

## Appendix 1 – 2015/16 Savings Proposals Summary

Ref.	Dir.	Description of Opportunity	2015/16 £'000	Public Consultation
D&R002/15-16	Development and Renewal	Optimising external funding	150	
D&R003/15-16	Development and Renewal	Lettings restructure	134	
D&R010/15-16	Development and Renewal	European social fund match funding payments	109	YES
D&R011/14-15	Development and Renewal	Barkantine Heat and Power Company	180	
	Development and Renewal	Various savings each of less than £100k	454	
		<b>Total (Development &amp; Renewal)</b>	<b>1,027</b>	
CLC009/15-16	Communities , Localities and Culture	Mainstreaming Recycling Education	103	YES
CLC010/15-16	Communities , Localities and Culture	Deliver more street care monitoring through champions and volunteers	140	
CLC012/15-16	Communities , Localities and Culture	Introduce Residual waste limits for multi occupancy premises	100	YES
CLC026/15-16	Communities , Localities and Culture	DMT Restructure	100	
	Communities , Localities and Culture	Various savings each of less than £100k	130	
		<b>Total (Communities, Localities and Culture)</b>	<b>573</b>	
ESCW002/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Management Streamlining (Adult Social Care)	263	
ESCW004/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Efficiency review of Community Mental Health Services	293	YES
ESCW006/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Reconfiguration of homecare services	2,021	YES
ESCW008/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Streamline support for Safeguarding Adults Board	195	
ESCW009/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Management Streamlining Children's Social Care	380	
ESCW012/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Reconfiguring children's homes	600	YES
ESCW013/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Review of non-statutory independent reviewing functions	289	YES
ESCW016/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Streamline management in YOT	188	
ESCW024/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Reconfigure Mental Health Day Opportunities	167	YES
ESCW026/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Review of adults using Tower Hamlets transport service	169	YES
ESCW028/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Procurement Savings - Supporting People	750	
ESCW030/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Remodel strategic support services	370	
ESCW032/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Change project funding model	120	
ESCW034/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Directorate administration review	500	
ESCW036/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Joint use of Careers Centre	133	YES
ESCW041/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Income generation and efficiencies in Early Years service	148	YES
ESCW044/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Reconfigure Children's Centre Service	1,000	
ESCW046/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Surplus learning and development budget	200	
ESCW052/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Integration of first response and local health services	250	
ESCW054/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Consolidation of learning disability service	225	YES
ESCW055/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Better targeting and integration of reablement services	200	
ESCW057/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Reduce duplication in leaving care service	427	YES
ESCW059/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Integration of accommodation based floating support service	109	YES
ESCW061/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Review Paid for Transport	675	
CD/PH02/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Public Health - Reconfiguration of sexual health services	800	YES
CD/PH05/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Public Health - Smoking cessation	360	
CD/PH08/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Public Health - Procurement and Non contract	419	
CD/PH09/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Public Health - Staffing	324	
CD/PH10/15-16	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Public Health - Mainstreaming 'healthy communities' projects	388	YES
	Education, Social Care and Wellbeing	Various savings each of less than £100k	1,568	
		<b>Total (Education, Social Care and Wellbeing)</b>	<b>13,531</b>	
RES004/15-16	Resources	Second Phase of Planned Finance Re-Organisation	350	
RES008/15-16	Resources	Reduction of controllable costs – Supplies and Services	150	
RES009/15-16	Resources	Recovery of court costs	100	YES
RES011/15-16	Resources	Delivering NVQ Support through Local Providers	205	
RES012/15-16	Resources	Rationalise Structure of Consultancy Service	130	
RES0024/15-17	Resources	Vacancy Management Customer Access	125	
RES025/15-16	Resources	Temporary & Agency Staff Contract	800	
	Resources	Various savings each of less than £100k	893	
		<b>Total (Resources)</b>	<b>2,753</b>	
	Law, Probity and Governance	Various savings each of less than £100k	284	
		<b>Total (Law, Probity and Governance)</b>	<b>284</b>	
CD002/15-16	Cross Directorate	Corporate Reserves Contingency Review	3,000	
RES022/15-16	Cross Directorate	Council Tax - Student Exemption, additional staff resource (FTC -1 Year)	335	
RES023/15-16	Cross Directorate	Employment Options Programme	3,900	
RES024/15-16	Cross Directorate	Business Rates - Data matching contract Budget to defend key appeal, additional staff resource	1,360	
	Cross Directorate	Various savings each of less than £100k	141	
		<b>(Total) Cross Directorate</b>	<b>8,736</b>	
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>26,904</b>	

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Optimising external funding</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	<b>D&amp;R</b>						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	<b>Economic Development</b>					<b>REF:D&amp;R002</b>	
<b>TEAM:</b>						<b>LEAD OFFICER: Andy Scott</b>	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	1,722	150			150	Income Optimisation	No
FTE Reductions	0	0			0		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>No adverse impact on staff numbers. Allocating appropriate external and/or Section 106 funding to replace General Fund. The Economic Development service is currently funded from a range of sources: General Fund, S106, Reserves and income from GLA contracts and other initiatives. Funds are allocated across the service according to the particular focus of the identified programme or the service delivered. S106 obligations currently support 11% of the Economic development service staffing budget across the board, but are available to support more.</p> <p>a. The Outreach, Engagement &amp; Tracking team within the Employment &amp; Skills Service currently has an overall staffing budget of £246,533, supporting 6 FTEs. Of this, just over 19% (£47,373) is from General Fund and relates specifically to the Manager's PO3 post; the five junior team members are already externally funded. The role of the PO3 manager's position is to secure and track outputs against GLA and other externally funded programmes, and to generate external income. Cash flow forecasts would indicate that the team can replace GF entirely with external funds (S106 and various grant incomes) year on year for this post, aligning it with its overall purpose of securing external incomes and commitments.</p> <p>b. Similarly, the Business Engagement Team supports nine posts through a combination of incomes: 63.5% of salaries are funded from GF, which could be replaced by S106 funds secured to support business development and inward investment across the borough. For accounting purposes the four posts for which GF funding could be replaced by S106 are: the Enterprise Projects Manager (PO2 - £43,809), the Enterprise Officer (PO1 - £20,790; the Enterprise Support Officer (SO1 – £19,944), and the Enterprise Support Assistant (Sc6 - £18,175); totalling £102,718.</p> <p>In the unlikely event that external S106 income is unavailable at any point then service delivery and current staffing structure can be reviewed. The structure of the service and its operational needs will remain under annual review.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
<p>Potential Implications - At present this proposal has no implications for service delivery or operational management. The service will continue as it presently does, with evidence based payment by results invoices being issued to the GLA and or other programme funders. S106 is secured through planning obligations and is drawn down on a project by project basis. Income will be constantly reviewed to ensure it meets service needs, and adjustments will be made accordingly. There are ongoing and potential new income streams becoming available for the delivery of enterprise and employment &amp; skills support from both government funded contracted delivery programmes and local development opportunities; draw down of these funds can be adjusted to meet operational requirements over the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Risks and issues - The key risk associated with these savings proposals is around the vibrancy of the economic environment. If there were to be a downturn in the economy there may be a need for increased activity around the areas of work in economic development including skills, employment and business support. This may impact on the viability of the service to deliver increased outcomes for a greater volume of participants.</p>							

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Lettings restructure</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	<b>D&amp;R</b>						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	<b>Housing Options</b>					<b>REF:D&amp;R003</b>	
<b>TEAM:</b>						<b>LEAD OFFICER: Colin Cormack</b>	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	1,651	134	0	0	134	Lean: Downsizing Teams	Yes
FTE Reductions	44	11	0	0	11		

#### DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY

It is important to stress that this proposal originated from, and is informed by, the Localism Act, policy changes including the revised Allocations Scheme, a comprehensive benchmarking exercise, regular and open staff workshops to consider process redesign and the subsequent formal adoption of amendments to operational practices.

#### Further information re key factors that have led to reduced workload:

1. Revised Allocations Scheme removing over 2,000 households (10%) from the Housing Register. Of the remaining 20,000 there is now a clear distinction between in housing need households (12,000) and not in housing need (8,000) permitting light touch engagement with the 8,000 not in housing need – less reviews, no exhaustive testing of application statements, etc.
2. With the 12,000 the use of intelligence around prospects of an offer to permit engagement with those most in need
3. Significantly reduced bidding activity in light of bid limits and penalties for refusal leading to reduction in work associated with bid handling tasks
4. Reduced offer refusals leading to less need to rearrange viewings or deal with no shows or 'on the door step' rejections – applicants are being much more circumspect about how they bid and what they bid for, meaning reductions in day to day handling activities

In essence, these allow for smarter working and the operational lessening of workloads particularly associated with the limited bids and penalties for offer refusals regime.

#### Further information re benchmarking with other local authorities with their own lettings services:

1. The two key activities of the council's allocations and choice based lettings function have been benchmarked against a group of London boroughs as a cost per unit of available social housing:
  - a. Applications & Housing Register Activity per unit of available social housing
  - b. Choice Based Lettings activity
2. LBTH came top of the top quartile in all cost indicators – and by a considerable margin - the proposed restructure would reduce the gap
3. Results suggest that further savings are possible but the service consider this would only be achievable by lowering the quality of services on offer to vulnerable households and adversely affecting the current intention to develop a tenancy attainment service.

#### IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER

**including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT**

Implications - Any reduction in staffing will need to be carried out lawfully, in accordance with the Council's contracts and procedures. HR have advised officers that this proposed reorganisation would take at least 6 months and could result in the redundancy of up to 11 employees. The resources required to support this would be provided by a lead HR Business Partner responsible for ensuring that the reduction in posts, and any change of roles, is carried out in compliance with the Handling Organisational Change Procedure. In addition to the General Fund saving there would be a gross saving to the Housing Revenue Account of £249K from 2015/16. Work is going on under the auspices of our "No Wrong Door" programme of service redesign for Housing Options that, in addition to making our work even more customer-appropriate, are likely to provide (significant) savings for 2016/17.

<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>		
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	Officers expect there to be a positive impact on front line services especially to the most vulnerable residents
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No	
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No	
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No	
Does the change affect Assets?	No	
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	Preliminary estimate of 44 FTEs reducing to 33 FTEs but, of course, that is subject to consultation
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	Please see details of savings proposal

TITLE:		European Social Fund Match Funding Payments					
DIR:		D&R					
SERVICE:		D&R Resources				REF:D&R010	
TEAM:		LEAD OFFICER: Dave Clark					
SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY	BASE BUDGET £000	Net Savings 15/16 £000	Net Savings 16/17 £000	Net Savings 17/18 £000	Total Saving	THEMES:	Is an EA Req?
Third Sector (TS) – Third Party Payments	2,176	109	0	0	109	Financial Adjustments	Yes
FTE Reductions	0	0	0	0	0		
DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY							
<p>As part of the European Social Fund Partnership agreement, the Council has contributed match funding against contributions from London Councils to enable local partners to benefit from the available European funding. This agreement - in terms of financial commitment - comes to an end at end of March 2015.</p> <p>The council will continue to support third sector organisations to access match funding. However, under this proposal the budget will be reduced by one fifth. This will not affect other third sector funding streams.</p>							
IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>In previous years Corporate Match Funding has been used to match a European Social Fund (ESF) administered by London Councils. This ESF funding ended in March 2014.</p> <p>This funding is currently uncommitted and the percentage reduction is relatively small compared to the cuts being faced by the Council - proposal 009 proposes savings equivalent to circa 25% of the service's General Funded staffing budget.</p> <p>The service recognises the role of voluntary and community organisations in providing services and is prioritising efficiencies through better management and alignment of third funding across the Council and ensuring a commissioning approach based on strategic outcomes. The proposed changes will be the subject of an equality impact assessment.</p> <p>This proposal is part of the Your Borough, Your Voice campaign which aims to identify residents' priorities for the borough, as government reductions increasingly impact on the public purse. At the time of updating this proposal the consultation is still open. To date there has only been 1 response regarding this particular proposal.</p>							
EQUALITIES SCREENING							
TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES/NO	IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	Yes	It is expected that all equalities groups are likely to be similarly impacted by the proposed reductions					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	Yes	The proposed change is extremely likely to reduce resources available to support vulnerable groups including those affected by welfare reforms. It is unclear however what categories of people fall within the 'top of the triangle' referred to as there wasn't any information within the guidance notes.					
CHANGES TO A SERVICE							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
CHANGES TO STAFFING							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

**Budget Savings Proposals**  
**Full Equality Analysis**

**Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal**

Savings – European social fund match funding payments - £109,000.

**1b) Service area**

**1c) Service manager**

**1d) Name and role of the officer/s completing the analysis**

Service area:  
Resources

Team name:  
Third Sector Team

Service manager:  
Dave Clark

Name and role of the officer completing the EA:  
• Everett Haughton - Third Sector Programmes Manager

## Section 2: Information about changes to services

### **2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

This proposal will reduce revenue expenditure as part of the Council's 2015/16 savings targets. To achieve the above savings it is recommended that the current Corporate Match Funding Budget (£555,000) is reduced by the full amount leaving a balance of £446,000.

The proposed savings represents a 5% reduction of the current grants budget directly managed by the Third Sector Team – the funding streams and in question include:

1. Community and Economic Engagement
2. Social Welfare Advice Services
3. Third Sector Infrastructure Support
4. Corporate Match Funding

A particularly important factor for consideration however, is the fact that the current Main Stream Grants programme (which incorporates 12 separate funding streams including items 1 to 3 above) although originally scheduled to end its current programme period on 31 March 2015, is expected to be extended for at least a further 6 months – to the end of September. This means that there is a significant financial commitment well into the 2015/16 financial year in which the savings are to be made.

The main aim of this funding stream is to increase employability of local residents through accredited/non-accredited training, volunteering and employment support, tackling inequalities, social inclusion of marginalised sections of the community and meeting local needs.

Job seekers allowance claimant count has been used as a particular basis for assessing need within the Borough in terms of economic inclusion. The claimant count rate for Tower Hamlets as at May 2014 is 3.6% compared to London 2.7% and nationally: 2.6%. This equates to 6,950 people who were unemployed and claiming JSA in Tower Hamlets. Source: ONS claimant count with rates and proportions. Note: % is a proportion of claimant count + workforce jobs total

The main Service User target groups include the 17,900 residents who are ILO-unemployed and 8,500 economically inactive

people assumed to want a job, totalling 26,400 residents. Source: ONS Annual Population Survey Jan 13 – Dec 13. Whilst there is other provision targeting this market, analysis suggests that some key groups are more disadvantaged in the borough and subsequently are disproportionately represented in lower employment and higher unemployment statistics. Equality profile is included in the 'Protected Characteristics' section.

Additionally, for the purpose of clarification it should be understood that the proposed savings come from a budget that had been used to match fund the ESF Community Grants Programme. This programme has now come to an end and the budget is not currently committed to a new programme. If the savings are approved, the remaining budget (£446,000) will be available for third sector organisations. This may be used as match funding to attract external funds or used for other purposes as agreed by the Corporate Grants Programme Board.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the identified savings could be taken on a pro-rate basis from each of the streams, due to a number of factors/considerations it is felt that the preferred option is to make the savings (of £109,000) from the Corporate Match Funding budget which currently stands at £555,000 per year.

### **Evidence (Consideration of Data and Information)**

- What initial evidence do we have which may help us think about the impacts or likely impacts on service users or staff:
  1. ONS Joint claimant count with rates and proportions
  2. ONS Annual population Survey Jan 2013 to Dec 2013
  3. LEA consultation findings
  4. LBTH Employment Strategy (April 2011)

### **Additional factors which may influence disproportionate or adverse impact?**

Budgets are set specific to the perceived or identified need of the various funding streams in line with directorate, strategic and community plan priorities. Therefore, in considering the implementation of potential funding reductions, due regard will need to be paid to ensuring that the 'hierarchy' of these priorities is taken into consideration.



In general with an 'across the board' reduction in funding, all groups with protected characteristics would be equally impacted by the reduction. The same would also apply if the reduction were to be from only one of the directorate funding streams.

### **Barriers**

What are the potential or known barriers to participation for the different equality target groups? e.g. communication, access, locality etc.

Projects funded under the funding streams in question are required to have due regard to equality issues and to addressing known barriers to participation for the different equality target groups.

Whilst there have been complaints regarding access or barriers to participation relating to currently funded projects we are aware of known/potential barriers – some of which are outlined below:

- Lack of childcare
- Poor accessibility
- fear
- Inappropriate/unsuitable timing
- Poor information
- Unsuitable location
- Inappropriateness of methodology/tutor/language

Officers will continue to work closely with service providers to look at how these barriers/issues can be addressed. In considering budget reductions officers will also give due regard to designing grant service specifications which maximises efficiency.

### **Recent consultation exercises carried out?**

Detailed consultation with a range of stakeholders, including voluntary sector stakeholders on both the individual service specifications and overall programme was undertaken in 2012 as part of the build-up to developing the 2012-15 Main Stream

Grants Programme. All service specifications refer to equalities duties and due regard was given to equalities considerations in the drafting and consultation on the service specifications and during all stages in the process including the application, assessment and moderation process.

These processes and arrangements will be repeated in developing the 2015/18 programme.

Consultation has been undertaken as part of the wider consultation process for the Council's Budget 2015/16. No major concerns can be drawn from the responses provided.

### Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Target Groups</b>	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li><li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will</li></ul>
----------------------	-------------------------------------	--

	What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users or staff?	<p style="text-align: center;">inform decision making</p> <p>Please also how the proposal will promote the three One Tower Hamlets objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reducing inequalities</li> <li>-Ensuring strong community cohesion</li> <li>-Strengthening community leadership</li> </ul>
Race	Neutral	<p>There is no disproportional negative impact on this group. Somali and Bangladeshi residents are key target groups due to the high levels of unemployment amongst these communities in Tower Hamlets as identified in the Employment Strategy. It is expected that there will be a high number of organisations applying for funding that will focus on supporting these residents.</p> <p>The suggested reduction is an overall 5% of the directorate's Third Party Payments budget. I this taken from Corporate Match funding budget as recommended, this is only likely to have a very marginal impact if any</p>
Disability	Neutral	<p>There is no disproportional negative impact on this group. People with a disability are key target groups for the targeting of services provided by grant funded projects.</p> <p>The suggested reduction is an overall 5% of the directorate's Third Party Payments budget. I this taken from Corporate Match funding budget as recommended, this is only likely to have a very marginal impact if any</p>
Gender	Neutral	<p>There is no disproportional negative impact on this group.</p> <p>The suggested reduction is an overall 5% of the directorate's Third Party Payments budget. I this taken from Corporate Match funding budget as recommended, this is only likely to have a very marginal impact if any</p>

Gender Reassignment	Not Known	Insufficient monitoring data available relating to this target group to draw any conclusion at this stage
Sexual Orientation	Not Known	Insufficient monitoring data available relating to this target group to draw any conclusion at this stage
Religion or Belief	Neutral	<p>There is no disproportional negatives impact on this group. Funding is available to all organisations irrespective of religion or belief; and services provided by grant recipient organisations are able to be accessed by all sections of the community regardless of their religion or belief.</p> <p>The suggested reduction is an overall 5% of the directorate's Third Party Payments budget. I this taken from Corporate Match funding budget as recommended, this is only likely to have a very marginal impact if any</p>
Age	Neutral	<p>There is no disproportional negative impact on this group. There are clear age-range targets for our funded projects, particularly those which form significant proportions of JSA claimants.</p> <p>The suggested reduction is an overall 5% of the directorate's Third Party Payments budget. I this taken from Corporate Match funding budget as recommended, this is only likely to have a very marginal impact if any</p>
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Not Known	Insufficient monitoring data available relating to this target group to draw any conclusion at this stage
Pregnancy and Maternity	Not Known	Insufficient monitoring data available relating to this target group to draw any conclusion at this stage
Other Socio-economic Carers	Not Known	Insufficient monitoring data available relating to this target group to draw any conclusion at this stage

#### Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones including target dates for either completion or progress	Officer responsible	Progress
<p>1. Improving the collection of equalities monitoring data from all grant funded projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and update project progress monitoring report</li> <li>• Review and update guidance for projects on the collection and reporting of equalities data</li> <li>• Incorporate equalities data within Performance Reports to Corporate Grants Programme Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Quarterly report document updated – end Sep 2014</li> <li>○ Information sheet sent to all funded projects – end Sep 2014</li> <li>○ Update incorporated within GIFTS online report - Oct 2014</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EH &amp; RM</li> </ul>	

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

**Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Barkantine Heat &amp; Power Company</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	<b>D&amp;R</b>						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	<b>Strategy, Regeneration &amp; Sustainability</b>					<b>REF:D&amp;R011</b>	
<b>TEAM:</b>						<b>LEAD OFFICER: Jackie Odunoye</b>	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Barkantine Heat & Power Company	534	180	0	0	180	Financial Adjustments	No
FTE Reductions	0	0	0	0	0		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
Budget reduction for Barkantine Heat and Power Company which is a Combined Heat and Power district heating scheme on the Barkantine estate.							
Barkantine Heat and Power Company (BHPC) is a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) district heating scheme on the Barkantine estate providing heat and power to residential customers, the leisure centre, primary school and community centre. The scheme is a joint venture between Tower Hamlets Council and London Electricity Group ( Now EDF energy). EDF energy manage BHPC on a 25 year PFI contract ending in October 2025.							
The capital cost of the scheme was financed by EDF Energy. In addition EDF Energy is responsible for all the generation, distribution and maintenance costs. In return EDF Energy charges the Council an annual facilities charge. In the current financial year the annual facilities charge to the Council will be £855,000. This charge is linked to the retail price index and will increase each year. The project started on the 1st November 2000 and will run to 31st October 2025. It is estimated that during this period the Council will pay £22 million to EDF Energy for the service.							
Each year the Department of Communities & Local Government (DCLG) pays the London Borough of Tower Hamlets a PFI Credit. The PFI credit is a fixed amount of £576,000 per annum. It is estimated that over the life of the project the total amount received from the DCLG will be £15 million leaving the Council to fund the remaining £7 million. Fund projections have been made for the project until the end of the contract where it was identified it is able to reduce the current available budget by £180,000.							
At the end of the 25 year contract BHPC will be handed back to the council where it will take full ownership; the council will be required to have a succession strategy in place.							
The current net budget including asset rentals is £331k (asset rentals are already covered by budget adjustments amended by corporate finance), this leaves a surplus budget of £202k, allowing for inflation increases and any property disconnection from the scheme resulting in decrease in income, the Barkantine budget could be cut by £180k.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
Barkantine Heat and Power Company (BHPC) is a district heating system serving some of the existing and new build properties on the Barkantine estate, the project was set up in 2001 on a PFI contract ending in 2025. At the end of the contract BHPC comes back in to the ownership of the council and will need to procure a new maintenance and services contract, some capital funding will be required for the procurement, upgrade of the building and renewal of the plant equipment. A worst case scenario would be if no contractors could be procured to take on the project, the council will be required to provide the service needing to put up the initial capital cost, although the money could be recouped through recharge.							
The surplus in the current budget has been generated through rationalisation of the funding (external grants and recharge) coming through. The savings is largely due to rationalisation of income (external grant and recharge of service users). The risk is if the service users do not or cannot pay, there will be a shortfall in the budget to cover our ongoing costs. As BHPC provide heat and power to residents and businesses it will need to continue to provide this service							

<b>TITLE:</b>		<b>Mainstreaming Recycling Education</b>					
<b>DIR:</b>		<b>CLC</b>					
<b>SERVICE:</b>		<b>Clean and Green</b>				<b>REF: CLC009</b>	
<b>TEAM:</b>						<b>LEAD OFFICER: Jamie Blake</b>	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
		103			103	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions		0			0		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The council currently provides recycling education and outreach which was intended to provide residents with an awareness of recycling services, increase recycling rates within the borough and promote recycling within schools and the local community. This proposal will review the discontinuation of this education and outreach service as residents are now aware of the services so this dedicated education service is no longer required.</p> <p>Recycling rates are currently at 28% and have shown only 2% growth since 2010/11 despite the continued investment in education and outreach. As there has been little change in the recycling rate over the past 3 years (reflecting recycling rate across the country over the last couple of years). This 28% recycling rate is one of the highest among inner London boroughs and through collection of dry recycling only, this rate would be unlikely to increase beyond 40%. This proposal reviews the continuation of this service.</p> <p>Schools are starting to mainstream recycling education within core lesson delivery. This could be enhanced and developed to ensure all schools offer comprehensive recycling training and sessions could also be delivered in youth centres. The training would be tailored to compliment the waste and recycling services offered by the Council. It is anticipated that the service could significantly reduce any loss of positive impact on behaviour change through a channel shift to direct mailing and better use of East End Life. An annual budget allocation would be created in order to facilitate this.</p> <p>Service users will continue to have access to the waste management and recycling services.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>In 2012/13 there were 106 contaminated loads of recycling. A reduction in recycling education may have an impact on the amount of contaminated loads as people are unsure of which items they can and cannot recycle. An increase in contamination would reduce the recycling rate and increase the amount of waste sent to landfill. Over time the absence of recycling education may have a detrimental impact on the recycling rates as new households move into the borough with no prior knowledge of the recycling opportunities. If this were to be the case additional investment may be necessary to deliver one off publicity campaigns and educational work.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						



# **Budget Savings Proposals** **Full Equality Analysis**

## **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal**

Mainstreaming Recycling Education

**1b) Service area**

Public Realm

**1c) Service manager**

Jamie Blake

**1d) Name and role of the officer/s completing the analysis**

Simon Baxter, Head of Clean Green

## **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

**2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

The waste services contract with Veolia includes a payment for the provision of recycling education and outreach. Aiming to increase recycling rates within the borough, this team promotes recycling within schools and community organisations and through events, door-knocking and working closely with housing associations.

