b>	<b>7 (1%)</b>	<b>13 (2%)</b>	<b>466 (73%)</b>	<b>640 (100%)</b>

**Table 9: Sexuality - online and paper booklets (public and stakeholder)**

APPENDIX H – Consultation Analysis

Sexuality	Central	East	North	North West	South	West	Cluster information not available	Total
Heterosexual / straight	29	25	20	34	21	44	167	340 (58%)
Bisexual	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	5 (1%)
Gay / lesbian	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	4 (1%)
Other (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3 (1%)
Prefer not to say	6	5	3	3	4	4	47	72 (12%)
Not Answered	7	9	10	14	6	1	113	160 (27%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>43 (7%)</b>	<b>40 (7%)</b>	<b>33 (6%)</b>	<b>52 (9%)</b>	<b>32 (5%)</b>	<b>51 (9%)</b>	<b>333 (57%)</b>	<b>584 (100%)</b>

**Table 10: Sexuality - focus groups (public and stakeholder)**

Sexuality	Central	East	North	North West	South	West	Cluster information not available	Total
Heterosexual / straight	26	12	11	16	9	8	20	102 (49%)
Bisexual	1			1				2 (1%)
Gay / lesbian		1						1 (0.5%)
Prefer not to say	5	2		3	1	1	5	17 (8%)
Not answered	7	7	10	13	6		45	88 (42%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>39 (19%)</b>	<b>22 (10%)</b>	<b>21 (10%)</b>	<b>33 (16%)</b>	<b>16 (8%)</b>	<b>9 (4%)</b>	<b>70 (33%)</b>	<b>210 (100%)</b>