Recycling rates are currently at 28% and have shown only 2% growth since 2010/11 despite the continued investment in education and outreach. The annual contract cost for the provision of this team is £311k. As there has been little change in the recycling rate over the past 3 years, this represents an investment of £750k with no additional benefit to the service. It has been recognised that the recycling rate across the country has flat-lined over the last couple of years. This 28% recycling rate is one of the highest among inner London boroughs and through collection of dry recycling only, this rate could not arguably increase beyond 40%.

Therefore, it is proposed that this funding to the contractor be removed because they do not provide value for money. Although recycling rates could decrease if the profile in the borough is reduced, especially with a churn of residents.

Schools are starting to mainstream recycling education within core lesson delivery. This could be enhanced and developed to ensure all schools offer comprehensive recycling training and sessions could also be delivered in youth centres. The training would be tailored to compliment the waste and recycling services offered by the Council. It is anticipated that the service could significantly reduce any loss of positive impact on behaviour change through a channel shift to direct mailing and better use of East End Life. An annual budget allocation of £150k would be created in order to facilitate this.

This proposal will only affect the contractor and their staff. It will not affect the Council staff.

## **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

All savings proposals have been screened for equalities relevance using the test of relevance questionnaire attached (Appendix A).

The consultation of this proposal has been conducted. Below is a summary of the consultation responses:

We received 19 responses to this proposal during the consultation period. The majority of the responses suggested that more recycling was preferable and residents' understanding of recycling and recycling practices was important.

Some responses made the following suggestions to increase recycling:

- Working with property management companies that take care of properties
- Make residents hear about recycling more frequently
- Recycling education needs to be repeated at periodic intervals due to the high turnover of residents in the borough
- More focus on children's recycling education, which would influence their parents' behaviour
- Recycling should be further promoted among businesses
- Provide as much clarity as possible about what can/cannot be recycled
- Reducing the number of issues of East End Life.

The mitigation of possible adverse impact includes:

- The recycling and disposal rate will continue to be closely monitored.
- The service will target the available resources to maintain and improve the recycling rate.
- The service will continue working with businesses and encouraging them to promote recycling.
- The service will explore a possibility of working with property management companies to increase recycling.
- ESCW to encourage recycling education to be mainstreamed in to school curriculums.

### **Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
Race	Neutral	This proposal is to shift away the resources for the recycling education and transfer some of them to direct mailing and EEL. It is anticipated that the negative impact of the proposal will be restricted by the resource shift and mainstreaming of recycling education. This group will not be affected due to its characteristics.
Disability	Neutral	Ditto
Gender	Neutral	Ditto
Gender Reassignment	Neutral	Ditto
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	Ditto
Religion or Belief	Neutral	Ditto
Age	Neutral	Ditto

Socio-economic	Neutral	Ditto
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Neutral	Ditto
Pregnancy and Maternity	Neutral	Ditto
Other		

#### Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

Adverse impact	Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact
N/A	


If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

**Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.

Recycling policy is reviewed regularly and will be the subject of an EQIA at these times.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Deliver more Streetcare monitoring through Champions &amp; Volunteers</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	CLC						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Clean and Green					REF: CLC010	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Jamie Blake	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	949	140			140	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions		3			3		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>Streetcare Officers provide the day to day monitoring of street cleanliness, identifying and arranging removal of graffiti, fly posting, fly tipping and excess litter. The officers work closely with the cleansing contractor to ensure the borough retains a good standard of cleanliness, however all requests to action need to be directed to the contractor to complete and are unable to be completed by the Streetcare Officers themselves.</p> <p>A number of improvements have recently been made to resident reporting channels. The Fifi phone application enables residents to send photographs of dirty streets, graffiti etc directly to the contractor to action. Usage of the application is increasing on a monthly basis creating a channel shift from face to face and telephone contacts to mobile and online service requests. This increased activity from residents is not a reflection that the borough is dirtier (performance targets continue to over achieve the target) it is a testament to increased resident engagement through the Localisation agenda and the confidence from the community that action will be taken if issues are reported.</p> <p>Members of the Muslim Women's Collective have been trained to undertake NI195 surveys on a quarterly basis in order to monitor the cleanliness of the borough and over 100 Community Champions operate across all wards, highlighting any service issues and helping to maintain the look and feel of the area.</p> <p>This increase in resident reporting and community monitoring outlined above means that it would be possible to reduce the on-street monitoring of cleanliness, transferring the day to day responsibilities to the contractor, and focusing the work of the client team onto the monitoring of data sets and customer satisfaction.</p> <p>The savings would be made through a reduction of 7 posts within the Streetcare Team, which would be managed in accordance with the Council's Handling Organisational Change policy. 3 posts in 15/16 will be reduced as a result of the ER/VR process. It is anticipated that staff would have the necessary transferable skills to be redeployed into other areas of the organisation, minimising the requirement for compulsory redundancies. A period of 9 months would be required to deliver this saving.</p> <p>15 Streetcare Officers would be retained within the service and would focus on responding to Members Enquiries, investigating and preventing serious faults and tackling any day to day issues that may arise.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>The 'visibility' of Streetcare staff across the borough would be reduced. However, resident access channels have significantly improved over the past two years and the ways in which residents report street cleanliness issues will remain in place.</p> <p>This change of monitoring arrangements will inform the procurement of new waste contracts in 2017. Tender submissions would need to demonstrate adequate supervision and ICT monitoring.</p> <p>There is a risk that the cleanliness of the borough could deteriorate if the strong relationship between the client and contractor breaks down. However, adequate monitoring systems would be in place to identify any performance failures at an early stage where mitigating actions can be implemented.</p> <p>There is also a risk of loss of Fixed Penalty Notices income as a result of this reduction.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						

**CHANGES TO A SERVICE**

Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No	
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No	
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No	
Does the change affect Assets?	No	

**CHANGES TO STAFFING**

Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	<p>This opportunity involves a reduction of approximately 7 full time equivalent posts. An equalities impact assessment will be undertaken as part of the development of this proposal to identify the composition of the staff group and mitigate any disproportionate impacts to vulnerable groups.</p> <p>All restructures will be undertaken in accordance with the Handling Organisational Change policy.</p>
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	



<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Introduce Residual Waste Limits For Multi Occupational Properties</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	CLC						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Clean and Green				REF: CLC012		
<b>TEAM:</b>					LEAD OFFICER: Jamie Blake		
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	4,474	100			100	Delivering Differently	Yes
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>This proposal is designed to be delivered as part of the procurement of the waste service contract in 2017, with a staged process from 2015.</p> <p>The impending change in the Council's statutory obligations in regards to recycling and the backdrop of higher recycling targets being imposed following a review of the Waste Framework Directive at the end of 2014 require the Council to review and update current policies in relation to waste and recycling services and make adjustments to the services that are currently provided, whilst being cognisant of a need to drive cost efficiencies within the services.</p> <p>Historically the emphasis of waste containment provision has been focused on dealing with the residual waste stream, this continues at present with a greater volume of bin space for rubbish rather than recyclable material. This ease of access to residual waste bins in all types of housing stock is one of the barriers to speedy and effective behaviour change.</p> <p>The collection of residual waste from estates and privately managed blocks has been historically managed according to request. Where RSLs identified that additional waste was being created within their estates an additional bin or extra collections would be arranged. This has resulted in disproportionate waste collections across the borough, with certain estates generating significantly higher tonnages of waste per property than the borough average. There is currently no onus on RSLs or managing agents to reduce the volume of residual waste and increase the volume of recycled materials generated from their properties.</p> <p>It is proposed that the Clean and Green service will work with RSLs and managing agents to reduce the amount of residual waste, setting achievable targets for waste reduction and the increase of recycling. The capacity of waste receptacles provided for Multi Occupational properties will be capped to a maximum level of 200 litres per week per household and recycling containers increased on a phased basis until the production of household waste is in line with the London average on all estates.</p> <p>Where estates are unable to reduce the levels of household waste from their properties, additional services would be offered to RSLs to undertake bulk waste collections and tackle fly tipping, for which a charge would be levied to the managing agent.</p> <p>The number of waste receptacles, frequency of collections and total tonnage will be analysed, comparing residual and recycled waste generated, for each estate and privately managed housing block in the borough. This can be compared against London waste averages to identify areas generating excessive residual waste within the borough.</p> <p>This opportunity is at the early stages of development. Further analysis is necessary, as detailed above, and a detailed plan developed to introduce waste limits across the borough through a phased approach. This project will take 3 years to implement across the whole borough.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>There is no guarantee that registered providers will be able to manage the waste production of their tenants effectively, potentially leading to the overflowing of waste chambers if they choose not to buy in additional collections to remove the waste. This approach may require the investment of additional Streetcare Officers to undertake fly tipping investigations, but again this function may fall to estates.</p> <p>This would have a financial impact on Tower Hamlets Homes if they failed to achieve the tonnage target on their estates. This may increase the levels of fly tipping and rubbish left on estates.</p> <p><b>RISK:</b> Risk of contravening the EPA. Risk to health and estate environment</p> <p><b>LEGAL:</b> The Council is a waste disposal authority within the meaning of Part 2 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and as such has the duty to dispose of controlled waste collected in its area and to comply with the targets for reduction of waste to landfill established under the Waste and Emissions Trading Act 2003. The proposal to work with particular estates to reduce production of waste appears consistent with the Council's responsibilities, but further advice may be required as details of the proposal come forward.</p> <p><b>STRATEGY:</b> This approach to achieving priority outcomes whilst still reducing costs based on a 'polluter pays' principle is preferable to the service cuts identified elsewhere. Could it be considered as an alternative to the food waste cut – ie fining those who don't recycle food and garden waste on a regular basis.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES/NO	IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	No group should be adversely affected. The intention is to better educate residents to recycle more to reduce residual waste and overflowing wate bins.
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No	
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No	
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No	
Does the change affect Assets?	No	
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

# **Budget Savings Proposals** **Full Equality Analysis**

## **Section 1: General Information**

### **1a) Name of the savings proposal**

Introduce Residual Waste Limits for Multi Occupational Properties

### **1b) Service area**

Public Realm

### **1c) Service manager**

Jamie Blake

### **1d) Name and role of the officer/s completing the analysis**

Simon Baxter, Head of Clean Green

## **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

**2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

This proposal is designed to be delivered as part of the procurement of the waste service contract in 2017, with a staged process from 2015.

The impending change in the Council's statutory obligations in regards to recycling and the backdrop of higher recycling targets being imposed following a review of the Waste Framework Directive at the end of 2014 require the Council to review and update current policies in relation to waste and recycling services and make adjustments to the services that are currently provided, whilst being cognisant of a need to drive cost efficiencies within the services.

Historically the emphasis of waste containment provision has been focused on dealing with the residual waste stream, this continues at present with a greater volume of bin space for rubbish rather than recyclable material. This ease of access to residual waste bins in all types of housing stock is one of the barriers to speedy and effective behaviour change.

This Council currently operates a weekly collection service and there are no proposals to change this standard level of service. However, the collection of residual waste from estates and privately managed blocks has been historically managed according to request. Where RP's or Private Landlords identified that additional waste was being created within their estates / managed communities an additional bin or extra collections per week would be arranged. This has resulted in some areas generating demand for multiple waste collections per week whilst other communities of similar density manage their waste more effectively and require far fewer waste collections. There is currently no onus on RP's or managing agents to reduce the volume of residual waste and increase the volume of recycled materials generated from their properties.

It is proposed that the Clean and Green service will work with RSLs and managing agents to reduce the amount of residual waste, setting achievable targets for waste reduction and the increase of recycling. The capacity of waste receptacles provided for Multi Occupational properties will be capped to a maximum level of 200 litres per week per household and recycling containers increased on a phased basis until the production of household waste is in line with the London average on all estates.

Where estates are unable to reduce the levels of household waste from their properties without help, additional services would be offered to RP's and Managing agents to better manage waste disposal and recycling for which a charge would be levied to the managing agent.

The number of waste receptacles, frequency of collections and total tonnage will be analysed, comparing residual and

recycled waste generated, for each estate and privately managed housing block in the borough. This can be compared against London waste averages and Borough waste averages to identify areas generating excessive residual waste within the borough generating substantially more collections than similar in borough communities. Many people will be unaffected by the above proposals and everyone will continue to get at least a once a week collection.

## **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

There is no evidence that poorer communities or particular ethnic groups produce more waste than others. Neither is there a clear gender link. Wealthier communities tend to recycle more but they also consume more and produce more waste.

### Summary of Consultation responses

33 responses were received during the consultation period. Some respondents thought that this proposal would help reduce waste in the areas affected, encourage recycling and maintain the environment clean by making residents more aware of the cost of waste removal. It was also pointed out that this proposal would give landlords of multiple occupational properties, including private landlords, and their residents, greater responsibilities.

Many respondents were concerned about a possibility of redistributing the additional waste management cost to residents. Some thought the transfer of the cost to residents would adversely impact on the community cohesion, because residents who do recycle and reduce waste need to pay for the waste created by their neighbours. However, that is already happening at a more macro level across the Borough and this selective proposal to target those communities generating substantially more waste than others in the Borough will address this. Other risks and possible adverse impact of the proposal identified in the consultation included:

- More contamination of recycling, since residual waste would be put in recycling bins
- Increasing fly-tipping.

The respondents also suggested the following measures to reduce waste and/or address possible negative consequences:

- Electronic goods recycling bins should be made available in the estates
- Food recycling and composting should be made available further
- More recycling and waste education should be made available
- Target homeowners' waste reduction too
- Work with large supermarkets to introduce 'no plastic bag policy'

- More enforcement activities and patrols to tackle fly-tipping.

To mitigate the identified risks, the service will:

- Work with and support RP's and managing agents to achieve the objectives. RP's are responsible for recycling bins being made available in the estates. The Council will encourage them to providing the facilities for residents.
- Continue monitoring the amount of residual waste, recycling, fly tipping and complaints
- Consult the stakeholders, including RP's and managing agents, about this proposal.
- Communication campaign for recycling and waste reduction.
- Continue working to maximise the food recycling and composting opportunities, although the borough's high number of high-rise housing buildings (80%) makes food recycling and composting a challenge.
- Continue working with businesses, including supermarkets, to reduce waste. The Council will work with supermarkets for them to take the environmental responsibilities, including reducing the amount of waste plastic bags.

### Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

Target Groups	Impact – Positive or Adverse	Reason(s)
What impact will		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform</li> </ul>

the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?		members decision making
Race	n/a	NA
Disability	n/a	NA
Gender	n/a	NA
Gender Reassignment	n/a	NA
Sexual Orientation	n/a	NA
Religion or Belief	n/a	NA
Age	n/a	NA
Socio-economic	n/a	NA
Marriage and	n/a	NA

Civil Partnerships.		
Pregnancy and Maternity	n/a	NA
Other		

#### Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

Adverse impact	Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact
----------------	--



<p><b>Whilst the proposals are not considered to favour wealthy or poorer communities increases in costs no longer covered by the Council for the management of excessive amounts of waste may be passed on to those residents generating the demand for multiple weekly collections by their managing agents. This may impact more heavily on the poorer communities effected until compliance and lower waste levels are achieved.</b></p>	<p>Engage RP's and Management agents to reduce the amount of residual waste.</p> <p>Continue monitoring the amount of residual waste, recycling, fly tipping and complaints</p> <p>Consult stakeholders, including RP's and managing agents, about the proposal</p> <p>Communication campaign for recycling and waste reduction.</p>
--	--

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

### **Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.

The impact of these measures will be reviewed as part of the Council's policy review process for which an EQIA will be undertaken.

n/a

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>DMT Restructure</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	CLC						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Strategy and Resources					REF: CLC026	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Robin Beattie	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	580	100			100	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	No
FTE Reductions		1			1		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The senior management structure within the Communities, Localities and Culture directorate comprises 5 Service Head positions.</p> <p>This structure was reviewed in 2010/11 resulting in the reduction of 1 FTE (from 6 posts to 5).</p> <p>There remains a commitment to reduce the number of Service Heads by 1.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Management Streamlining - Adult Social Care</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	ADULT SOCIAL CARE				REF: ESCW002		
<b>TEAM:</b>							LEAD OFFICER: Bozena Allen
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	20,198	263	0	0	263	Lean: Downsizing Teams	Yes
FTE Reductions	451	4.4			4.4		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
This opportunity would review management responsibilities within Adult social care, merging some responsibilities to reduce the number of management posts whilst ensuring effective synergies between functions. There will be a reduction in service and team manager posts.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
Whilst merging some responsibilities will lead to the realisation of greater synergies between different teams, this proposal will reduce management capacity within the service and increase the span of control of some remaining management posts. Some posts in jointly managed services will require consultation with relevant NHS trusts and the Clinical Commissioning Group.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	This proposal would reduce the establishment by 4.4 FTE staff (3% of the total establishment.) It is unlikely given the small scale of the reduction that there would be an adverse equalities impact although this would need to be assessed in the context of other staffing reductions that are taken forward.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	The reduction in management posts will necessitate the redesign of the posts of remaining managers. There is unlikely to be a change in working patterns.					

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Efficiency review of Community Mental Health Services</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	ADULT SOCIAL CARE					REF: ESCW004	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Bozena Allen	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	2,129	293	0	0	293	Lean: Service Re-Design and	Yes
FTE Reductions	44.5	8			8		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The community mental health service provides assessment, review and support planning to eligible adults with mental health needs. This proposal would review how to make savings in the community mental health service through service redesign and consolidation. These efficiencies will still allow the council to continue to deliver its core statutory obligations for community mental health service users.</p> <p>All Service Users will continue to receive a service but this will be delivered in a more streamlined and consistent way reducing the number of separate contacts for service users. The proposal will improve services by making them more streamlined and reducing the number of different people that service users have contact with, whilst still meeting all of their mental health needs.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>As set out above this proposal will improve services by making them more streamlined and reduce the number of different people that service users have contact with, whilst still meeting their needs.</p> <p>This proposal would be implemented by working in partnership with East London Foundation Trust and the CCG who commission the Health component of the service.</p> <p>This proposal would be subject to organisational change processes, and some change management for staff who will need to extend their field of operation but with a greater focus on Council Core functions .</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	All Service Users will continue to receive a service but this will be delivered in a more streamlined and consistent way reducing the number of separate contracts for service users.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	As above					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	We would retain the 4 community mental health teams at the current staffing levels but there will be a reduction in some posts in other teams in regard to posts which in the main deliver ELFT contractual functions. This will not affect the council's capacity to meet eligibility or deliver the required level of service					
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	There will be a reduction of 9 FTE. There are 5 vacancies in the service which provide redeployment opportunities for some of these staff. Given the small number affected it is unlikely that there will be an adverse equalities impact although this will need to be more fully assessed in the context of other staffing reductions across the Council.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	There will need to be some broadening of focus changes in the CMHTs to absorb the work currently carried out in separate teams but no change in role or function . The CMHTs already provide input and cover for these other teams, and the changes are therefore unlikely to be significant.					

## **Budget Savings Proposals** **Full Equality Analysis**

### **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal:** ESCW004 - Efficiency review of Community Mental Health Services

**1b) Service area:** Adult Social Care, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

### **2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

This savings opportunity proposes to make efficiency savings through service redesign and consolidation. The savings target for this proposal is £293,000 in the 2015/16 financial year. This represents 14% of the total budget.

The efficiencies outlined here are in the context of an agreement with the East London Foundation Trust (ELFT) under S113 (1A) of the Local Government Act 1972 by which 70 Council employees are seconded to work alongside ELFT employees within the ELFT Tower Hamlets Adult Community Mental Health Services.

This service provides assessment, review and support planning to eligible adults with mental health needs. This efficiency proposal enables a strengthening of the Council's focus and control with regard to its statutory service delivery for adult mental health in order to ensure a strong local oversight on effective delivery of the Council's statutory functions for vulnerable people with mental health issues in Tower Hamlets.

An opportunity for efficiency has also arisen from the success of the Mental Health accommodation strategy delivered within the work of the Mental Health Resettlement team, which has reduced the number of service users placed in residential care out of

borough and returning to live back to Tower Hamlets with the service being managed by the Community Mental Health teams instead of the resettlement teams.

This proposal will deliver savings in 2015/16, bringing the operational staffing budget in line with established posts thereby eliminating overspends. This eliminates risk to the Council from cross funded posts whilst enabling the ELFT to pick up its own cross charged posts. This proposal ensures that there is clarity as to which posts each respective organisation is responsible for funding.

The proposals provide for better alignment of services across the teams in the mental health service which will enable the service to meet the needs of service users more consistently whilst releasing efficiencies. This savings opportunity will deliver an improvement in key areas of service arrangements such as Emergency Mental Health Advice Liaison Service and the Rapid Assessment, Interface and Discharge team.

There were two responses on this proposal during the public consultation period. One response was concerned about the impact this proposal might have on the future accessibility of these services. The other response recognized that an efficient Community Health Service would be beneficial so long as the current support provision is at least maintained. This feedback is addressed in this impact assessment.

## **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

The efficiencies proposed for 2015/16 are to be achieved whilst retaining the service levels, therefore enabling the Council to continue to deliver its core statutory obligations with no reduction in such activity for the borough's vulnerable residents. The approach also preserves the benefits for local people of the Council's long established joint working arrangement with the ELFT. These changes will enhance the focus on LBTH adult social care delivery in mental health at a time when the Trust's canvass is becoming ever wider and continues the delivery of integrated health and social care service to vulnerable service users.

The redesign of services protects the four Locality Community Mental Health Teams where the bulk of the Council's statutory functions are delivered.

All Service Users will continue to receive a service but this will be delivered in a more streamlined and consistent way reducing the number of separate contacts for service users whilst still meeting all of their Mental Health needs.

### Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
<b>Race</b>	Neutral	No adverse impact identified
<b>Disability</b>	Positive	An improved focus on statutory functions promotes a more effective and consistent customer offer to vulnerable mental health service users. Alongside the work of integrating care and health services this will offer a streamlined support service; minimising the number of separate contacts and focusing on delivering a personalised service centred around the individual’s needs, including a joined up approach to managing any comorbid conditions that the service user may have.
<b>Gender</b>	Neutral	No adverse impact identified



<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	Neutral	No adverse impact identified
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Neutral	No adverse impact identified
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Neutral	No adverse impact identified.
<b>Age</b>	Neutral	No adverse impact identified.
<b>Socio-economic</b>	Neutral	No adverse impact identified.
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnerships.</b>	Neutral	No adverse impact identified.
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Neutral	No adverse impact identified.
<b>Other</b>	Neutral	No adverse impact identified.

#### **Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan**

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Adverse impact</b>	<b>Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact</b>
No adverse impacted identified for any specific target group	

#### **Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored. See above action plan.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Reconfiguration of home care services</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	ADULT SOCIAL CARE					REF: ESCW006	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Bozena Allen	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	4,030	2,021	0	0	2,021	Delivering Differently	Yes
FTE Reductions	63.25	62.25			62.25		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
The in house homecare service provides home care packages to adults that are eligible for social care support. This supplements the majority of provision which is externally commissioned.							
The in house service is very expensive compared to externally commissioned provision – it is also a service with a reducing number of users. This proposal would close the in house service and provide all home care packages through external providers, with an emphasis on local provision. This would create savings. Some of these savings would be reused to improve quality assurance and capacity to support the development of external providers in order to mitigate the risk that quality would deteriorate.							
The vast majority of eligible service users already receive their care through external providers. Of approximately 2,500 service users, 85 receive a service from the in house provision.							
We also have high levels of service user satisfaction for external provider users. If this service is subcontracted, robust safeguards will be put in place to ensure that the future provision embeds the borough's high standards of quality of care.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
The closure of the service will reduce usage of the first floor at Albert Jacob House.							
This change would require organisational change processes involving redundancy or redeployment for 62.25 staff .							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	Although the closure of the service reduces expenditure, support for eligible people will be provided through commissioned providers.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	Although the closure of the service reduces expenditure, support for eligible people will be provided through commissioned providers					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	There will be a change in provider for approximately 85 out of 2,300 residents receiving home care. This does not affect eligibility.					
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	Home care support would continue to be provided as part of care packages to meet assessed need, but they would be provided by a different provider.					
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	Yes	Commissioned providers would provide the required levels of support					
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	Yes	There will be a small increase in business for local suppliers of home care					
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	Yes	There will be a small increase in business for third sector suppliers of home care.					
Does the change affect Assets?	Yes	The home care service utilises office space at Albert Jacobs House and this will no longer be required.					
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	Approximately 62.25 posts (FTE) will be affected. Further expressions of interest for voluntary redundancy would be sought and consideration would need to be given as to opportunities for remaining staff in new community providers. A full EIA will be required to fully understand the staffing impact and put in place suitable mitigation.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

## **Budget Savings Proposals Full Equality Analysis**

### **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal:** ESCW006 Reconfiguration of homecare services

**1b) Service area:** Adults Social Care, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

### **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

**2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

The proposed savings from this proposal are £2,021,000 during 2015/16. This represents 50% of the total budget.

The in-house homecare service provides home care packages to adults that are eligible for social care support. This supplements the majority of provision which is externally commissioned.

The in house service is very expensive compared to externally commissioned provision at £33.80 per hour compared to a basic rate of up to £14.50.

Members have previously agreed to close the In-House Homecare Service by 2016. This could be brought forward in order to deliver savings for 2015-16. Action is already in place to reduce the number of existing service users and a process of voluntary severance was undertaken in early 2013-14 resulting in 27 staff leaving the service. Closing the in-house service and providing all home care packages through external providers, with an emphasis on local voluntary sector provision, would therefore yield significant savings.

A report into the experience of disabled people in Tower Hamlets in June 2013 found that ‘people had low opinions of care staff/support workers provided through agencies and little faith that something could or would be done about them’. This presents the opportunity to use a proportion of savings (£200k) into improving quality assurance and capacity to support the development of commissioned providers in order to mitigate the concern that quality would deteriorate.

There is currently a debate at national level about the rates paid to home care providers, and the extent to which downward pressure has forced them to adopt potentially unethical workforce management practices (e.g.; zero hours contracts/ non-payment for travel time). UK Homecare Association (UKHCA) has recommended a minimum hourly rate of £15.19 to allow providers to avoid these practices. The calculation of the potential savings from this opportunity has therefore been based on the assumption that we will be paying that rate to external providers rather than the current, lower, hourly rate.

**2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

**All savings proposals have been screened for equalities relevance using the test of relevance questionnaire attached (Appendix A).**

**Please go back to each of the test of relevance questions and using evidence please provide a more detailed analysis of the equality impact of your proposal.**

The proposal to transfer the homecare services to an external provider would bring the hourly rate paid to carers in line with London average. The new contractual

arrangements should not result in any loss of quality for service users. It is likely that this proposal will help strengthen contract monitoring between the Council and Commissioned providers as providers will be expected to demonstrate and evidence that the provision will be in compliance with quality standards.

Social care support has recently been a matter of media scrutiny due to poor standards of care and abuse. The current model of delivery offer levels of staff training, supervision and safeguarding in accordance with the councils core values, and commitment to good practice for both working conditions and customer care. If this service is subcontracted, robust safeguards are necessary to ensure that the future provision also embeds the boroughs high standards of quality of care.

**Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

**With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.**

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
Race	Neutral	The majority of service users in this area are white (74%), and there are commissioned services that provide services specifically for BME groups.  This proposal will further ensure commissioners provider framework take into consideration the need for community languages spoken by employees, familiarisation with cultural practices, and understanding of the diversity that exists within local service users. Therefore, the needs of service users from all communities will be met where appropriate.
Disability	Neutral	All service users in this area have been assessed as having critical or substantial levels of need, and any commissioned service would continue to provide equal levels of care to meet the needs of service users.

		Therefore it is not expected that individual with a disability would be adversely impacted by the proposal.
Gender	Neutral	There is higher proportion of female service users (59%), but it is not expected that they would be disproportionately affected by the proposal.
Gender Reassignment	Neutral	There are currently no service users who have been identified as having gender reassignment.
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	Service user data does not record the sexuality of the majority of service users, but it is not expected that this proposal will have an adverse impact on users as future commissioned services will be required to demonstrate and evidence their ability to meet quality standards for fair Access, Inclusion and Diversity.
Religion or Belief	Neutral	Information about service users' religion or belief has not been provided, however it is not expected that this proposal will have an adverse impact on users as future commissioned services will be required to demonstrate and evidence their ability to meet quality standards for fair Access, Inclusion and Diversity.
Age	Adverse	There are comparable numbers of service users across the age brackets using the service, so it is not expected that this proposal will affect one particular group disproportionately. However, it is important to note that the majority of service users in this area (78%) are over 64 years of age. It is understood that many of these individuals may have built up a relationship with their carer(s) that has spanned many years, and given the intimacy of care, and age and the vulnerability of clients, this proposal will need to factor in a transition period when services are transferred to a new provider. Managing the change and continuity of care will be a key factor for this group of older service users, and it will take time to build relationships to the levels of trust and confidence which have developed over a number of years.
Marriage and Civil Partnerships	Neutral	This information is not currently recorded but it is not expected that this proposal will have an adverse impact on users as future commissioned services will be required to demonstrate and evidence their ability to meet quality standards for fair Access, Inclusion and Diversity.
Pregnancy and Maternity		Not applicable
Other		Not applicable

<b>Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan</b>	
<p>Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.</p> <p>If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group(s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.</p>	
<b>Adverse impact</b>	<p><b>Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact</b>  <i>(All the actions below will be included within the overall action plan for the closure of in-house homecare service).</i></p> <p>If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.</p>
<p>Vulnerable service users particularly older service users may be distressed by the changes to their care arrangements, and may not welcome a change in carer. It is important to recognise that high levels of trust build up over time in the professional caring relationship, as is necessary for the delivery of a service that administers intimate care</p>	<p>It is recommended that service users are consulted in the process and once providers are identified, a handover period is managed for the transition, taking into account the sensitive nature of both the role and the transfer, and the associated risks involved.</p> <p>It will be important to involve the long term social care teams within this process, to ensure that service users are aware of their care options. It may be that changes are needed to support plans if users decide that they would prefer to take a personal budget and recruit a personal assistant. This process may be managed independently, or may require brokerage or advocacy to ensure that the rights of vulnerable individuals are explored, and they are fully involved in the decision making process.</p>

<b>Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring</b>
<p>Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.  <b>See above action plan.</b></p> <p>As part of the monitoring of commissioned services, service user profile information should continue to be collected and analysed to ensure that services are developed in line with identified needs.</p> <p>It is recommended that consultation is undertaken with service users 2-3 months after the transfer to collect feedback and review levels of satisfaction with the new service provision.</p>

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Streamline support for Safeguarding Adults board</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	ADULT SOCIAL CARE				REF: ESCW008		
<b>TEAM:</b>					LEAD OFFICER: Bozena Allen		
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	280	195	0	0	195	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions	5	2			2		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The Safeguarding Adults Board oversees and co-ordinates activity in relation to protecting vulnerable adults across all key partners in the borough. It is not currently statutory, but will become so when the Care Act is implemented. The board is currently supported by a standalone team but a recent review of support functions across ESCW identified synergies with the support provided to the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) which is currently managed as part of the SPP function.</p> <p>This opportunity proposes taking advantage of these synergies by joining up support to the two boards, whilst maintaining some specialist policy and advisory capacity. This would strengthen support for both boards whilst releasing efficiency savings by streamlining some of the support function. It would also help to strengthen links with the Health and Wellbeing Board which is currently supported within SPP.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
<p>This proposal offers an opportunity to improve governance of safeguarding by improving the links between adults and children's boards. However there is a risk that as the adults board becomes statutory, and the agenda around adult safeguarding gains priority, the work of the team will increase reducing the feasibility of this saving.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	Due to the small number of staff affected this proposal is unlikely by itself to have an adverse equalities impact. However, this would need to be more fully assessed within the context of other staff changes being proposed across the Council.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	Some staff will have changes to their job roles to support more than one board but this will have no effect on working patterns and will not have an adverse equalities impact.					



<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Management Streamlining Children's Social Care</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Children's Social Care				REF: ESCW009		
<b>TEAM:</b>							LEAD OFFICER: Steve Lidicott
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Management Streamlining	40,052	380	0	0	380	Lean: Downsizing Teams	Yes
FTE Reductions	528	5			5		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
This opportunity proposes reviewing management posts across the children's social care teams to achieve a reduction of 2 service manager posts, 2 group manager posts and 1 team manager post. Management posts will be reviewed to ensure consistency in the breadth of portfolio and number of reporting lines, and also to take better advantage of synergies between teams that are currently separate.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
The reduction in management capacity in this high risk service area will have to be considered carefully and mitigation put in place to address any increased risks. Changes would be subject to organisational change process.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	This proposal would continue existing services but make reductions in the number of management posts					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	5 out of 528 posts across Children's Social Care will be reduced. Given the small number this is unlikely to have disproportionate impact but would need to be assessed in the context of other staffing reductions across the Council.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	Some remaining management posts would need to be redesigned to include wider spans of control. This is unlikely to have disproportionate impact.					

TITLE:		Reconfiguring children's homes					
DIR:		ESCW					
SERVICE:		Children's Social Care				REF: ESCW0012	
TEAM:		LEAD OFFICER: Steve Lidicott					
SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY	BASE BUDGET £000	Net Savings 15/16 £000	Net Savings 16/17 £000	Net Savings 17/18 £000	Total Saving	THEMES:	Is an EA Req?
Reconfiguring children's homes	1,509	600	0	0	600	De-commissioning, Reducing services	Yes
FTE Reductions	33	12			12		
DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY							
<p>The Council currently operates two children's homes and this proposal involves closing one of the children's homes. Both have 6 beds but are not fully utilised, resulting in a significant number of empty beds. This proposal would reduce the provision of in-borough children home placements from 12 to 6.</p> <p>All children who are assessed by a social worker as requiring a placement are referred to the Children's Placement Team who broker a suitable placement. If this proposal is adopted, this process would remain the same and the child would be placed in the most suitable available accommodation. In keeping with the current process, unless the care plan for the child specifically identifies residential placement the child would be provided with accommodation in a foster care or a family placement in the first instance. The Council would still maintain its obligations under the government's Sufficiency Duty to place children within borough or where this is not possible within 20 miles of the borough unless the specific needs of a particular child indicates placement at a distance is more appropriate.</p>							
IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER							
<p><b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b></p> <p>This proposal would release an asset that could yield a capital receipt or be used for alternative use. The proposal does not at this stage quantify the value of the asset. The proposal would require organisational change processes and consultation with service users. Some service users may need to move to alternative accommodation although residents are not long term.</p>							
EQUALITIES SCREENING							
	YES/NO	IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	Although the change would mean reducing our in house capacity, this is underused and, if required, external provision would be sourced. Any child requiring a residential placement would continue to have one					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	As Above					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	All children requiring residential placements will continue to be placed in suitable accommodation.					
CHANGES TO A SERVICE							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	Yes	One children's home would be closed resulting in an asset which could be used for alternative purposes or disposed of. There is a further opportunity to redevelop the remaining children's home.					
CHANGES TO STAFFING							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	There would be a reduction of 13 FTE staff. The impact of this would need to be fully assessed through an EIA.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

## **Budget Savings Proposals Full Equality Analysis:**

### **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal:** ESCW 012: Reconfiguring Children's Homes

**1b) Service area:** Children's Social Care, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

### **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

#### **2a) Description of savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

##### **Reconfiguring Children's Homes**

The proposed saving for this savings proposal is £600,000 in the 2015/16 financial year. This represents 40% of the total budget.

The Council currently operates two children's homes and this proposal involves closing one of the children's homes. Each home currently has three residents although this is subject to change should any emergency requests for in house residential provision arise. This proposal would reduce the provision of in-borough children home placements from 12 to 6.

Looked after children requiring placements would continue, as now, to be placed in the most suitable available accommodation. Unless the care plan for the child specifically identifies residential placement this would follow the existing process of being provided with accommodation in a foster care or a family placement in the first instance. We would still maintain our obligations under the government's Sufficiency Duty to place children within borough or where this is not possible within 20 miles of the borough unless the specific needs of a particular child indicates placement at a distance is more appropriate.

#### **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

**Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?**

No. Staffing levels would be reduced by a total of 12 FTE within the Children's Social Care Resources service area, however, all children who required accommodation would still be provided with appropriate accommodation.

**Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?**

Yes. The Children's Homes provide accommodation to young people who have become looked after and are deemed in need of a residential placement. Currently, there are 12 beds in local authority run children's homes and the proposal is to reduce this to 6. The homes are both under-utilised and generally do not have more than 6 residents at a time (in recent times there have been occasions when there have been 7 residents but this has been for very short periods), however this proposal would reduce the ability to respond to a change in this situation.

Looked after children requiring placements would continue, as now, to be placed in the most suitable available accommodation. Unless the care plan for the child specifically identifies residential placement this would follow the existing process of being provided with accommodation in a foster care or a family placement in the first instance. LBTH would still maintain our obligations under the government's Sufficiency Duty to place children within borough or where this is not possible within 20 miles of the borough unless the specific needs of a particular child indicates placement at a distance is more appropriate.

It is not envisaged that this proposal would have a negative impact on the existing users of the two children's homes.

Concerns were raised via the public consultation that placing a child up to 20 miles away would make it more difficult for families to maintain contact. Currently, the majority of children in residential placements are placed outside of the borough and arrangements are made to ensure that they maintain close relationships with their families. For example, the LA will pay for travel in some circumstances and facilitate home visits. As the proposal aims to reflect a current under-utilisation of the resource, children who are most in need of the placement in the borough should still be able to be placed there.

In consultation with the service users, the overriding view was that they did not want to leave the place that they considered to be their home. There are currently 6 young people in placement. The care plans are such that it is unlikely that any will have to move from one children's home to the other. In order to mitigate the impact on new residents, once the decision is taken as to which home to close, the young people should be placed in the home that is to remain open.

**Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?**

No. Eligibility is statutory.

**Does the change alter access to the service?**

No. If individuals are eligible for the service they can access it – this is a statutory obligation on the local authority and this will continue.

**Does the change involve revenue raising?**

Yes, there is a strong possibility that whichever children’s home is closed will be sold. This would lead to a one off capital receipt.

**Does the Change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?**

No

**Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,  Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making
Race	Neutral	<u>Analysis</u>  From the anticipated impact of the proposal there is no evidence that it will negatively impact any specific race group. The racial background of service users is broadly representative of the Tower Hamlets.
Disability	Neutral	<u>Service User Profile</u>  The local authority children’s homes are not designated for children with a permanent and substantial disability. Therefore it is unlikely that it would be considered the most appropriate placement for a child who met the criteria for the Children with Disabilities Team. However, there have been in the past and are currently children placed there who have more minor disabilities.  <u>Analysis</u>  The Local Authority will continue to identify and provide the most appropriate placement to children dependent on their specific needs. There is no evidence of any negative impact on children who have a disability.
Gender	Neutral	<u>Analysis</u>  From the anticipated impact of this proposal there is no evidence that it will negatively impact any specific Gender group. The gender of service users is broadly representative of the Tower Hamlets.

Gender Reassignment	Neutral	There is no Service User data on Gender Reassignment. From the anticipated impact of the four proposals there is no evidence that it will negatively impact any gender reassignment group.
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	There is no Service User data on sexual orientation. From the anticipated impact of the four proposals there is no evidence that it will negatively impact any sexual orientation group.
Religion or Belief	Neutral	From the anticipated impact of the proposal there is no evidence that it will negatively impact any specific Religious or belief group.
Age	Neutral	<u>Analysis</u> The residents of the two children's homes tend to be at the upper range of the age profile. The Local Authority will continue to identify and provide the most appropriate placement to children dependent on their specific needs. There is no evidence of any negative impact by age.
Socio – economic	Neutral	Research indicates that children known to Children's Social Care are more likely to be from an economically deprived background and any change to provision will have more of an impact on children from poorer families. As the proposal is to reduce the number of beds in line with service need, it does not appear that this will have an adverse impact.
Marriage and civil Partnership	Neutral	Not relevant
Pregnancy and Maternity	Neutral	Not relevant
Other	Neutral	Not relevant

#### **Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan**

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

<b>Adverse Impact</b>	<b>Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact</b>
No adverse impact is identified.	



<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Review of non - statutory independent reviewing functions</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Children's Social Care					REF: ESCW0013	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Steve Lidicott	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Non- statutory independent reviewing functions	2,156	289	0	0	289	De-commissioning, Reducing services	Yes
FTE Reductions	14	4			4		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
We are required by law to have Independent Reviewing Officers (IROs) for child protection and Looked After Children cases but not Child in Need plans, which whilst vulnerable are not our most in need cases.							
This proposal will entail reverting to previous practice of reviews being led by frontline social work teams. Reviews will still be undertaken as before and this proposal does not reduce resources for casework in the social work teams. To ensure that we continue to manage cases effectively and that there is no risk to children, social care management will periodically seek independent assurance around the quality of reviews from other review agencies and also from the council's internal audit function, and ensure soundness and adequacy of systems and controls. Specific training and/or measures will have to be undertaken to ensure that the role is embedded within their team/s.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
If this opportunity is implemented, measures will be implemented to mitigate against the risk that the reduction in independent oversight compromises the quality of casework. Independent assurance will periodically be sought around the quality of reviews and adequacy of systems from other review agencies and also from the Council's internal audit function.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	Yes	The proposal removes our capacity to carry out independent reviewing of child in need cases and foster placements. These cases will still be reviewed, but not independently of the frontline social work service.					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	There will be a reduction in staff of 4 FTE. It is unlikely that this would have a disproportionate impact but it will need to be assessed in the context of reductions taking place elsewhere in the council.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	Leading reviews of CIN cases and foster placements will revert back to other social work teams. This is unlikely to have a disproportionate equalities impact.					

# **Budget Savings Proposals**

## **Full Equality Analysis**

### **Section 1: General Information**

#### **1a) Name of the savings proposal**

ESCW013: Review of non-statutory independent reviewing functions

#### **1b) Service area**

Children's Social Care, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

### **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

#### **2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

The proposed savings target for this proposal is £289,000 in the 2015/16 financial year. This represents 13% of the total budget for child protection and reviewing.

Children's Independent Reviewing Officers undertake quality assurance of cases involving our most vulnerable children. In Tower Hamlets, this includes the independent chairing of Child Protection case conferences and Strategy Meetings, Looked After Children Reviews, Child in Need (CIN) Reviews and reviews of foster placements. The remit also extends to young women subject to sexual exploitation, those placed in two of the borough's residential units, those subject to pre-proceedings process and children subject to complex section 47 investigations. The role is statutory for all the functions except that of the independent reviewing of Child in Need plans. While the CIRO's are independent from the social work teams and do not have line management responsibility for the cases that they are reviewing, they are still council employees and as such are not fully independent.

It is proposed to remove independent reviews of Child in Need cases from the responsibilities of these staff, which would reduce the staffing requirement by 3 FTE. This will entail reverting to previous practice of reviews being led by frontline social work teams. Cases that were previously reviewed by CIRO's would still be reviewed within the frontline social work teams.

Children's social care has a total of 15 Independent Reviewing Officers, out of which some have a predominant focus on Child in Need cases and others a focus on CIN cases as well as the chairing of Child Protection conferences, conducting Foster Carer Reviews and Independent Residential Inspections.

## **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

**All savings proposals have been screened for equalities relevance using the test of relevance questionnaire attached (Appendix A).**

**Please go back to each of the test of relevance questions and *using evidence* please provide a more detailed analysis of the equality impact of your proposal.**

**This involves looking at the equality profile of the staff expected to be affected by the changes, as well as the equality profile of the service users.**

This proposal will affect the Independent Reviewing Officers of CIN cases, foster carers and residential inspections, the impact of which will be looked at separately. The effect will also extend to existing frontline staff taking on an additional task of reviewing CIN cases, as this may add pressure to their existing workload.

The recommendation that CIN cases are reviewed, despite there being no statutory requirement to do so, came from the outcome of a 2005 CSCI Inspection which highlighted concerns about a lack of priority being given to these cases. The report was critical of the oversight in these cases and identified occasions when there had been significant drift as well as escalation to a CP Plan. As a result, the current system of independent reviewing officers for non-statutory work was implemented in 2006.

Since the current system was established, the practice of multi-agency reviews for child in need cases has become fully embedded. In addition, the establishment of the Principal Social Worker role has brought greater understanding of the social work role and areas for improvement, following the national review of child protection practice undertaken by Professor Eileen Munro. The work of the Principal Social Worker has identified a need to better empower social workers (in line with Professor Munro's findings) and remove some of the additional bureaucracy created by the current reviewing system. The view is that this will lead to a more focused and timelier CiN service. The Principle Social worker will ensure that there is effective oversight of practice following the removal of independent reviewing officers for children in need

All Independent Reviewing Officers oversee cases involving vulnerable children and young people whose welfare is assessed as being impaired in some way, who have suffered or are at risk of suffering significant harm and who therefore require intervention. In terms of impact to the community, the reduction of the posts will change the way we manage CIN cases. Although the reviewing of CIN cases could be undertaken by highly skilled frontline team or practice managers within social care, the reviewing will not be independent. Child in Need cases include vulnerable children, often on the cusp of child protection.

Currently Child in Need Plans are reviewed in a multi-agency format. The input of partner agencies is an essential element of the reviewing process. There needs to be a mechanism to ensure that this happens, both to obtain a holistic understanding of the case, and to assuage professional anxiety. Professionals who feel that they are not fully aware of the status of a CIN case are likely to press for an escalation to a CP Plan if they feel that progress is not being made. Review meetings should continue to be convened in a multi-agency format, albeit managed from within the social work teams rather than independently. Key members of the family's network must still be invited to attend these meetings and to feedback with any changes or concerns as they do currently.

The number of children becoming Looked After and subject to Child Protection Plans has increased and the number of case conferences requiring an independent chair is increasing year on year. The number of these conferences over the past years is set out below:

- 2011: 493
- 2012: 550
- 2013: 589
- 2014: 660 conferences projected based on current performance.

There is a risk that Child in Need social work would lose priority as compared to Child Protection cases and cases concerning Looked After Children. This could potentially lead to some of these cases escalating and therefore requiring a Child Protection Plan. To add some further context, there are currently 1251 children identified as Child in Need, compared to Looked After Children (313) and the number of Children with Child Protection Plans (365). The number of children in foster placements is 253. The high number of CIN cases gives an indication of the scale of quality assurance needed over such cases. Without independent monitoring, there is a risk of drift in the implementation of the Child in Need plans leading to children being open for longer than necessary. Previous experience has shown that the lack of formal independent reviewing of CIN cases leads to increased anxiety among agencies and to increased pressure for Child Protection Plans. However, the benefits from removing this additional layer, the fact that reviewing practice is now better embedded, and the oversight of our Principal Social worker will effectively mitigate against these risks.

As further mitigation, social care management will periodically seek independent assurance around the quality of reviews from other review agencies and also from the Council's internal audit function, and ensure soundness and adequacy of systems and controls.

It is essential that ensuring reviews take place becomes a regular part of the managers' role and that cases continue to be reviewed regularly, albeit not independently. We will ensure that CIN cases are given adequate attention so that they are not allowed to drift and that any deterioration in the family situation is identified and addressed at the earliest stage.

Independent Reviewing Officers play a key role in delivering training around risks and safeguarding to a range of staff including members of the Local Safeguarding Children's Board. The remit of their work also extends to the provision of targeted service to Bangladeshi families, support around sexual exploitation and domestic violence. The reduction in the posts could therefore impact on the delivery of training, and therefore reduce the support available to support professional development around safeguarding, and support in other areas of work would be affected too. However, we continue to invest significantly in learning and development on safeguarding and employ specific staff to oversee this. Any training responsibilities will be absorbed in existing posts.

The public consultation highlighted concerns that a lack of independent oversight and the risk that this could potentially pose. The proposal allows for this, by recommending that Child in Reviews are chaired by managers who do not have direct responsibility for the case, that oversight of practice is maintained by the Principal Social Worker, and that periodic independent assurance is put in place. There was also concern that this proposal could lead to cases being allowed to drift. The proposal recommends that additional safeguards be put in place to ensure that this does not happen.

**Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

**With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.**

**Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process**

**If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.**

**If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact**

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
Race	Neutral	<p>The table in Appendix 1 shows that the majority of children subject to independent reviewing due to the nature of their cases are of Bangladeshi background. This is broadly representative of the racial profile of the borough and as such does not appear to negatively impact on one particular race. The BME population has a younger age profile than the white population which partially accounts for the higher proportion of Bangladeshi children subject to CP/CIN Plans. The proposal does not change the eligibility criteria and the children's cases will still be reviewed.</p>

<b>Disability</b>	Neutral	12% of the CIN cohort are children and young people with a disability. There is no adverse impact to this group as all children identified as Child in Need will be affected equally.
<b>Gender</b>	Neutral	There is no adverse impact to this group, although any reduced support to females affected by sexual exploitation will be affected by the change.
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	Neutral	There is no adverse effect to this group.

<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Neutral	There is no adverse effect to this group.
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Neutral	46 % of children subject to Child in Need Plans are currently Muslim. This group is slightly over-represented when compared to the overall profile of the borough. However, there is a younger age profile amongst the BME population which partially accounts for the difference.
<b>Age</b>	Neutral	There is no adverse impact on this group as the split between the older cohort of CIN (9-18) and the younger cohort (0-9) is approximately equal.
<b>Socio-economic</b>	Neutral	Children who become known to Children's Social Care, are by their nature more vulnerable. They will all have some additional needs which has led to their being allocated a social worker. There is evidence that children who come from economically deprived backgrounds are more likely to be known to Children's Social Care, therefore any proposals which impact on the delivery of CSC services are more like to have an additional impact on poorer families. However this specific proposal is about changing the way that cases are reviewed and as the plan is for there still to be a review process there should not be a significant impact on any particular socio-economic group.
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnerships.</b>	Neutral	There is no adverse effect to this group.
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Neutral	There is no adverse effect to this group.



## **Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment**

### **Action Plan**

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

No adverse impact has been identified as a result of this proposal.

## **Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.

- 1) A Senior Manager be designated to oversee CIN Plans and ensure that reviews are taking place in a timely and effective manner
- 2) Regular monitoring to take place to ensure that any increase in CP Plan activity is not linked to the change in review process for Children subject to CIN Plans. The first such review to take place within three months of implementation of the new system. This could be achieved through the introduction of a CIN plan panel chaired by s senior manager.
- 3) Regular monitoring to ensure that there continues to be no adverse impact in respect to equalities.

## Appendix 1- Child in Need Cases by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Number
Asian (Any Other Asian Background)	25
Asian (Bangladeshi)	574
Asian (Indian)	6
Asian (Pakistani)	22
Black (African)	46
Black (Any Other Black Background)	17
Black (Caribbean)	29
Black (Somali)	31
Mixed (Any Other Mixed Background)	58
Mixed (White & Asian)	34
Mixed (White & Black African)	9
Mixed (White & Black Caribbean)	49
Other (Any Other Ethnic Group)	15
Other (Chinese)	7
Other (Information Not Yet Obtained)	13
Other (Refused)	1
Other (Vietnamese)	7
White (Any Other White Background)	52
White (White - British)	189
White (White - Irish)	7
Not Recorded	60
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1251</b>

## Appendix 2- Child in Need Cases by Religion

Religion	Number
Buddhist	1
Christian	179
Jewish	3
Muslim	580
No Religion	37
Not Stated	108
Other Religion	3
Sikh	1
Not Recorded	339
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1251</b>

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Streamline management in YOT</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Children's Social Care				REF: ESCW0016		
<b>TEAM:</b>					LEAD OFFICER: Steve Lidicott		
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Streamline management costs in YOT	804	188	0	0	188	Lean: Downsizing Teams	Yes
FTE Reductions	41	2			2		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
This proposal represents a reduction in the current management structure within YOT. The proposal would remove 1 service manager post and one other management post at team manager level.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
This is a core statutory service, and the proposal would result in a reduction in management capacity which would need to be carefully managed to avoid any adverse impact. The change will require organisational change process to be followed. As stated above the impact on the service of a reduction in management capacity would need to be carefully considered.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	The proposal reduces management posts but would retain the current level of service					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	There will be a reduction in staffing of 2 FTE. Given the small number it is unlikely that this would have disproportionate impact on any equalities groups but this would need to be assessed in the context of other staffing reductions across the Council.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	Some remaining management posts would need to be changed to expand span of control. This is unlikely to have disproportionate impact on any equalities group.					

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Reconfigure Mental Health Day Opportunities</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Commissioning & Health, Mental Health and Joint				REF: ESCW024		
<b>TEAM:</b>							LEAD OFFICER: Richard Fradgley
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Reconfiguration of Mental Health day opportunities	1,070	167	0	0	167	Lean: Service Re-Design and Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions	11	3			3		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
This proposal would deliver savings by greater efficiency at Pritchard's Road Day Centre. Over recent years there has been reduced demand against the capacity of the service. This is due to a number of factors linked to personalisation and alternative options available in the community for people using personal budgets.							
A small reduction in Council employed staff (3FTE) will enable the staff team to be restructured in line with levels of demand. This reduction will be achieved by vacancy deletion, redeployment and voluntary redundancy. Existing service users will continue to receive services in line with choices made through the support planning process.							
Further opportunities will be explored to make better use of capacity at Pritchard's Road as part of the wider programme of work to redesign mental health recovery & wellbeing services. These services will be procured from the voluntary sector by July 2015.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
The Tower Hamlets Health and Wellbeing Board approved the Mental Health Strategy for the borough in February 2014 which included delivery of a new model for mental health day opportunities. This proposal is in line with that strategy.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	The changes aim to maintain access to a range of opportunities with a reduced budget.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	As above					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	Services will change to maintain a range of activities in line with service user choice					
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	Yes	Further opportunities will be explored to make better use of capacity at Pritchard's Road as part of the wider programme of work to redesign mental health recovery and wellbeing services. These services will be procured from the voluntary sector by July 2015.					
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No	As above					
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	There is likely to be an impact on staffing levels as a result of reviewing the in house provision. The level of impact will be assessed as part of the review, and an EIA will be required.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	As above					

# **Budget Savings** **Proposals** **Full Equality Analysis**

## **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal:** 024 Reconfiguration of mental health day opportunities

**1b) Service area:** Commissioning & Health, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

## **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

**2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

The London Borough of Tower Hamlets and the NHS Tower Hamlets Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) work jointly to commission a range of mental health day opportunities and community support services.

At present £1.57 million is currently invested in the local voluntary sector and a further £0.5 million to provide Pritchard's Road Day Centre (PRDC). Eleven local mental health organisations provide a range of services including:

- Group support and activities
- 1:1 mental health support
- Welfare advice
- Support into employment
- Sheltered training scheme
- Culturally specific advice and support.

The proposal is to deliver savings of up to £167k from the overall budget. A saving of £65k will be made from services which have already been decommissioned. The remaining £102k will be delivered by redesigning services at Pritchard's Road Day Centre (PRDC).

### **Pritchard's Road Day Centre**

The vision is to develop an innovative, sustainable service for the future. The following approach is proposed for further development within the context of reducing costs and providing a financially viable service.

- *Community Bridge Building:* The aim would be to re-position Pritchard's Road as a place to offer access to a wealth of opportunities within the centre and in the community. This would create innovative new partnerships to develop supported pathways. This would reduce barriers, tackle stigma acting as to bridge the gap between supported mental health services and mainstream opportunities.
- *Co-Location of Services:* This approach would bring new resources into the Centre opening up further opportunities for existing and future clients. New services would be made available at Centre by voluntary sector providers in addition to Council staff. This would be commissioned as part of the recovery and wellbeing services to be commissioned.

### **The rationale for proposing this approach**

In Tower Hamlets, there are approximately 35,000 people with common mental health disorders, 15,000 with anxiety and depression and around 2,500 people diagnosed with a severe long term mental illness. Over 45% of people claiming unemployment benefits due to ill-health in Tower Hamlets do so because of mental health problems. There are approximately 440 services users in receipt of FACS eligible long term support services who suffer from mental health issues.

Mental health day opportunities have been provided by the voluntary sector and the Council for many years. These services support around 1000 individuals each year. These services help people to stay well, reduce isolation; and risk of relapse, in addition to helping people learn new skills and find employment.

A review of current spend, service use and demand shows roughly 25% of the total £2.07 million budget available for mental health day opportunities is allocated to PRDC. This amounts to £500k to support around 92 registered service users each year. Although service user feedback is positive and the services are valued by those using them, there are a number of factors which suggest better value for money may be achieved:

- There has been a steady decrease in the number of service users at Pritchard's Road over the last 3 years which means the Centre consistently runs under capacity. Further work is underway to assess the viability of maintaining current service levels within a reduced budget.

Pritchard's Road Day Centre is presently underutilised as a result of changing demand and alternative choices made by service users. This means there are high quality facilities and available space which more people could benefit from by bringing in additional resources which are already funded. This approach would aim to increase the range of potential options available for current clients without the need for any service reduction provided by Council staff. The current PRDC budget is based on providing a service for up to 50 attendees each day. Recent data shows an average of 24 attendances per day.<sup>1</sup>

## **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

The proposed changes will impact adults of working age with a disability relating to a diagnosed mental illness. This applies to both current and potential clients of PRDC in the future.

Ultimately, the key equality strand that has been identified for analysis in relation to the proposal is 'Disability' related to Mental illness.

The current proposals provide an excellent opportunity to reshape services to ensure a degree of choice, to demand more of the services commissioned, and to be able to engage with the largest percentage of the borough who have been affected by mental health illnesses. A summary of the implications are provided below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on attendance data for each day of September 2014.

## Potential implications:

### 1. PRDC Service Provision Maintained:

If proposals to redesign the service at PRDC are agreed, the proposed approach would maintain current service provision for current users and establish a viable service for the future. The aim would be to re-position PRDC as a place to offer access to a wealth of opportunities within the Centre and in the community. This would create innovative new partnerships to develop supported pathways. This would reduce barriers, tackle stigma acting as a bridge to the gap between supported mental health services and mainstream opportunities. Ultimately, the service at PRDC would be maintained and will continue to support provide the benefits of a safe and supportive resource for mental health problems. As part of redesign process, service users would be fully involved and consulted on proposed improvements e.g. feedback from consultation suggested a literature and drama group, more user led groups and drop in function which will be fully explored in the redesign process.

The facilities at PRDC are currently underutilised. The Centre has 92 registered service users however an active client group of 5-60. Average daily attendance is currently 24 compared with a capacity to support 50 attendees per day. This means there are high quality facilities and available space which more people could benefit from without reducing the service available to current clients. Through the co-location of services this approach would bring new resources into the Centre opening up further opportunities for existing and future clients. New services would be made available at the Centre by voluntary sector providers in addition to Council staff. This would be commissioned as part of the borough-wide recovery and wellbeing service model proposed for implementation during 2015.

### 2. Mental/Physical Health and Wellbeing:

Feedback from current service users about PRDC is positive with all those who participated in consultation reporting that they highly value the service and would not like to see it changed or closed down. They believe that previous efficiency savings and changes to the services they receive have been detrimental to their health and wellbeing. However if the decision is made to redesign the services delivered at PRDC all current service users will be reviewed with mental health professionals (care co-coordinators). Support plans and personal budgets will be reassessed in line with current needs. In the short term, changes to existing services will be managed carefully, however, service users and carers will be involved in the decision making process to determine suitable options for the future. This will ensure that their needs are



carefully considered and met in order to avoid the risk of relapsing backing into old mental health issues that they have worked to overcome.

**Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?**

No, the changes aim to increase access to a range of opportunities with a reduced budget.

**Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?**

No, the changes aim to increase access to a range of opportunities with a reduced budget.

**Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?**

Services will change to provide a greater range of activities with a focus on wellbeing and recovery.

**Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?**

No

**Does the change alter access to the service?**

Yes, the review would aim to make services more accessible so this would be a positive impact.

**Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?**

Yes, Re-commissioning services is likely to result in some change of provider although the Council in partnership with the CCG would remain the commissioner. As a consequence there will be no adverse impact.

**Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected?**

Yes, there will potentially be changes required to external contracts for day services.

**Does the change affect the Third Sector?**

Some of our day service contracts are with the third sector so they will be affected as outlined above.

### **Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact. If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> – Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and, – Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making																						
<b>Race</b>	Neutral	<p>Current PRDC service data reveals the ethnic composition of services users to be representative of the borough:</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr><td>African Caribbean</td><td>16%</td></tr> <tr><td>African</td><td>4%</td></tr> <tr><td>Albanian</td><td>1%</td></tr> <tr><td>Bengali</td><td>25%</td></tr> <tr><td>Greek Cypriot</td><td>1%</td></tr> <tr><td>Irish</td><td>2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Moroccan</td><td>3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Saudi Arabian</td><td>1%</td></tr> <tr><td>Somali</td><td>3%</td></tr> <tr><td>White British</td><td>42%</td></tr> <tr><td>Vietnamese</td><td>1%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The proposed changes to PRDC have been considered and it is not envisaged that they will have a negative impact on a particular race. The Centre will remain accessible to all ethnic groups.</p>	African Caribbean	16%	African	4%	Albanian	1%	Bengali	25%	Greek Cypriot	1%	Irish	2%	Moroccan	3%	Saudi Arabian	1%	Somali	3%	White British	42%	Vietnamese	1%
African Caribbean	16%																							
African	4%																							
Albanian	1%																							
Bengali	25%																							
Greek Cypriot	1%																							
Irish	2%																							
Moroccan	3%																							
Saudi Arabian	1%																							
Somali	3%																							
White British	42%																							
Vietnamese	1%																							

<b>Disability</b>	Positive	<p>If this proposal goes ahead and PRDC is redesigned it is likely that there will be a short period of disruption in service which will be felt by the 50-60 regular attendees currently attending PRDC as their old services and resources are replaced by new ones. This will be carefully managed. However, once the redesign of PRDC has taken place it is not envisaged that there will be any adverse impact.</p> <p>If proposals to redesign the service at PRDC are agreed, this would maintain current service provision for current users and establish a viable service for the future. The aim would be to re-position PRDC as a place to offer access to a wealth of opportunities not just within the Centre but also in the community. This would create innovative new partnerships to develop supported pathways which would enable current service users at PRDC to access community services with a safe and supportive approach. This would reduce barriers and tackle stigma, acting as a bridge to the gap between supported mental health services and mainstream opportunities. The pathways between each of these services will be better developed in collaboration with existing service users. Ultimately, the service at PRDC would be maintained and will continue to provide the benefits of a safe and supportive resource for mental health problems. As part of the redesign process, service users would be fully involved and consulted on proposed improvements e.g. feedback from consultation suggested a literature and drama group, more user led groups and drop in function which will be fully explored in the redesign process.</p>
<b>Gender</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Religion or</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.

<b>Belief</b>		
<b>Age</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Socio-economic</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Review of adults using Tower Hamlets transport service</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Strategic Commissioning					REF: ESCW026	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Barbara Disney	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Review of all people who use Tower Hamlets transport service	1,982	169	0	0	169	De-commissioning, Reducing services	Yes
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>Over the last two years the council has rolled out a pilot programme of travel training for young people with a learning disability being provided with transport to college. This pilot was implemented for all service users attending Tower Hamlets College to maximise their independence. Of the service users attending the College, 50 of the 71 with transport provision did not need transport services. Importantly, these young people are enjoying the independence the travel training has given them.</p> <p>This proposal would review all people who use the Tower Hamlets transport service to access their day provision and assess them to see if they are suitable for travel training. There are currently 82 service users in day services using transport, and based on the experience in our pilot a large proportion of them will be able to travel independently with travel training. We will also be looking at new college intakes to assess suitability for independent travel. Following a reduction in the number of people being provided with transport, service provision would be rationalised with better use of the in-house provision and decreased external provision.</p> <p>Current transport provision will continue for those who are unable to travel independently.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> <b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
<p>Experience during the first tranche of work with people with Learning Disabilities has indicated that it is parents who are most anxious rather than the service users themselves. Feedback from service users has been positive.</p> <p>A bus will cost the same whether there is one or five people travelling on it so careful planning of the routes will be needed to reduce the number of buses used, along with reducing the use of external transport providers.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	The change would reduce expenditure on transport provision for adults with learning disabilities. However this would be achieved by enabling people to travel independently where appropriate, with continuing provision for those that need it.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	As above					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	As above					
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

# **Budget Savings Proposals** **Full Equality Analysis**

## **Section 1: General Information**

### **1a) Name of the savings proposal:**

ESCW026: Review of adults using Tower Hamlets transport service

### **1b) Service area**

Commissioning and Health, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

## **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

### **2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

This saving opportunity proposes to save money through decommissioning and reducing services. The savings target for this proposal is £169,000 for the 2015/16 financial year. This represents 9% of the total budget.

Over the last two years the Strategic Commissioning team has rolled out a pilot program of travel training for young people with a learning disability being provided with transport to college. This pilot was implemented for all service users attending Tower Hamlets College. In total 50 of the 71 service users on transport did not need transport services and have now gone through or are completing travel training in order to maximise their independence. This has yielded an efficiency saving of £68k per year. Most importantly, young people are enjoying the independence the travel training has given them. Current transport provision will continue for those who are unable to achieve independence after training.

Subsequently following this successful pilot, all people who use the Tower Hamlets transport service to access their day provision will be reviewed and assessed to see if they are suitable for travel training. This process has begun with adults under 65 with a learning disability who attend learning disability day services. There are 82 people on this list. It will extend out to adults with a physical disability and older people aged 65 or over using day service provision. It will include both Council-run day service provision and commissioned day service provision.

Following a reduction in the number of people being provided with transport following this programme, service provision would be rationalised with better use of the in-house provision and decreased external provision.



## 2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?

This proposal will have a greater impact on adults with disability or frailty, as this is the group who are being targeted for travel training. As of January 2013, 17% of adult social care users in receipt of longer-term support had “learning disability” as their primary need (563 people). 67.5% had “physical disability, frailty or sensory impairment (2277 people), though it should be noted that only a proportion of these people use day service provision.

The demographic profile of adult social care users largely matches the profile of the borough. There are more people of a White British ethnic background and people of a Christian faith in the over 65 group. There are more people of a Bangladeshi ethnic background and people of a Muslim faith in the under 65 group.

Through a range of consultations and workshops, service users have expressed a greater desire for more independence and flexibility in arriving at services which travel training would allow for. This improves equality needs around access so all service users are assessed on their need and offered as appropriate access to an Independent Travel Trainer and Travel Training. Ultimately, the focus is to try to ensure that each service user receives a personalised approach when looking into their needs, with travel being one of these. A clear and user focused assessment which involves service users will enable Social Workers to capture their abilities, skills and aspirations in order to deliver a service package to support and develop service users, enhancing their choices, freedom and independence. The approach is not guided by assumptions and provides a clear process for all stakeholders so there is clarity to decision making throughout the process.

Through a range of the same consultations and workshops with service users, we also know that adults with a disability and their carers can have concerns about safety on public transport. For example, negative attitudes towards people with a disability was one of the top three themes identified through the feedback people with a disability gave in the Local Voices report<sup>1</sup>. At a discussion at the “Have Your Say” learning disability group in September 2014, people explained that they can feel vulnerable to being exposed to theft and anti-social behavior on buses and trains. Travel training was suggested by service users as a way to help support people with this. Some parents and carers have raised concerns with the idea of the people they care for using public transport due to safety fears. Parents and carers are involved in assessments to ensure they have an understanding of the Travel Training process and to ensure training is offered to people who can benefit from it. Workshops have been held for parents and carers to raise understanding of Travel Training, and these can be offered again as necessary.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Local Voices: A Report for Tower Hamlets Council” (Real, April 2013)

Travel Training is not restricted in that it works with an individual until that person is ready to be independent. This can take from weeks to over a year. Some individuals will attain greater independence than others. Each is supported accordingly and travel options provided on individual's needs. For some service users the traditional transport of mini bus and taxi is the most appropriate mode of transport and this will be provided.

The travel training will promote choices and independence for all service users across all the adults' age groups. This is by enabling as appropriate, service users to access community resources and travel such as buses, tubes, DLR. Each service users is supported to learn route planning and accessing services in Tower Hamlets in a personalised one to one manner.

The travel trainers in the team also reflect the local community so are able to communicate and support the service users and parents and carers from the Bangladeshi community. This ensures that both service users and carers are involved and informed about the process.

The travel policy is a follow on from practice within children's services so provides a consistent approach from childhood to adulthood.

Adults with a disability qualify for a Freedom Pass and older people resident in London qualify for a 60+ London Oyster Photocard so people would not need to pay to use public transport following Travel Training.

**Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?**

No

**Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?**

Yes.

**Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?**

No

**Does the change alter access to the service?**

No

**Does the change involve revenue raising?**

No

**Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?**

No

### **Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

**With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.**

**Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process.**

**If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact. If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.**

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact:</b> <b>Positive</b> <b>or</b> <b>Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
<b>Race</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Disability</b>	Positive / potentially adverse	<p><u>Positive:</u> The proposal is intended to have a positive impact on adults with a disability or frailty in terms of how independent people are. 70% of the 71 service users who took part in a travel training pilot were identified as not needing transport services.</p> <p><u>Adverse:</u> There is a risk that adults with a disability or frail older people using public transport will be more likely to experience anti-social behavior and discrimination on public transport. We know from service users and carers that people can have safety concerns when travelling on public transport. However, Travel Training increases people's confidence and skills to be able to cope with this. Carers will be supported by being fully involved in assessment decisions as to whether Travel Training is appropriate for an individual.</p> <p><u>Positive:</u> Higher visibility of adults with a disability on public transport should also promote community cohesion and discourage discrimination against people with disabilities.</p>
<b>Gender</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Age</b>	Positive / Potentially adverse	<p><u>Positive:</u> The proposal is intended to have a positive impact on older people in terms of how independent people are. As previously noted, 70% of the 71 service users who took part in a travel training pilot were identified as not needing transport services.</p> <p><u>Adverse:</u> Older people within the three groups (adults with a learning disability, adults with a physical disability, older people) are more likely to have been using Council-funded transport services to day opportunities for a longer period of time. There is a risk that people may have more difficulty changing from existing transport arrangements to public transport if they have been using existing services for some time. This can be mitigated against as travel trainers can work with people for as long as they need.</p>
<b>Socio-economic</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Neutral	There is no impact to this group.

<b>Other</b>	Positive	The proposal should have a positive impact on parents and carers of adults with a disability and older people. If people are able to travel independently, they are likely to be less dependent on unpaid carers to get travel support overall.
--------------	----------	---

**Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment  
Action Plan**

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

Adverse impact	Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact
Experiencing discrimination on public transport and being targeted for crime	
There is a risk that adults with a learning disability using public transport will be more likely to experience anti-social behavior and discrimination on public transport. We know from service users and carers that people can have safety concerns when travelling on public transport.	Travel Training works to increase people's confidence on public transport and enables people to be able to cope with safety risks. Service users have suggested Travel Training as a way of addressing safety concerns on public transport. Carers concerns will be discussed and addressed at a group level by offering information workshops. Carer concerns will be addressed on an individual level by involving carers in the assessment decision as to whether each individual will benefit from Travel Training.
Older people are more likely to have been using Council-funded transport services to day opportunities for a longer period of time. There is a risk that people may have more difficulty changing from existing transport arrangements to public transport if they have been using existing services for some time.	Travel Trainers will work with people for as long as they need to ensure that people feel confident about using new forms of transport.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Procurement savings- Supporting People</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Supporting People (Commissioning)					REF: ESCW028	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Carrie Kilpatrick	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Procurement savings	13,800	750	0	0	750	Commissioning Efficiencies	Yes
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>These savings will be made through the programme of tendering already underway. The tendering programme will reduce costs through a mixture of service reconfiguration, reduced costs and in a number of incidences decommissioning services. <b>Members have already taken the relevant decisions in relation to the procurement process and contract awards.</b></p> <p>This programme is currently being implemented and we anticipate full year savings to be available from 2015-2016.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
<p>These savings are projections from a programme of procurement activity that has already been completed. The relevant decisions in relation to the procurement and contract award have already been taken. Equality Impact analysis of the programme has also been completed.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	Some of the supporting people services are changing as a result of the procurement strategy. Equality impact analysis has already been undertaken as part of the procurement programme.					
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	Yes	In so much as this is a competitive tendering exercise that requires Organisations to bid to provide services. However, this is an established procurement process.					
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	Yes	As above					
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	Yes	Any third sector suppliers of supporting people services will have been affected as outlined above.					
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Remodel Strategic Support services</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	SPP/Transformation/PMO					REF: ESCW030	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: TBC	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Remodel Strategic Support services	1,753	370	0	0	370	Lean: Service Re-Design and Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions	47	4			4		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>This opportunity proposes a review of the teams within ESCW who currently carry out the following functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Horizon scanning to identify relevant policy change</li> <li>• Strategic and business planning</li> <li>• Data collection and analysis</li> <li>• Quality assurance</li> <li>• User engagement</li> <li>• Governance, including safeguarding children board (safeguarding adults board is subject to a separate opportunity)</li> <li>• Programme design</li> <li>• Project management</li> <li>• Change management</li> <li>• Monitoring delivery</li> </ul> <p>The aim will be to streamline teams, reduce management posts and create synergies to ensure that work can be done more efficiently.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>All three services play a key role in the delivery of a number of directorate and corporate priorities. A reduction in capacity too soon, may risk achievement of a number of key projects, including the implementation of the Care Bill, Children and Families Bill, the new ITF funding arrangements and the Directorate's savings programme as part of the MTFP. As these programmes are currently underway or being initiated, there is a risk that progress will be undermined by destabilising these services. This will need to be carefully managed.</p> <p>There is potential to consider an approach like this corporately, consolidating a range of strategic support functions across the Council, not solely in the ESW Directorate. This was explored through the last SPP review and although there are risks involved, there is the potential for some significant savings which might have lesser risks than those impacting more directly on frontline services.</p> <p>This opportunity would affect approximately 4 staff in the current SPP, PMO and Transformation teams.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	There is a proposed reduction in staffing of 4 FTE. A full impact assessment will be required as proposals are developed, particularly in the context of additional staffing reductions across the Council.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	Staff will need to work more flexibly over a wider portfolio. This is unlikely to change working patterns and result in negative equalities impact.					



<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Change project funding model</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	SPP/Transformation/PMO				REF: ESCW032		
<b>TEAM:</b>					LEAD OFFICER: TBC		
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Change project funding model	1,753	120	0	0	120	Income Optimisation	No
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>This opportunity involves changing the funding model for our PMO so that the general fund is only used for a programme manager, with project managers/ project support officers funded from other sources related to the projects being delivered. This would require all projects to be properly costed including project management costs. It would introduce additional risk and uncertainty to the funding for the PMO functions but ensure that project costs are more rigorously identified, and potentially lead to better use of specific funding streams such as Integration Transformation Fund.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>This proposal would introduce greater uncertainty into the funding for PMO related work. As the deployment of programme and programme management resources will be dependent on funding being available our resource may become less flexible.</p> <p>There is a risk that funding streams are not made available to fund project work, but that we will need to continue to deliver it. In this event it will not be possible to deliver this savings opportunity.</p> <p>The PMO has already been subject of restructuring to deliver savings, with the former CSF directorate PMO being reduced to a skeleton team in 2010. The experience has been that the requirement for delivery of significant projects has continued which has resulted in 'growing back' the PMO since the creation of the new ESW directorate. It is our strong view that there is likely to remain a permanent need for a PMO function in the directorate.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	Although it does introduce more risk as to whether current level of posts can be sustained.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Directorate administration review</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Directorate Services				REF: ESCW034		
<b>TEAM:</b>					LEAD OFFICER: Robert McCulloch-Graham		
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Directorate administration review	223,724	500	0	0	500	Lean: Service Re-Design and Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions	177	16			16		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>Administrative support provides an important function supporting the range of ESCW services. A recent analysis exercise identified £8m of administrative activity across the directorate, £4m of which related to 177 specific administrative roles. This support is currently provided across the range of teams across the directorate and there is scope to consolidate and streamline, maintaining effective support whilst realising efficiencies. The directorate is currently reshaping administrative support to saving approximately £100k as part of our existing programme. This proposal is for additional savings following this review to be achieved through further streamlining of functions.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>There will need to be a more detailed review to establish how these savings are to be delivered. Admin support is provided across a range of services including many statutory functions and the review will need to ensure that service provision is maintained to deliver statutory and other priority outcomes.</p> <p>Approximately £100k savings in the current programme are being delivered through a review of admin functions. Savings opportunity ESCW 001 also envisages an additional 2.5 specific admin posts being deleted in Adults Social Care. The total impact of these proposals is therefore in the region of 37 posts, 21% of the total, over three years. This will be achieved through vacancy deletion and voluntary severance/ early retirement.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	A full review will be carried out to ascertain the level of staffing reduction that will take place. It is estimated that this will be in the region of 32 FTE over 2 years. An EIA will be required to assess the impact of this change and put in place appropriate mitigation.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	This will be addressed as part of the review and associated EIA.					

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Joint use of Careers Centre</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Learning and Achievement – Careers Service				REF: ESCW036		
<b>TEAM:</b>							LEAD OFFICER: Steve Grocott
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Joint use of Careers Centre	762	133			133	Lean: Service Re-Design and Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions	26	2			2		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>This proposal would review using the current Careers Centre as a Careers and Employment Hub through bringing in current delivery from across the Careers Service, Transition Mentors and Skills Match Teams. This will create savings on premises related costs. There may also be an opportunity for other teams to utilise space to run activities bringing further savings.</p> <p>The Centre is well situated for transport and already attracts over 4,000 young people a year who know it as the place to come for Careers and jobs advice. Bringing in work with parents could fit well with a family support model reducing unemployment in the community. Allowing facilities for businesses to recruit from gives an added attraction of more apprenticeships and other vacancies being available from the Centre. Overall, these changes will foster a more integrated employment service that complements the approach outlined in the Tower Hamlets Fairness Commission to work towards employment services that work better for local people and businesses.</p> <p>There may be potential cost savings in terms of advisers being able to carry out information and advice, mentoring placing and tracking work across the range of clients currently dealt with by the Careers service, Transition mentors, Newstart and Skillsmatch teams.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> <b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
<p>The saving outlined would look to bring together services which currently deal with reducing Youth and adult unemployment. Whilst there would be a reduction in the number of staff working on NEET reduction for young people ( a Mayoral priority ) the aim would be to minimise the impact by better aligning services. The services identified in this proposal are currently located in Bow Road, Canary Wharf and Kit Kat Terrace and any premises related savings would depend on the existing commitments in relation to these premises. This opportunity includes £57k of premises related savings which is based on sharing the cost of Bow Road, a premises held on a lease which expires in 2016, but which is already well known to young people as a centre for careers advice.</p> <p>The Local Authority has a statutory duty under the Education and Skills Act 2011 to encourage, enable and assist the participation of young people in education and training. Under this local authorities are required to assist the most vulnerable young people and those at risk of disengaging with education or work. In addition there is a duty under the Raising the Participation Age legislation 'to promote the effective participation in education and training of young people covered by the duty to participate 'and to have arrangements in place to identify those who are not participating '.</p> <p>Local authorities are also expected to have arrangements in place to ensure that 16 and 17 year olds have 'agreed post 16 plans and have received a suitable offer of education or training, under the September Guarantee.</p> <p>The cost saving outlined would have implications for services in other directorates with Transition Mentors and Newstart in CLC and Skills Match as part of Economic Development.</p> <p>The introduction of a central tracking team may release staff time to alleviate the reduction in staff time for face to face front line support.</p> <p>The opportunity requires us to look at NEET reduction the reduction of unemployment how we engage with employers, training providers and education providers in the round</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	Savings will be achieved by better joining up services, which should also improve accessibility.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable	No	See above					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	Services will be improved by better joining up support for careers and employment advice.					
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	Streamlining services into one location should improve access.					
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						

Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No	
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected?	No	
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No	
Does the change affect Assets?	Yes	Joining up services in shared premises will reduce the use of leased assets.
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	There may be a small reduction in staffing numbers as a result of integrating service provision. The impact on this will need to be assessed in the context of other staffing changes being made across the Council.
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	There may be changes to working practices as a result of integration of service delivery but this is unlikely to have adverse impact.

## **Budget Savings Proposals** **Full Equality Analysis**

### **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal: 036 Joint Use of Careers Centre**

**1b) Service area: Learning and Achievement, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing**

### **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

**2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

This budget savings proposal reviews using the current Careers Centre as a Careers and Employment Hub. This proposal suggests bringing in current delivery from across the Careers Service, Transition Mentors and Skills Match Teams. Overall this will create a more integrated employment service that works better for local people and businesses.

The proposal is to utilise the Current Careers Centre as a Careers and Employment Hub bringing in current delivery from across the Careers Service, Transition Mentors and Skills Match Teams. This will allow for savings on premises related costs by splitting these across the teams. There may also be an opportunity for the Parental Support team to utilise space to run activities and bringing further savings.

The Centre is well situated for transport and already attracts over 4,000 young people a year who know it as the place to come for Careers and jobs advice. Bringing in work with parents could fit well within a family support model reducing unemployment in the community. Allowing facilities for businesses to recruit from gives an added attraction of more live apprenticeships and

other vacancies being available from the Centre.

There may be potential cost savings in terms of staff savings and premises savings where advisers carry out information and advice, mentoring placing and tracking work across the range of clients currently dealt with by the Careers service, Transition mentor, Newstart and Skillsmatch teams. The staff savings could be achieved by working in an integrated way across teams, and premises savings could be achieved by running services from a range of teams from the Careers Centre.

The Careers Service meets the local authority's statutory duties around Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) prevention, NEET reduction the raising of the participation age.

Careers Guidance raises the aspirations of young people, helping individuals to make informed realistic decisions, matching their own skills, abilities and aspirations to the opportunities available and broadening their horizons. The service aims to ensure that young people become well-rounded adults, who are committed to learning and development and contribute to economic prosperity. It is an essential element of forward planning enabling businesses to succeed by having highly motivated trained staff. It also enables young people to succeed in securing sustainable jobs in growth sectors - benefitting the individual the economy and the community.

There is also opportunity to draw in additional income by securing ESF contracts, contracts with LDA, LOCOG or via the 5 borough partnership to run NEET reduction or Careers related contracts. We have previously managed to secure contracts to a value of £150k per annum but continued success will depend on the availability and nature of contracts that are let in the future.

## **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

Under the proposal, there is a potential for a reduction in staff from the Careers service engaged in NEET reduction (reducing the number of young people not in education employment or training) affecting the level of individual Careers information, advice, mentoring, and submission and placing help available to young people. The implications of a staffing reduction may mean be that service users from the most hard to engage groups, or those with greater vulnerabilities, complex needs or multiple barriers to employment would be adversely affected and find it more difficult to access services and support.

The website consultation feedback about this proposal raised issues about a) the accessibility of the Hub's location and b) the Hub's proposed variety of services are offered independently as being able to integrate with other services.

This feedback has been considered, and staff will still work peripatetically in schools, the College and community venues across the borough to ensure local access .

Additionally by offering an integrated service from the HUB provides the opportunity for clients to benefit from a seamless Careers Guidance ,employability support ( cv support ,interview preparation etc. ) and job placing service as well as a focus for employers to source potential recruits .

The proposal will lead to less staff from the careers service supporting young people to move forward into education employment and training. The possible adverse impact is that without this support more young people will become NEET. The proposal looks to minimise the effects of this by better aligning other services which have some impact on NEET reduction (Transition Mentors and Skills match) to offer services from the same centre, with additional potential benefits that older clients can benefit from Careers Service expertise with greater alignment of services. If discussion across the services led to pooling of budgets a greater integration would also be possible.

To prevent any adverse impact the following actions will be put in place:

- Having members of the transition mentor team based at the centre who focus on NEET reduction to assist in keeping the Centre open for the same time as currently.
- The service will put in funding bids (e.g. European Social Fund) to run NEET reduction and NEET prevention contracts which would draw in funding so staff could be replaced using this funding.
- Utilising some of the space in the Careers Centre for the Parental Engagement team to run their services from would give the potential to align services (services for parents of NEET and NEET) and draw in some funding to alleviate accommodation costs.
- Adjustment of focus so that advisers carry out more tracking thereby reducing adverse impact, by focusing on carrying out more work – placements matching and mentoring work to achieve the end result of moving young people to education employment and training.

### Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Target Groups</b>  What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
<b>Race</b>	Neutral	<p>The Careers Service has been very successful in reducing NEET .The London Borough of Tower Hamlets has consistently hit its targets for reducing 16-18 year old NEETs. The latest figures for the ‘Department of Education standard measure’ for the period November 2013 to January 2014 shows a substantial reduction in NEETS at 4.56% - the lowest figure ever for Tower Hamlets, and down from 12.6% in 2005 . At the same time, the annual ‘Year 11 destinations survey’ of young people educated in Tower Hamlets shows an increase of young people moving into learning post -16 from 79.4% to 95.4%.</p> <p>Whilst most recent (March 2014) figures for young people who are not in education, employment or training (NEET) are relatively low at 4.8% (348), ethnicity breakdown figures suggest that half of the 348 individuals identified as NEET are Asian (177). There are lower numbers of Black (24, or 6.9%) Mixed (13 or 3.7%) and Other (5 or 1.4%) young people who are in the NEET category.</p> <p>When we look at this in more detail however we see that whilst White British young people form less than 14% of the cohort they form over 31% of the NEET.</p> <p>Recent data suggests that there are lower numbers of Pakistani and Bangladeshi people in employment at 32%, and that this is lower for women in this group at 20.9%.</p>



This suggests that this group of service users may benefit from additional support from the Careers Service in developing their qualifications and skills for the workplace. This could also include language support, advice on childcare, and training and development opportunities.

**Table 3: Employment rate by selected ethnic group and gender March 2013 in Tower Hamlets (%)**

	Total	Male	Female
Total Employment rate 16 – 64	61.9	70.9	52.1
White	80.2	80.5	79.7
Ethnic minority	47.7	62.3	34.1
Pakistani / Bangladeshi	32.1	63	20.9

**Disability**

Neutral

Data shows that the employment rate for disabled residents is lower than for the general population (43% compared to 66% in 2013, an increase from 30% in 2012). A resident with a disability may need more tailored advice according to the level of need, and may therefore be disproportionately affected by a reduction in services or advisers. The service will therefore need to focus on this group to make sure that it provides a full, accessible service for young people with a range of needs.

**Gender**

Neutral

The 2011 Census indicated that 64.5% of working-age males were in employment, compared to 57.3 of females. This suggests that there is not a discernible impact for either gender, although women may require careers advice following maternity leave or career breaks.

**Gender Reassignment**

Neutral

There is no discernible impact on the reduction of services for this group, although it may be that any reorganisation of staff takes into account the training of staff in to working with minority groups and the specific barriers they can face in to entering the

		workplace.																									
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Neutral	No identified adverse impact																									
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Neutral	No identified adverse impact																									
<b>Age</b>	Neutral	<p>The table below shows employment rates for people post 16 within the borough from the 2011 census. This suggests that the group who would be most in need of careers and employment support are those in the 50 plus bracket. There may be issues in developing appropriate services for this group of people in conjunction with the current service for younger people, considering the different employment and advice needs of these groups, and their engagement with services.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5"><b>Table 2: Employment rate 16 plus population by gender and age in Tower Hamlets (%)</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th><b>Ethnic Group</b></th> <th><b>16 plus</b></th> <th><b>16 to 24</b></th> <th><b>25 to 49</b></th> <th><b>50 plus</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td>59.40%</td> <td>43.60%</td> <td>73.20%</td> <td>33.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Male</b></td> <td>66.70%</td> <td>44.40%</td> <td>81.50%</td> <td>40.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Female</b></td> <td>51.70%</td> <td>42.90%</td> <td>63.70%</td> <td>27.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It is not expected that the current proposal will adversely impact on specific age groups, as the local authority will continue to fulfil its statutory duty to support young people in their participation in education, employment or training under the savings proposal.</p>	<b>Table 2: Employment rate 16 plus population by gender and age in Tower Hamlets (%)</b>					<b>Ethnic Group</b>	<b>16 plus</b>	<b>16 to 24</b>	<b>25 to 49</b>	<b>50 plus</b>	<b>Total</b>	59.40%	43.60%	73.20%	33.60%	<b>Male</b>	66.70%	44.40%	81.50%	40.40%	<b>Female</b>	51.70%	42.90%	63.70%	27.00%
<b>Table 2: Employment rate 16 plus population by gender and age in Tower Hamlets (%)</b>																											
<b>Ethnic Group</b>	<b>16 plus</b>	<b>16 to 24</b>	<b>25 to 49</b>	<b>50 plus</b>																							
<b>Total</b>	59.40%	43.60%	73.20%	33.60%																							
<b>Male</b>	66.70%	44.40%	81.50%	40.40%																							
<b>Female</b>	51.70%	42.90%	63.70%	27.00%																							
<b>Socio-economic</b>	Positive	<p>The proposal seeks to help support the skills required for employment and thereby increase employment rates which will have a positive socio-economic impact. The borough has high levels of child poverty, worklessness, deprivation and overcrowding.</p> <p>A strong strategic focus is on raising the aspirations and opportunities for local</p>																									

		residents, and the careers service is an integral part of this. Any reductions for the services offered should take consideration of residents who have complex needs, and who are farthest away from the workplace, in terms of ensuring that the service has the capacity to meet the needs of groups who need intensive and targeted support.
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnerships.</b>	Neutral	No identified adverse impact
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Neutral	No identified adverse impact
<b>Other</b>		

#### **Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan**

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Adverse impact</b>	<b>Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact</b>

#### **Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.  
See above action plan.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Income generation and efficiencies in Early Years service</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Learning and Achievement, Birth to 11 Primary School					REF: ESCW041	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Monica Forty	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Seek to fund Early Years Service G11 through DSG	1,174	148	0	0	148	Better Budget Management	Yes
FTE Reductions	12.7	0			0		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>Provision of early years services is largely through private and voluntary providers funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The Early Years team co-ordinates this provision, and supports development of the sector by providing training. This proposal would review reducing expenditure and increasing revenue by increasing fees for training courses and reducing some of our small grants to private and voluntary sector providers, whilst maintaining the core services of the team such that the offer it makes to the early years sector is not significantly affected. This proposal would not affect the provision of free support and advice services for child minders.</p> <p>Expenditure would be decreased over each of the three years and revenue would be increased each year as well.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>The proposal assumes that funding for the delivery (administration, project workers) of the Early Learning for two year olds will continue to be available through the Dedicated Schools Grant.</p> <p>Fees for training courses – the proposal assumes that childcare providers will continue to use the service we provide as costs increase.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	Yes	This opportunity would result in raising revenue from private and voluntary sector childcare providers through charging for training.					
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	Yes	Local childcare providers will be asked to pay an increased contribution to training costs.					
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	Yes	Any third sector suppliers of childcare will be affected as above.					
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

## **Budget Savings Proposals** **Full Equality Analysis**

### **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal:** ESCW041 Income generation and efficiencies in Early Years' Service

**1b) Service area:** Learning and Achievement, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

### **2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

The provision of Early Years' Services is largely achieved through private and voluntary providers. The Early Years' team co-ordinates this provision, and supports the development of the sector by providing training. This proposal reviews reducing expenditure and increasing revenue by introducing a new charging structure for workforce development, and advisory services for schools and private, voluntary and independent (PVI) providers, whilst maintaining a high quality offer to the Early Years sector.

The income generation and efficiencies proposal seeks to increase fees for training courses and reduce the development grant to PVI providers, whilst maintaining the core services of the team; in such that the offer it makes to the Early Years' sector is not significantly affected.

The savings from this proposal for 2015/16 amount to £148,000 representing 13% of the total budget.

This proposal would not affect the provision of free support and advice services for child minders. The aim of the proposal is to decrease expenditure, and increase revenue over each of the three years.

### **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

There will be no direct impact on families.

The proposed charging structure is an extension to the current charging policy. Courses are already charged for. The Service seeks to charge at a reasonable price which currently stands at £35 a day for PVIs. The rate is set by researching into the market rate to ensure that it is competitively priced. .

There is a small possibility that PVI providers may decide to seek training elsewhere if it is cheaper and consequently the revenue estimates may not be met. To mitigate this, services will be promoted by emphasising the quality of provision, the uptake will be closely monitored, and the pricing structure reviewed.

The proposed reduction in the development grant is unlikely to have a significant impact. The function of this grant is to support groups to purchase items or improve their settings in cases where the lack of these is holding back quality improvements. In practice, the grant has been used for general funding support.

Voluntary playgroups already receive support funding through Mainstream Grants. The number of two- year old places being funded is being increased, bringing more funding into the sector. All early education providers will receive the pupil premium from next year.

The feedback from the website public consultation states that the users of the service might be impacted on in that the 'increased cost might be prohibitive and users might decrease leading to no additional revenue benefit'. If the prices rise, then there is a possibility that PVI providers may seek to find other training providers that are cheaper, and the consequence of that is not meeting the revenue estimates.

### Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
<b>Race</b>	Neutral	There will be no adverse impact to this group.
<b>Disability</b>	Neutral	The Inclusion support provided to settings will not be affected by these changes.
<b>Gender</b>	Neutral	There will be no adverse impact to this group.
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	Neutral	There will be no adverse impact to this group.
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Neutral	There will be no adverse impact to this group.
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Neutral	There will be no adverse impact to this group.
<b>Age</b>	Neutral	There will be no adverse impact to this group.
<b>Socio-economic</b>	Neutral	There will be no adverse impact to this group.



<b>Marriage and Civil Partnerships.</b>	Neutral	There will be no adverse impact to this group.
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Neutral	There will be no adverse impact to this group.
<b>Other</b>	Neutral	There will be no adverse impact to this group.

**Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan**

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Adverse impact</b>	<b>Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact</b>
No adverse impact identified	

## **Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.

The pricing policy will be reviewed termly.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Reconfigure Children's Centre Service</b>				
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW				
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Learning and Achievement, Birth to 11 Primary School			REF: ESCW044	
<b>TEAM:</b>	LEAD OFFICER: Monica Forty				
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>		<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>
Reconfigure Children's Centre Service	9,071	1,000	transfer from public health grant	1,000	Delivering Differently
FTE Reductions	189	0		0	
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>					
This proposal aims to shift the emphasis of Children's Centres provision to improving public health outcomes, supported by the Public Health grant. Children's Centres are an important component of our strategy to improve health outcomes and this proposal builds on the successful work that is already delivered from our centres, to accelerate improvement in addressing health inequalities. This will impact on a range of public health outcomes including for example child development, diet and childhood obesity. The level of expenditure in our children's centres will not be affected by this proposal, but 11% of their funding will be redirected to the public health grant to increase the focus on health outcomes whilst continuing to deliver other priorities.					
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>					
including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT					
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>					
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>			
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No				
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No				
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No				
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>					
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No				
Does the change alter access to the service?	No				
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No				
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No				
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No				
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No				
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No				
Does the change affect Assets?	No				
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>					
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No				
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No				

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Surplus learning and development budget</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	HR (ESCW)				REF: ESCW046		
<b>TEAM:</b>							<b>LEAD OFFICER: Mark Keeble</b>
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Surplus learning and development budget	562	200	0	0	200	Better Budget Management	No
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
This budget is the former Directorate of AHWB provision for learning and development. In the last 3 financial years there have been significant underspends whilst no training request has been refused due a to lack of funding. It is proposed to use the surplus budget as a savings opportunity.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
This budget funds the training programmes and development activities for adult social care staff, including statutory training for mental health social workers. The remaining budget will be sufficient to still meet these needs.							

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Integration of first response and local health services.</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	First Response					REF: ESCW052	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Bozena Allen	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
First Response	2,572	250			250	Delivering Differently	Yes
FTE Reductions					0		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The integration agenda between social care and NHS services, funded through the Better Care Fund, presents an opportunity to better join up services at local level. The First Response team is able to deliver savings to the NHS through facilitating timely discharge from hospital, and there is an opportunity to bid for Better Care Fund resources in recognition of this. As part of this bid there will be a move to 7 day working in order to secure savings over and above the Better Care Fund investment requirements, increasing the availability of services to residents.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
<p>The use of Better Care Fund will need to be negotiated with the Clinical Commissioning Group. We have evidenced that savings the NHS over and above the investment required can be delivered, and therefore are confident that this will be secured.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	Through securing Better Care Fund investment, the service will be increased whilst delivering a saving to the Council's budget.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	The availability of the service will be increased through a move to 7 day working.					
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	There will be a move to 7 day working which will require a change in terms and conditions.					

TITLE:		Consolidation of Learning Disability Service					
DIR:		ESCW					
SERVICE:		Learning disability				REF: ESCW054	
TEAM:		LEAD OFFICER: Sandra Howard					
SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY	BASE BUDGET £000	Net Savings 15/16 £000	Net Savings 16/17 £000	Net Savings 17/18 £000	Total Saving	THEMES:	Is an EA Req?
Efficiency Review of Learning Disability Service	2,262	225			225	Delivering Differently	Yes
FTE Reductions					0		
DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY							
<p>The Community Learning Disability Service is integrated with community health services and jointly funded by the Barts NHS Trust and the council.</p> <p>This proposal will focus on achieving better value for money through a review of care packages. Potential savings may also be made to the council through increased support from health workers in the NHS. It is assumed that the reduction in expenditure can be achieved whilst maintaining appropriate support to meet the needs of eligible service users. This proposal will not alter who is eligible for the services, however there will be regular reviewing of service users' needs to ensure the provision is in line with the eligibility criteria.</p> <p>It is likely that the savings will be achieved whilst benefiting service users through the review of expensive residential and community care packages, helping people to be more independent and, where appropriate, moving to be closer to family and friends.</p> <p>As part of the council's continued drive to promote independence and support service users the council will ensure that the needs of service users are met where appropriate, and that the most vulnerable adults are provided with a seamless experience in accessing specialist or targeted support.</p>							
IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER							
<p><b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b></p> <p>Reviews of care packages will need to be robust with effective oversight to ensure that service users' needs continue to be met whilst meeting the aim of maximising independence.</p>							
EQUALITIES SCREENING							
	YES/NO	IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	The financial envelope, but not the services that develop the required outcomes, in themselves					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	The financial envelope, but not the services that develop the required outcomes, in themselves					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	Better outcomes for some existing service users and some will require a change without a change in outcomes. Guidance and availability of options will change for SEN and LD Service Users coming from Children's Services.					
CHANGES TO A SERVICE							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	Yes	Some services users will have their personal budgets revised in line with the new providers terms and costs					
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
CHANGES TO STAFFING							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	Changes in process and performance management processes will be required. This will be supported with training to provide a better service.					

## **Budget Savings Proposals Full Equality Analysis**

### **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal** – ESCW054 Consolidation of learning disability service

**1b) Service area** – Adults Social Care, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

### **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

**2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

The Community Learning Disabilities Service is an integrated service with community health jointly funded by Barts NHS Trust and the Council. This proposal will focus on achieving better value for money through reviewing individual care packages and by increased support from health workers in the NHS. It is assumed that the reduction in expenditure can be achieved whilst maintaining appropriate support to meet the needs of eligible service users.

This proposal will not alter who is eligible for the services; however there will be regular review of all service users' needs to ensure the provision is in line with the eligibility criteria. This process will ensure that each service user will receive the appropriate level of support, with the aim of maximising their independence and promoting healthy living. It is likely that the savings target of £225,000 will be achieved through this process during 2015/16. This represents 10% of the overall budget.

This proposal will promote independence of service users and, where appropriate, moving them to be closer to their family and friends. It will also ensure carers are supported as required by the Care Act 2014.

This proposal will also provide further opportunity to support service users to manage their own personal budget as much as they wish, so that they are in control of what, how and when support is delivered to match their needs.

**2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

**All savings proposals have been screened for equalities relevance using the test of relevance questionnaire attached (Appendix A).**

**Please go back to each of the test of relevance questions and using evidence please provide a more detailed analysis of**

### **the equality impact of your proposal.**

This proposal will involve reviewing care packages of people with learning disabilities. Currently there are 805 adults accessing the Learning Disabilities Service. The service users likely to be selected for review are those with care packages costing from £100,000 per year.

It is expected that this will affect mostly adults with Learning Disabilities in residential care (who will live out-of-borough as the Council does not have any Learning Disabilities residential care homes in Tower Hamlets) but will also include people living in the community. This work already takes place in the borough and when Social Workers carry out reviews; they will be looking at people's needs, whether this is reflected in the support package and whether the provider offers value for money.

If the provider does not offer value for money, the Council will negotiate with the provider to change the fee or consider a different provider that will continue to meet the needs of the vulnerable adult. The Council's Access to Resources Team will be involved in this process to find the best solution for the service user and manage any potential transition without disruption to their support arrangements. People will only be moved to a different provider in agreement with the affected person(s) and if they lack capacity, a decision would be made in their best interest.

The Council will ensure that the needs of service users will continue to be met based on the FACS eligibility criteria. If service users are receiving care that they are no longer eligible for, their support packages will be adapted. However, there will be reviews of service users' needs to ensure the provision is in line with the eligibility criteria.

The Independent Living Fund (ILF) will continue to deliver financial support to existing disabled recipients in Tower Hamlets so they can continue to choose to live in their communities rather than in residential care. This funding is permanently closed to new applications and from 1 July 2015, the funding and responsibility of ILF care and support needs to existing service users will transfer to local authorities in England. ILF funds will be transferred to Local Authorities on 30 June 2015 as a section 31 into the Corporate pot and is expected to be ring fenced for existing ILF recipients. It is anticipated that in Tower Hamlets the ILF criteria will be aligned with the FACS eligibility criteria. The Council has already begun reviewing ILF recipients in Tower Hamlets and it is understood that there are 27 recipients of whom 17 are also receiving services from the Council's Learning Disabilities Service. There are 2 clients that are 'not known' to the Council. This is expected as the ILF is an independent fund. ILF recipients will be assessed and payments will be made to support their care and support needs accordingly. LBTH will review all ILF packages as part of an overall review, initially focus will be on collecting ILF recipient's bank account details so payments can be continued without incurring any unnecessary delays from 1 July 2015.



The Council will further continue to promote where possible independent living with the Supporting People Team leading work on developing appropriate accommodation for people with Learning Disabilities.

**Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

**With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.**

*Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process*

*If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.*

*If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.*

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
Race	Neutral	Tower Hamlets has the largest Bangladeshi population in both London and England at 30%. Currently there is proportionally a small over-representation of the Bengali community using the Learning Disability Service at 39% against demographic estimates. It is not anticipated that this proposal will impact on this group.

		Through this proposal, service users from all communities will continue to receive care and support that will meet their needs. Services that will be reviewed will help users to be more independent and, where appropriate, moved to be living closer with family and friends. It is therefore anticipated that this proposal will help service users maintain contact with their communities of choice, where previously this may have been more difficult.
Disability	Neutral	The proposal will focus on effective reviews of service users with a learning disability and determining whether their needs can be met with a reduced support package. All service users in this area will continue to receive services based on FACS eligibility criteria. Through the review of care packages existing recipients of ILF care will be reviewed to ensure that their needs are met. Although we will need to think what other preventative support is provided for service users if they do not meet FACS eligibility. Therefore it is not expected that any individual with a disability would be adversely impacted by the proposal.
Gender	Neutral	There is higher proportion of male service users (57%), but it is not expected that they would be affected by the proposal.
Gender Reassignment	Neutral	There are currently no service users who have been identified as having gender reassignment.
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	Service user data does not record the sexuality of the majority of service users, but it will not have an adverse impact on users of any sexual orientation as needs of service will continue to be met based on the FACS eligibility criteria.
Religion or Belief	Neutral	Data on the religion and belief of service users with a learning disability is incomplete, but it is not anticipated that this proposal will have an adverse impact on different communities of faith.

		The proposal will review users' needs against the FACS eligibility criteria and where appropriate, move them closer to their family, friends and communities. Therefore enable them to have easier access to established sources of informal support than they would have had if for example, they moved to out of borough residential care.
Age	Neutral	Over half of service users with Learning Disability are aged 16-34. These are usually young people with complex needs. The prevalence of people with learning disabilities is also growing moderately due to improving health and life expectancy, which means higher likelihood of older people with learning disabilities in the future. This proposal will not affect service users' eligibility for services. Therefore it is not anticipated that this proposal will have an adverse impact on any particular age group of service users.
Marriage and Civil Partnerships	Neutral	This information is not currently recorded but it is not expected that this proposal will have an adverse impact on users of any marital status as needs of service will continue to be met based on the FACS eligibility criteria.
Pregnancy and Maternity		Not applicable
Other		Not applicable

#### **Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan**

**Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.**

**If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group(s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.**

<b>Adverse impact</b>	<p><b>Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact</b>  <i>(All the actions below will be included within the overall action plan for the closure of in-house homecare service).</i></p> <p><i>If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.</i></p>
Not applicable	

<p><b>Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring</b></p>
<p><b>Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.</b>  <b>See above action plan.</b></p> <p>As part of the monitoring of Learning Disability Services including commissioned services, service user profile information should continue to be collected and analysed to ensure there is no adverse impact on vulnerable adults receiving Learning Disability Care packages.</p> <p>It is recommended that management teams monitor the number of care packages that are reviewed to ensure service users' needs are in line with the eligibility criteria.</p> <p>Tower Hamlets will continue to be involved with the ILF transfer programme to feed into ongoing discussions with other Local Authorities.</p> <p>It is also recommended that consultation is undertaken with Learning Disability service users 2-3 months after a care package review was carried out to collect feedback and review levels of satisfaction with the process.</p>

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Better targeting and integration of reablement services</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Reablement					REF: ESCW055	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Bozena Allen	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Better targeting and integration of reablement services	2,150	200			200	Delivering Differently	Yes
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The integration agenda between social care and NHS services, funded through the Better Care Fund, presents an opportunity to better join up services at local level. This opportunity is to review our current reablement service with our health partners, to better target the service on need and potentially lever in funds from the NHS to help support the work that this service does in facilitating hospital discharge and preventing readmissions.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>There is a risk that NHS partners will not agree to provide funding to support this service. However given the important role it will play in facilitating discharge and preventing re-admission to hospital, and as a result making savings in the health system, this is thought to be unlikely.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	This proposal would reduce net expenditure by raising income from health through better targeting of the service to hospital discharge and preventing admissions					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	As above					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	Yes	Revenue from NHS- no adverse equalities impact					
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected?							
Does the change affect the Third Sector?							
Does the change affect Assets?							
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	This would be established as part of the review. Any impact would need to be assessed as proposals emerge					

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Reduce Duplication in Leaving Care Service</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Leaving Care Service					REF: ESCW057	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Shahid Tilley	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Efficiency review of Leaving Care Service	2,066	427			427	Delivering Differently	Yes
FTE Reductions	30	7			7		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The Leaving Care service provides a statutory function supporting young people who are eligible for support as care leavers. This includes helping these young people into employment, education or training and housing.</p> <p>Our expenditure on leaving care services is approximately 1.6 times the London average per head of population, despite relatively low numbers of children in care.</p> <p>Currently, looked after young people are supported by social workers in the Looked After Children team as well as the Leaving Care Service from 16 to 17.5 years which can cause duplication and unnecessarily increases the number of contacts for the young person. The proposal would streamline support for young people in care, by increasing the age at which Personal Advisors in the Leaving Care Service start supporting a young person to 17.5 years. Young people would continue to be supported by social workers between the ages of 16 and 17.5 years. This will enable us to reduce our expenditure on supporting care leavers through reducing the number of staff who work in this service. We are also proposing small reductions in transfer payments to individuals leaving care. We would continue to provide support to these young people in line with statutory requirements.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
The change in provision for 16-17.5 year old children in care will need to be carefully managed in order not to compromise service delivery for existing service users.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	Yes	Although there will be a reduction in staffing to support care leavers, we will continue to meet the statutory requirements in relation to care leavers support. There will also be a small reduction in non-essential grant payments.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	Yes	As above					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	As above					
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	Yes	It is likely that we will be reducing some of the financial support given to care leavers, however we will retain a large part of our current expenditure and will be seeking to target financial support more effectively. The extent of this will be established as part of the review and a full EIA completed to assess impact.					
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	Estimated impact 7 FTE . 2 of the posts are currently vacant. Social work posts can be redeployed within the children's social care service.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

# Budget Savings Proposals Full Equality Analysis

## Section 1: General Information

### 1a) Name of the savings proposal

ESCW 057: Reduce duplication in leaving care service

### 1b) Service area

Children's Social Care, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

## Section 2: Information about changes to services

### 2a) Description of savings proposals and the reasons for this change

#### 1. Efficiency Review of Leaving Care Service

The savings from this proposal are £427,000 for the 2015/16 financial year. This represents 21% of the overall budget.

The service provides a statutory function supporting young people who are eligible for support as care leavers. This includes helping these young people into employment, education or training and housing.

Our expenditure on leaving care services, at £49 per head of population, is approximately 1.6 times the London average, despite relatively low numbers of children in care. Our outcomes for care leavers are favourable compared to other boroughs in educational achievement and sending young people to university. Our indicators for suitable accommodation as well as being involved in activities (education, employment and training) are also favourable – but not necessarily in the top banding. There is an opportunity to review the service to bring costs in line with London average expenditure whilst maintaining positive outcomes.

The savings proposal would reduce our expenditure on supporting care leavers through reducing the number of staff who work in this service, bringing our expenditure closer to the London average. We would continue to provide support to these young people in line with statutory requirements. At present Personal Advisors become involved from the age of 16 plus in line with what is deemed as good practice under case law. However, it is proposed that we reduce this entitlement to a level which is consistent with many other local authorities (while at the same time not breaching statutory guidelines) by raising the age of involvement of personal advisors from 16 years old to 17 ½ years old. Young people in care would continue to be supported through the looked after children teams until personal advisors are allocated at age 17½.

There is a statutory requirement that all looked after children have a named allocated social worker who is registered with HCPC. All looked after children are deemed as looked after children until they are 18. Post 18 they become former relevant children and do not need a social worker allocated to them. Social workers are also better trained in safeguarding and often have experience of court work that is useful in addressing post 18 legal disputes.

Personal Advisors do not need to be professionally qualified. Their aim is much more to support the young people as they move towards their adulthood. Their skills lie in gaining confidence from young people and supporting them. They take on a greater advocacy role as well. They have a restricted role as far as safeguarding is concerned.

Most other boroughs have personal advisors who become involved post 17 ½ and not 16 like TH. The average allocation of cases held by Personal Advisors in other boroughs is 24/25. We are planning to move from 18 to 22.

Since the introduction of the current 'dual allocation' system for looked after children between 16 and 17.5 years old, we have invested in other services to support looked after children. As a result we have much improved services such as our Virtual School, which ensures that young people are supported in education and outcomes are maximized. We can also signpost young people to mainstream services such as Careers advice. This further reduces the need for two workers being allocated to cases.

It should be noted that young people will continue to have two workers for 6 months preceding their 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, to ensure that there is a smooth handover and effective transition management.



During consultation, care leavers expressed some concern about this plan. They felt that due to the higher case load that their social workers had, the PA was the person who they felt most able to meet their needs. They were concerned that they would find it difficult to contact their social worker and that they would often speak to a Duty Social Worker who would not be familiar with their case. During consultation, care leavers expressed that they felt that the time between 16/17½ was crucial in preparing young people for their transition into adulthood and were concerned about how this support would be offered by their social worker. They felt that having access to the support offered by the PA at age 17½ would be too late. By way of mitigation, even when a PA is allocated, the social worker remains the key worker for the young person. The specialist nature of some of the support offered by the LCS should be offered by the social worker within the Looked After Team, supported by opportunities to signpost into other services. The process of planning for independence already takes place jointly between the social worker and PA, and this will continue for the 6 month period prior to 18<sup>th</sup> birthday. The additional support offered to young people via the leaving care service, particularly access to courses, will still be offered once they turn 16. Care leavers also expressed a concern that the removal/reduction of some of their grants may impact on their motivation to attend education/work. This will need to be addressed by the allocated social worker so as to ensure that young people have access to these opportunities.

In summary, whilst this proposal reduces the amount of resources available to support young people looked after, no significant impact is anticipated due to the support and safeguards that will remain in place.

**2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

**Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?**

No. Despite the changes in staffing levels, all care leavers who were statutorily entitled to receive support would continue to do so.

**Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?**

Yes. Currently, young people are allocated a Personal Advisor as they turn 16. This person works alongside the allocated social worker until the young person turns 18. The proposal is to increase the age at which a PA was allocated to 17½.

**Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?**

No. Eligibility is statutory.

**Does the change alter access to the service?**

Yes. The age at which young people are allocated a Personal Advisor is proposed to increase from 16 to 17½

**Does the change involve revenue raising?**

No

**Does the Change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?**

Possibly. There will be discussion as to some of the grants currently given to care leavers and whether they would continue.

**Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

--

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and, Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making
Race	Neutral	<u>Analysis</u>  From the anticipated impact of the there is no evidence that it will negatively impact any specific race group. The racial background of service users is broadly representative of the Tower Hamlets.
Disability	Neutral	<u>Analysis</u>  There is no evidence that the impact of the proposal will adversely affect service users with a disability.
Gender	Neutral	<u>Analysis</u>  From the anticipated impact of the proposal there is no evidence that it will negatively impact any specific Gender group. The gender of service users is broadly representative of the Tower Hamlets.

Gender Reassignment	Neutral	There is no Service User data on Gender Reassignment. From the anticipated impact of the proposal there is no evidence that it will negatively impact any gender reassignment group.
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	There is no Service User data on sexual orientation. From the anticipated impact of the proposal there is no evidence that it will negatively impact any sexual orientation group.
Religion or Belief	Neutral	<u>Analysis</u> From the anticipated impact there is no evidence that it will negatively impact any specific Religious or belief group.
Age	Neutral	<u>Analysis</u> Young people who access the LCS are between 16 and 21 (24 if still in full time education). The proposal increases the age of eligibility to 17½. This remains within statutory guidelines although it is not deemed to be best practice under case law.
Socio – economic	Neutral	<u>Analysis</u> Children who become known to Children’s Social Care, are by their nature more vulnerable. They will all have some additional needs which has led to their being allocated a social worker. There is evidence that children who come from economically deprived backgrounds are more likely to be known to Children’s Social Care, therefore any proposals which impact on the delivery of CSC services will have an additional impact on poorer families. However, the proposal is to end the dual allocation of a social worker and personal advisor. As long as the young person receives

		the necessary support, there should be no significant impact.
Marriage and civil Partnership	Neutral	Not relevant
Pregnancy and Maternity	Neutral	Not relevant
Other	Neutral	Not relevant

#### **Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan**

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

<b>Adverse Impact</b>	<b>Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact</b>
No adverse impact identified	

#### **Monitoring and Review**

- All children who would previously have been allocated a Personal Advisor are considered Looked After and as such their plans are reviewed by independent reviewing officers. Following the change in allocation age, an additional emphasis should be placed on these reviews to ensure that the young people still receive the necessary support and guidance from their social worker that they had been from the PA.
- Children in Care Council to continue to be involved in the implementation and review of this proposal.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Integration of Accommodation Based Floating Support Service</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Supporting People					REF: ESCW059	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Carrie Kilpatrick	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Decommission MHFSS	2,494	109			109	Delivering Differently	Yes
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>This proposal would review ending current contracts and incorporating the support provided for existing service users into another existing mental health service. It is envisaged that the incorporation of the Accommodation Based Floating Support into another service will not have an adverse impact on the service users or the provision of support provided to them when in crisis.</p> <p>As this proposal does not seek to withdraw or decommission the existing service but incorporate the Accommodation Based Floating Support service into another Mental Health service we will not see a significant shift in the way support is delivered to users of the service. Under the proposed changes, service users will still receive the same level of support and hours they currently receive at a time that is convenient to them. They may however experience a change in support worker although they will still be given a choice of keyworkers from which to choose.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<p>The renegotiation of contracts to deliver floating support will deliver savings whilst retaining our commitment to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The prevention agenda and demand management;</li> <li>• Maximising independent living for people with mental health issues;</li> <li>• The Time to Change Agenda and Mental Health Issues more widely.</li> </ul>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	Yes	The proposal will reduce the amount of support available to for people with mental health issues living in the community by 100 support hours per week or 5,200 per year					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	Yes	This is a core preventative service that supports people to remain independent, so preventing the need for more institutionalised high cost forms of care- including registered care and hospital care. There are though still significant resources available in the ILCS floating support services.					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?							
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	This ends the existing service; although some work will be absorbed in the remaining contract with LookAhead					
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	Yes	As detailed above this affects contracts with a third sector provider					
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

## **Budget Savings Proposals** **Full Equality Analysis**

### **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal:** ESCW 059 Integration of accommodation based floating support service

**1b) Service area:** Commissioning and Health, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

### **2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

The savings from this proposal are £109,000 in 2015/16 representing 40% of the total budget.

The existing Accommodation Based Floating Support service is comprised of three schemes, Bishops Way (6 units) School House (15 units) and St Marks Street (3 units). This service is a floating support service and is currently provided by Look Ahead Care and Support. This proposal seeks to end this contract and incorporate the support provided to the 26 service users into another existing mental health service provision to be determined. It is envisaged that the incorporation of the Accommodation Based Floating Support into another service will not impact adversely on the service users or the provision of support provided to them when in crisis.

### **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

All savings proposals have been screened for equalities relevance using the test of relevance questionnaire.

As this proposal does not seek to withdraw or decommission the existing service, but incorporate the Accommodation Based Floating Support service into another Mental Health service we will not see a significant shift in the way support is delivered to users of the service. Under the proposed changes, service users will still receive the same level of support and hours they currently receive at a time that is convenient to them. The new service will be provided by Look Ahead Care and Support therefore service users will not experience a change of provider. They may, however, experience a change in support worker although they will still be given a choice of keyworkers from which to choose.

**Reduce the level of resources available to address inequality:**

No potential negative impact is envisaged as the service will be maintained and continue albeit via another service.  
**Alter or change access to the service:** The proposals will not alter or change the way service users access the service. They will still receive a support service based on their level of need as and when required. They will still be able to float in and out of the service as their support needs change.

**Involve revenue raising : N/A**

**Change who is eligible for the service:** The eligibility criteria for the Accommodation Based Floating Support service will not be affected, as it is predominately the same as other Mental Health service provision which specifies service users being subject to Care Plan Approach (CPA) arrangements within their criteria.

**Change the provider of this service:** Initially the incorporation of this service into another service will not result in a change of service provider. However in line with EU Regulations and procurement guidelines there is the possibility that the provider of this service could change when the service is retendered at the end of the existing contract in 2017.

### Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

<b>Target Groups</b>  What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
<b>Race</b>	Neutral	The largest proportion of service users in this area are Black or mixed race, with smaller numbers of White services users. A smaller proportion of service users are Asian. Both the current service and the proposed service into which the Accommodation Based Mental Health Floating Support service will be amalgamated were procured from the Framework Agreement, as such there is no evidence to suggest that there will be any negative impact. All potential suppliers are tested on their ability to deliver specific services at the ITT stage. Additionally all race groups receive an improved service under modernisation plans identified through the



		<p>Supporting People Strategy and other complimentary strategies.</p> <p>Buildings and services will be modernised and supported housing service personalised around the needs of each individual regardless of race.</p> <p>Equalities profiling of the current service user group is monitored to ensure improved outcomes are delivered for all race groups.</p> <p>Diversity monitoring will continue to be part of on-going contract monitoring.</p>
<b>Disability</b>	Neutral	<p>From the available data, the majority of service users stated that they did not consider themselves to have a disability, and two users stated they were disabled. The incorporating of the Accommodation Based Mental Health Floating Support service into another will not negatively impact on an individual with a disability. As identified in the SP 2011-2016 Commissioning Strategy, everyone living in supported housing, or receiving a floating support service, will have a wider range of options put in place to enable them to live a more independent life (improvements will be made to buildings, employment and training opportunities will increase and services will become more personalised). Everyone living in supported housing or receiving a floating support service will have access to improved information, advice and advocacy services.</p>
<b>Gender</b>	Neutral	<p>The majority of service users in this area are male. Services such as this that have been identified for procurement through the SP and other related strategies will be improved for everyone regardless of gender. With the expected increase in BME communities living in Supported Housing, service specifications have been written to ensure that the needs of both men and women from BME communities are met and services improved.</p> <p>Equalities profiling of the current service user group is monitored to ensure improved outcomes are delivered across gender.</p>
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	Neutral	<p>No service users identified as having gender reassignment, there is no perceived negative impact for this group of service users.</p>

<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Neutral	<p>The majority of service users (22) stated they are heterosexual, with five users declining to state their sexuality and two identifying as 'Other'. The SP team's long term plan is that services will be improved for anyone living in supported housing regardless of their sexual orientation. The improvement in data collection relating to sexual orientation will ensure that better data is collected to inform future improvement to commissioned services to meet the needs of LGB communities in Tower Hamlets.</p> <p>Equalities profiling of the current service user group is monitored to ensure improved outcomes are delivered for everyone regardless of sexual orientation.</p>
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Neutral	<p>The majority of service users in this stated they were Christian (23), smaller numbers identified as being Muslim (3) or as having no religion (3). Housing related support services such as these are not contracted to deliver faith specific provision and all providers are required to demonstrate and evidence an ability to support service users to access religious and faith based services of their choice.</p> <p>All providers of housing related support provision are required to achieve prescribed national quality standards for fair access, diversity and inclusion.</p> <p>Equalities profiling of the current service user group is monitored to ensure improved outcomes are delivered for all religious and faith groups.</p>
<b>Age</b>	Neutral	<p>Service users are from a variety of age groups, with 11 users aged 26-34 and 11 aged 35-43, and smaller numbers (1-2) of service users across other age brackets. All Mental Health support services within the Supporting People programme are accessible to adults of any age.</p> <p>Equalities profiling of the current service user group is monitored to ensure improved outcomes are delivered for service users of all ages.</p>
<b>Socio-economic</b>	Neutral	<p>Supporting People Services such as these support individuals to maximise benefits, live a healthy lifestyle and access training with the aim of entering employment. Both services are performance managed to deliver against these aims.</p>
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnerships.</b>	Neutral	<p>27 service users indicated that they were single, and two stated they were married. There is no impact in terms of unlawful discrimination.</p>

<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Neutral	No service users stated they were pregnant. There is no further impact beyond those noted for gender.
<b>Other</b>	Neutral	Amalgamating the Accommodation Based Mental Health Floating Support Service into another service will not result in any loss of quality or availability of Supporting People services.

## Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

Adverse impact	Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact
No adverse impacted identified for any specific target group	<p>Once the Accommodation based Floating Support service has been incorporated into another service, the service will be monitored in line with the current SP monitoring framework and will include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring of prescribed statistical information, i.e. complaints, incidents, diversity and other scheme specific outcomes / information</li> <li>• Service user questionnaire Stakeholder questionnaire</li> <li>• Supporting people Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) resubmission of Action Plan (Including achievement of a level B grade of core objective C1.4 Fair Access, Diversity and Inclusion</li> <li>• Scheme Visit, which includes service user consultation, validation of performance / concerns, validation of QAF</li> <li>• Staff consultation</li> </ul>

## Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.  
See above action plan.

The impact of changes will be monitored through:

1. The 2011-16 Supporting People Commissioning Strategy Delivery Plan;
2. The Mental Health Accommodation Strategy
3. Regular monthly monitoring information submissions from providers on service user (or customer) age, disability, ethnicity, gender, orientation, customer satisfaction, religion or belief, health and income status will be reviewed to ensure services are developed to meet identified needs;
4. Regular inspection visits/reviews will take place to ensure Look Ahead are meeting all necessary equality targets and legislation; and
5. Regular consultation with service users (or customers) will take place to ensure the needs of everyone regardless of age, disability, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion or belief, health and income status are taken into account

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Review paid-for transport</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Transport					REF: ESCW061	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Anne Canning	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Review home to school transport provision	4,637	675			675	Delivering Differently	
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>Benchmarking data suggests that our expenditure on home to school transport is £900k above London average. This opportunity is to review all paid for transport provision for both adults and children with a view to making efficiencies and to bring our spend in line with the average. This saving will be achieved through working with both CLC transport service and private transport providers to make efficiency savings. CLC savings will be made through improved route planning, vehicle procurement, depot costs and/ or raising alternative income sources to supplement the budget. Savings from private transport providers will be made through improved procurement processes.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
The review would affect the CLC transport provider service.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	This opportunity is an efficiency review of transport provision to bring our spend in line with London average. Transport will still be made available to eligible children in line with need.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	As Above					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	Yes	From other commercial sources- no equalities impact					
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	Yes	The review of transport may affect the use of depot premises.					
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	Possible impact- to be Assessed					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Public Health - Reconfiguration of sexual health services</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	PUBLIC HEALTH - ACUTE SEXUAL HEALTH SERVICES				REF:CD/PH002/15-16		
<b>TEAM:</b>	PUBLIC HEALTH				LEAD OFFICER: CHRIS LOVITT		
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	7,311	800			800	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>Tower Hamlets has the 6th highest rates of acute sexual health infections (STIs) in England (up from 8th highest in 2011); 4932 acute STIs were diagnosed in 2012 (new figures due in October), a rate of 1926.5 per 100,000 residents (approx. 2.5 times higher than the England average). TH also has one of the lowest GP prescribed long acting reversible contraception rates in London. Two PHOF indicators (HIV late diagnosis and Chlamydia screening) relate to sexual health.</p> <p>The majority of STIs are treated in open access GUM services with 8 London providers accounting for approx. 90% of all TH GUM appointments using a tariff of approx. £170 for first appointments and £100 for second appointments. The savings will be made via four strategies:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Primary Prevention- reducing STIs infections especially amongst gay &amp; bisexual men, at risk young people and people from specific BME groups (black ethnic origins) who have disproportionately high rates of infections through increased condom use and behaviour change</li> <li>2) Secondary prevention- increasing effective treatments, reducing time to diagnosis by greatly increased targeted case finding, improving partner identification and confirmed treatment</li> <li>3) System redesign through invest to save- shifting appropriate sexual health activity to Primary Care (Pharmacy &amp; Primary Care) and community services (tier 2 contraceptive and sexual health services (CASH services) especially screening for STIs, increasing uptake and access to contraception (especially long acting reversible contraception). There was an approx. 30% increase in uptake of the sexual health local enhanced service in Primary Care in 2013/14 and the budget for activity has been increased by a further 30% for 2014/15. Cost per patient in Primary Care is approximately 50% less than those seen in GUM services. CASH services are currently being re-commissioned with a greater focus on prevention and provision of alcohol &amp; drugs screening and increasing efficiency.</li> <li>4) Reducing costs within GUM services- continued operation of cost containment through a) formal demand management strategy with providers b) application of a deflator c) marginal rate for increased activity d) application of a new London wide payment system for GUM services which pays for outcomes &amp; activity undertaken rather than a flat rate for first appointment and follow up. The cost containment strategy will not impact adversely on any user group such as LGBT patients as access to the GUM services will remain open to those who have a strong preference to use GUM services.</li> </ol>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>(Summarise impact on services provided, service users and health outcomes. Outline any risks to achievement of the saving)</b>							
<p>Sexual health and contraceptive services are mandated public health services which are currently under increased scrutiny by PHE and DH. Tower Hamlet's demographic change is increasing numbers of people in high sexual health need groups, notably young people and gay &amp; bisexual men- these trends are continuing.</p> <p>It is important to recognise that we are not closing, or limiting services as anonymised GUM services will continue to be available to Tower Hamlets residents on an open access basis.</p> <p>However, if sexual health costs are not contained it means that other priorities for expenditure within the public health such as tobacco, alcohol, weight management, prevention in early years and school health services will need to be reduced.</p> <p>Through 15/16 we will be closely monitoring and reviewing spend on open access GUM services and will be maximising the use of commissioning levers (negotiation with providers) to keep costs down.</p> <p>All services in primary care, community sexual health services and acute GUM provides services regardless of sexual orientation</p> <p>In addition, due to the high prevalence of sexually transmitted infection and HIV in gay men, there is 300k of additional investment targeted particularly at this group around prevention as well as supporting people living with HIV. This investment is not being cut.</p> <p>The savings are based on seeking to stem the increasing demand on the acute GUM services through prevention and reconfiguration of services in the community. This will absolutely not affect access to open access services for any group, including LGBT. No-one will be turned away from the anonymous GUM services which will continue to be available on an open access basis and anyone who regards it as a vital personal preference, for example because they are anxious about disclosure of their gender or sexuality, would still have the right to present for testing or treatment there.</p>							

<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>		
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	Inequalities in sexual health will be addressed through the four part strategy
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	Vulnerable, high risk and groups with high sexual health need will continue to be encouraged to access GUM services
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	GUM services will continue to be open access and a demand management strategy agreed with the providers will encourage appropriate activity to be diverted to level 1 & 2 services. As stated above the cost containment strategy will not impact adversely on any user group such as LGBT patients as access to the GUM services will remain open to those who have a strong preference to use GUM services.
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	GUM services will continue to be open access but appropriate activity will be encouraged to be undertaken in level 1 & 2 services
Does the change involve revenue	No	Increased activity in Primary Care is already funded in 2014/15 budget and non
Does the change involve a reduction or	No	
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	Yes	Greater local provision of services within Tower Hamlets will be encouraged
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?		Yes- services are already adopting a more nurse, nurse consultant, self care and remote testing regimes. These will need to continue to modernise service provision. Primary Care will need additional training and support to deliver level 1 & 2 services



# **Budget Savings** **Proposals** **Full Equality** **Analysis**

## **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal: Public Health - Reconfiguration of sexual health services**

**1b) Service area: ESCW Public Health**

## **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

**2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

Provision of sexual health services is one of the new mandatory public health services of the council. Tower Hamlets has the 6th highest rates of acute sexual health infections (STIs) in England (up from 8th highest in 2011); 4932 acute STIs were diagnosed in 2012) (1926.5 per 100,000 residents - 2.5 times higher than the England average). TH also has one of the lowest GP prescribed long acting reversible contraception rates in London. Two PHOF indicators (HIV late diagnosis and Chlamydia screening) relate to sexual health.

The majority of STIs are treated in open access GUM services with 8 London providers accounting for approx. 90% of all TH GUM appointments using a tariff of approx. £170 for first appointments and £100 for second appointments. Containing costs requires reducing demand through prevention and diverting patients away from more expensive hospital services to community services. The savings will be made via four strategies:-

- 1) Primary Prevention- reducing STIs infections especially amongst gay & bisexual men, at risk young people and people from specific BME groups (black ethnic origins) who have disproportionally high rates of infections through increased condom use and behaviour change
- 2) Secondary prevention- increasing effective treatments, reducing time to diagnosis by greatly increased targeted case finding, improving partner identification and confirmed treatment

3) System redesign through invest to save- shifting appropriate sexual health activity to Primary Care (Pharmacy & Primary Care) and community services (tier 2 contraceptive and sexual health services (CASH services)) especially screening for STIs, increasing uptake and access to contraception (more long acting reversible contraception). There was an approx. 30% increase in uptake of the sexual health local enhanced service in Primary Care in 2013/14 and the budget for activity has been increased by a further 30% for 2014/15. Cost per patient in Primary Care is approximately 50% less than those seen in GUM services. CASH services have been re-commissioned in 2014 with an increase in both activity and a greater focus on prevention. The new CASH services have had an increase in their cost effectiveness through the specification of alcohol & drugs screening as part of their contract.

4) Reducing costs within GUM services- continued operation of cost containment through a) formal demand management strategy with providers b) application of a deflator c) marginal rate for increased activity d) application in 2016 of a new London wide payment system for GUM services which pays for outcomes & activity undertaken rather than a flat rate for first appointment and follow up e) investigating new service provider models to assess suitability where increases in activity are being reported e.g. The newly opened Dean Street Express has increased activity amongst Tower Hamlets in the first three months of the 2014 financial year by 199%

The above measures will not be straightforward as they will need a range of levers and increases in activity has been running at an annual rate of approx. 10% for the last three years (33% increase in costs) and are likely to be opposed by the current GUM providers. Cost containment of sexual health issues is an issue across London; however Tower Hamlets has one of the highest predicted increases in activity due to population change. The integration of a new integrated tariff for sexual health services should help with cost containment as activity will be more accurately coded and costed. A greater focus on prevention and incentivisation of primary care treatment is the longer term goal.

### Consultation Responses

There have been a significant number of responses to the proposal to reconfigure sexual health services. Responses have been from a mixture of clinicians at GUM service providers, their patients and residents of the borough. The responses have focused on the following: potential for negative impact on accessibility to GUM services, an apparent lack of evidence base that prevention can reduce sexual health need, concerns as to the capacity and capability of primary care to increase sexual health services provided and apparent high numbers of GUM attendees (80%) who are symptomatic. One of the most frequently expressed concerns is that a reduction of service in GUM would force patients to go to GPs and pharmacies which would cause them embarrassment whereas in fact the GUM services would continue to be available but patients would be encouraged to make better use of primary care services where this is appropriate and acceptable to them. The cost containment strategy will not impact adversely on any user group such as LGBT patients as access to the GUM services will remain open to those who have a strong preference to use GUM services.

The potential for more efficient service provision through cost containment and a new payment mechanism (the integrated tariff) has only 138

featured in a small number of returns who have highlighted the potential for increased complexity of GUM patients increasing costings. A number of respondents have highlighted concerns with the process stating that the My Tower Hamlets forms have inhibited their response and so they have responded via the general council enquiry email. Respondents have also highlighted the need for more information on the proposed extent of the cuts and timing of their implementation. Given the issues highlighted further consultation on proposed changes to sexual health services is recommended to ensure that the cost containment proposals and potential to divert activity to lower cost providers is realistic.

**2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

All savings proposals have been screened for equalities relevance using the test of relevance questionnaire attached (Appendix A).

Please go back to each of the test of relevance questions and **using evidence** please provide a more detailed analysis of the equality impact of your proposal.

EQUALITIES SCREENING		
TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES/NO	IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	The resources available to level 1 and 2 services have been increased as well as access to these services has increased by approx. 20%. New contracts for enhanced primary prevention were mobilized in August 2014. As GUM services will remain open access high need groups will continue to be able to access providers of choice.
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	Vulnerable, high risk and groups with high sexual health need will continue to be encouraged to access GUM services and services will remain open access, free at the point of delivery and so these will not be impacted by the proposed changes.
CHANGES TO A SERVICE		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	GUM services will continue to be open access (i.e. available to all but focused on those with the greatest need) and a demand management strategy agreed with the providers will encourage appropriate activity e.g. routine contraception or appropriate asymptomatic STI screening to be diverted to level 1 & 2 services.
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	GUM services will continue to be open access and appropriate activity will be encouraged to be undertaken in level 1 & 2 services
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	Increased activity in Primary Care is already funded in 2014/15 budget and non-contract PH budget spend will be used to fund the prevention campaigns
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	N/A
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	Yes	Greater local provision of services within Tower Hamlets will be encouraged and all level 1 and level 2 providers are based within Tower Hamlets

### **Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

Target Groups What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	Impact – Positive or Adverse	Reason(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
Race	Neutral	There will be greater access to local sexual health services by the expansion of level 1 and level 2 services. For complex or high need individuals open access will be maintained at level 3 i.e. GUM services.
Disability	Positive	Local level 3 services are still not yet fully DDA compliant and activity to address this will be required as part of the commissioning process in 2014/15. Increasing access to level 1 and level 2 services will widen the choice of more local providers.
Gender	Neutral	Sexual health services will remain open to all genders with specialist women’s and men clinics provided by level 3 services as clinically indicated
Gender Reassignment	Neutral	Sexual health services will remain open to all genders with specialist women’s and men clinics provided by level 3 services as clinically indicated. The cost containment strategy will not impact adversely on gender reassigned patients as access to the GUM services will remain open to those who may have a strong preference to use GUM services if they are concerned about using primary care settings.
Sexual Orientation	Positive	There will be greater access to local sexual health services by the expansion of level 1 and level 2 services. The cost containment strategy will not impact adversely on any user group such as LGBT patients as access to the GUM services will remain open to those who have a strong preference to use GUM services if they are concerned about using primary care settings.
Religion or Belief	Positive	The sexual health services do not currently collect information on this equality domain but have agreed to do so in 2014/15. It is not expected that there will be an impact on this domain
Age	Neutral	There will be greater access to local sexual health services by the expansion of level 1 and level 2 services. For complex or high need individuals open access will be maintained at level 3 i.e. GUM services which are open to all age competent people
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Positive	The sexual health services do not currently collect information on this equality domain but have agreed to do so in 2014/15. It is not expected that there will be an impact on this domain
Pregnancy and Maternity	Neutral	The services are already fully integrated into the maternity, pregnancy pathway and there is not expected to be any changes to this
Other	Neutral	Services will remain open access and free at point of delivery with a focus on local and accessible services and

Socio-economic Carers		so would not expected to adversely impact on any other relevant equality domain.
-----------------------	--	--

**Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan**

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

<b>Adverse impact</b>	<b>Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact</b>
None	

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

### **Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.

See above action plan.

The impact will be considered as part of the quarterly contract management meetings of level 1, 2 and 3 services. In the event that impacts are greater than anticipated or mitigating actions are not successful then further actions will be implemented to ensure no or only positive impacts on the equality domains.

As tier 3 services will remain open access and free at the point of delivery if the cost containment, prevention and appropriate activity diversion is not successful then future budgets may need to be reprofiled to ensure services are maintained.



TITLE:		PUBLIC HEALTH - SMOKING CESSATION					
DIR:		ESCW					
SERVICE:		PUBLIC HEALTH - SMOKING CESSATION				REF:CD/PH005/15-16	
TEAM:		PUBLIC HEALTH				LEAD OFFICER: CHRIS LOVITT	
SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY	BASE BUDGET £000	Net Savings 15/16 £000	Net Savings 16/17 £000	Net Savings 17/18 £000	Total Saving	THEMES:	Is an EA Req?
	1,480	360			360	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions							
DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY							
<p>Smoking cessation services are provided across the borough to all residents from a wide range of places including GP practices (the tobacco NIS contract) and Community Pharmacists- these account for 25% and 37% of quits. In addition there are more specialist services that target more complex smokers including pregnant smokers, smokers with a long term health condition and also specialist support for smokers from all black and minority ethnic groups (BME groups)- these account for 15% and 18% of quits.</p> <p>Helping people quit smoking and realise the huge health benefits of living tobacco free lives remains a local priority for Tower Hamlets. We have helped over 16,400 people quit smoking in the last 5 years and in 2014/15 we plan to help 2,000 more local residents become tobacco free. During this period our smoking prevalence has moved from being higher than that national average (27% in 2009) to slightly lower in 2014 (19.3%). We expect smoking prevalence to continue to fall as smokers either give up themselves or switch to e-cigs or nicotine vaporiser. However, the remaining smokers are likely to require more specialist help to break their nicotine addiction</p> <p>It is on the basis of this fall in prevalence that we estimate that we can reduce investment from previous levels without affecting access to services for people who need help or outcomes (maintaining a rate of 5% of estimated numbers of smokers being supported to quit ie 2000). At the same time, we need to target the groups with highest levels of smoking prevalence (eg Bangladeshi men, people with mental health problems). We therefore propose that the 360k funding reduction is mainly from universal services in general practice and community pharmacy (340k – reflecting expected reduction in need) with minimal impact on the more targeted services (20k efficiency savings).</p>							
IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER							
<b>(Summarise impact on services provided, service users and health outcomes. Outline any risks to achievement of the saving)</b>							
<p>Smoking prevalence is likely to continue to reduce through a combination of tobacco control policies and as existing smokers quit- however the remaining smokers are likely to continue to need targeted support and access to different NRT products to ensure they are supported in attempting to effectively quit. As in previous years maintaining access and uptake of smoking cessation services is likely to remain a Mayoral priority. It is too early to be sure of the implications of the large scale uptake of electronic cigarettes will have on smoking cessation or renormalizing tobacco smoking- these may be an opportunity or a threat in smoking cessation.</p>							
EQUALITIES SCREENING							
TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES/NO	IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	Yes	Although the overall budget for smoking cessation will be reduced, the programmes that target the most vulnerable groups will be maintained at current levels ( subject to small efficiencies) and there will not be any significant impact on the resources focused on reducing health inequalities.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	Yes	Smokers with chronic diseases e.g. COPD are often vulnerable residents and the reduction in resources for smoking cessation will be carefully managed to ensure vulnerable residents are not adversely affected.					
CHANGES TO A SERVICE							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	Services will remain open access					
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	The treatment targets for the specialist cessation services will be reviewed and reduced in order to reflect a small reduction in funding and to provide a better quality service and higher completion rates. This will mean that slightly reduced numbers will be treated but with much stronger outcomes for individual patients, targeting those with the most urgent need to stop smoking with much stronger outcomes for individual patients.					
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	Yes	There is likely to be a reduction in income to providers including Primary Care as item of service fees are reduced by applying a cost deflator					
CHANGES TO STAFFING							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

# **Budget Savings Proposals**

## **Full Equality Analysis**

### **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal:** PH 05 Public Health - Smoking cessation

**1b) Service area:** ESCW Public Health

### **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

**2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

Public health has been requested to make savings on services for 2015 -16. A total saving of £360,000 is required from the current smoking cessation services.

It is on the basis of a fall in prevalence that we estimate that we can reduce investment from previous levels without affecting outcomes (maintaining a rate of 5% of estimated numbers of smokers being supported to quit ie 2000). At the same time, we need to target the groups with highest levels of smoking prevalence (eg Bangladeshi men, people with mental health problems). We therefore propose that the 360k funding reduction is mainly from universal services in general practice and community pharmacy (340k – reflecting expected reduction in need) with minimal impact on the more targeted services (20k efficiency savings). These are set out below.

It is recommended that savings should be made where there is minimum impact to both quantitative and qualitative performance outcomes which enables the directorate to continue its commitment to the Public Health outcomes framework for tobacco. The greatest saving, with minimum risk to the 9 protected characteristics, can be made from the pharmacy treatment budget. This is due to the transfer of Primary Care treatment costs to the NIS contracts which led to an underspend last year with a predicted saving for the year 2014/15.

Further savings can be made within GP smoking cessation contracts. Primary care achieved a lower than expected quit rate in 2013-14 as a result of which the funding will be reduced. Due to the low quit rate any savings made through the GP contracts will have minimal impact on the volume or quality of service delivered. A re-negotiation of targets could in turn improve efficiency.

The treatment targets for the specialist cessation services will be reviewed and reduced in order to reflect a small reduction in funding and to provide a better quality service and higher completion rates. This will mean that slightly reduced numbers will be treated but with much stronger outcomes for individual patients, targeting those with the most urgent need to stop smoking.

## **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

All savings proposals have been screened for equalities relevance using the test of relevance questionnaire attached (Appendix A).

Please go back to each of the test of relevance questions and **using evidence** please provide a more detailed analysis of the equality impact of your proposal.

There will be minimal impact on the nine protected characteristics as savings are being made where there is currently an underperformance in Primary Care and also an underspend on treatment costs due to the transferring of these costs to Primary Care. The existing services, including the specialist services, collectively support all local population groups. The BME specialist tobacco service works with all BME groups under the 2014/15 contract. The service will be accessible to all regardless of culture, language, gender etc. The specialist stop smoking service is accessible to all with specific targets for SMI, pregnancy and long term conditions. Both services bring in translators where required and use venues which have disabled access (including satellite venues). Primary care also offers disabled facilities and some translation services and may be more accessible to some segments of the local population. Pharmacies have restrictions with translation and disabled access.

### **Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
Race	Neutral	The BME specialist tobacco service will continue to support clients from all BME groups and the generic specialist stop smoking service continues to be a service of choice for all segments of the local population.
Disability	Neutral	Both specialist services have disability access.
Gender	Neutral	There are sufficient existing services for all genders.
Gender Reassignment	Neutral	The specialist stop smoking service has an open door policy and supports all.
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	The specialist stop smoking service has an open door policy and supports all.
Religion or Belief	Neutral	Both specialist services are available for any religion/belief with translators where required.
Age	Neutral	All services are available for age 12 and above.
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Neutral	All existing services are available to all regardless of marital status.
Pregnancy and Maternity	Neutral	The specialist stop smoking service will continue to fully support pregnant smokers and their families.
Other Socio-economic Carers	Neutral	All services are available to all.

#### Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

<b>Adverse impact</b>	<b>Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact</b> <i>(all the actions below will be included within the overall action plan for the closure of Aldgate Hostel)</i>
None identified.	

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

### **Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.  
See above action plan.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Public Health - Procurement and Non contract</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	PUBLIC HEALTH - Procurement and Non-Contract				REF:CD/PH008/15-16		
<b>TEAM:</b>	PUBLIC HEALTH				LEAD OFFICER: SOMEN BANERJEE		
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	1,310	419			419	Lean: Service Re-Design and Consolidation	No
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
The aim of this savings project is to achieve savings through (i) reduced expenditure on interim procurement support as the expectation is that this is no longer required as the Public Health procurement programme is close to completion. (ii) Savings will also be achieved through a reduction in Public Health's non-contract budget and (iii) technical support for public health needs assessment provided through the Commissioning Support Unit and the Clinical Effectiveness Group will also be reduced to provide savings.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>(Summarise impact on services provided, service users and health outcomes. Outline any risks to achievement of the saving)</b>							
Risks are mainly that delays to contract awards which hold up completion of the procurement process could require continuation of the additional procurement support far longer than originally intended making realisation of savings more difficult.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	Yes	Small impact on Clinical Effectiveness Group (Queen Mary University) from reduced funding and decommission of sexual health support service currently provide by North East London Commissioning Support Unit.					
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	Reduction of temporary support staff as follows: -1 Public Health (interim), -1 procurement (interim), -2 Legal services (interim)					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						



<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Public Health - Staffing</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	PUBLIC HEALTH - STAFF					REF:CD/PH009/15-16	
<b>TEAM:</b>	PUBLIC HEALTH					LEAD OFFICER: SOMEN BANERJEE	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Administrative Efficiencies	2,800	324			324	Lean: Service Re-Design and Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions	42	5			5		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
To reduce public health staffing costs through restructure of the public health function in the context of streamlining roles (eg commissioning functions), vacancy management and identification of synergies with other council functions (eg analysis)							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>(Summarise impact on services provided, service users and health outcomes. Outline any risks to achievement of the saving.)</b>							
The purpose of the restructure is to set a coherent establishment for the long term delivery of the public health function in the council. This is happening in the context of the implementation of a VR/ER process in the council. It will be important to coordinate the two processes as there is a risk that the outcome in terms of staff skill mix could become suboptimal.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	There will be a reduction in staffing although this will be achieved through vacant post deletion and there will be no negative impact.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

<b>TITLE: Public Health - Mainstreaming Healthy Communities Projects</b>							
<b>DIR:</b>		ESCW					
<b>SERVICE:</b>		PUBLIC HEALTH - HEALTHY COMMUNITY				REF:CD/PH0010/15-16	
<b>TEAM:</b>		PUBLIC HEALTH				LEAD OFFICER: ESTHER TRENCHARD-MABERE	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Administrative Efficiencies	1,619	388	0	0	388	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>Healthy Communities provides funding to address the wider determinants of health. This proposal would reduce local authority funding for certain projects including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can Do Community Development – provides one off support for local community led health projects. Funding will be reduced but the programme will continue.</li> <li>• Community Gardeners – provides funding that supports identification of new sites/groups doing community gardening. Funding will be reduced but the programme will continue.</li> <li>• Referral Hub – provides a signposting “hub” to help residents access health activities (this work will be supported from another funding source)</li> <li>• Fast Food Demo – this was only a one year project to demonstrate a healthier take away retail model.</li> <li>• Reduction in non-contract spend – this is funding that is temporarily required whilst new contracts are started up. No service impact is anticipated.</li> <li>• Air Quality – this is short term project that is due to end in March 2015</li> <li>• Well London Phase 2 - this is short term project that is due to end in March 2015</li> <li>• Health Trainer Data – this service is being provided through the main Health Trainer contract and is therefore no longer needed</li> </ul> <p>We will be seeking to secure external funding and support to supplement our continued funding in these areas and will be encouraging partners (such as registered social landlords) to support projects.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>(Summarise impact on services provided, service users and health outcomes. Outline any risks to achievement of the saving. )</b>							
None							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	Yes	age; - disability; - gender reassignment; 0 marriage and civil partnership; 0 pregnancy and maternity; - race; - religion or belief; - sex; - sexual orientation 0 Key ++ strong positive + positive 0 neutral - negative -- strongly negative					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	Yes	Yes -Healthy Communities funding is largely around at the wider determinants of health which can be or particular benefit vulnerable residents					
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	Reduce funding will lead to less sites and less participants					
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	Yes	Will need to recommission so revised services					
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	Not within LBTH but could affect staff within funded third sector organisations.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

<p><b><u>Budget Savings Proposals</u></b>  <b><u>Full Equality Analysis</u></b></p>
<p><b>Section 1: General Information</b></p>
<p><b>1a) Name of the savings proposal: Public Health - Mainstreaming 'healthy communities' projects</b></p> <p><b>1b) Service area: ESCW Public Health</b></p>
<p><b>Section 2: Information about changes to services</b>  <b>2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change</b></p> <p>The following service areas will be reduced as indicated: Community Gardeners £50,000, Referral Hub £50,000, Fast Food Project £87,000, Health Trainer Data £9,150, Contract overlap costs £115,000 Reduction in non-contract spend £45,000, Air Quality £5,000, Well London Phase 2 £27,000 Total £388,150 Healthy Communities funding is largely focused on the wider determinants of health. A number of services will come to a natural end as they were short term and due to end by March 2015. The community gardening programme will continue but with reduced Council funding and support from other sources. Healthy Communities includes a range of projects and programmes – this savings proposal represents a 20% reduction of the overall budget.</p> <p>Community Gardeners – reduction in ability to promote &amp; support local people to take control of their environment and get involved in growing  Referral Hub – Reduction assuming outreach workers programme goes ahead – no equalities impact from this  Fast Food Demo – project is 12 month only.  Reduction in non-contract spend – reduction in one off short term projects  Air Quality, Well London Phase 2, Health Trainer Data, and contract overlap costs are all contracts that are due to end this year so no new recurrent spending</p>
<p><b>2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?</b>  All savings proposals have been screened for equalities relevance using the test of relevance questionnaire attached (Appendix A).</p> <p>Please go back to each of the test of relevance questions and <b>using evidence</b> please provide a more detailed analysis of the equality impact of your proposal.</p>
<p><b>Consultation response</b></p> <p>The consultation responses were very limited in number but did express concerns about reducing funding for healthy community interventions - especially community gardening- and the impacts on vulnerable users. A petition of people who attended the Tower Hamlets Food Growing Network event held on 18<sup>th</sup> October against reduced funding for community gardening initiatives was also submitted stressing the case for community gardening as a means of promoting healthy food education and community cohesion.</p> <p>In response it should be noted that it is not the Council's intention to reduce the commitment to supporting community gardening but there is already a strong movement for this in the borough and many of the borough's housing bodies already support this with their own resources. The Community Gardening project has been funded by the Council as a 15 month pilot and has been intended to provide seed funding for more growing sites to be established across the borough which it has delivered. We intend to continue funding this in 2015-16 but with a reduced</p>

level of funding. It is anticipated that any impact from the reduction in community gardening programme can be offset by an increase in funding from other external sources such as the housing associations that are supportive of this activity on their land.

The proposal has also been changed since the original saving proposal to remove the proposed reduction to the Can Do programme. This reduces the equalities impact.

### **Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and, Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making
Race	Neutral	Some ethnic minorities are over represented within the group that the Community Gardening programme engages, however, no adverse impact is anticipated as the pilot programme is now well-established and able to draw funding support from a range of committed sources.
Disability	Neutral	Community gardening is particularly suitable for those with low level mental ill-health however no adverse impact is anticipated for the same reasons as stated above.
Gender	Neutral	
Gender Reassignment	Neutral	
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	
Religion or Belief	Neutral	
Age	Neutral	
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Neutral	
Pregnancy and Maternity	Neutral	
Carers	Neutral	

**Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan**

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

<b>Adverse impact</b>	<b>Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact</b>
None	

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

**Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.

See above action plan. Impacts will be monitored through the regular cyclical programme monitoring process.

--

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Mainstream the work of African Families Service</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Children's Social Care					REF: ESCW0018	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Steve Lidicott	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Mainstream the work of Muslim and African Families service	2,156	95	0	0	95	De-commissioning, Reducing services	Yes
FTE Reductions	2	1			1		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
The African Families service is part of the Child Protection and Reviewing service, and carries out some direct case work with children and families as well as targeted community based work. This includes raising awareness of safeguarding issues specific to faith/ culture, and working with community groups to improve safeguarding practice. This opportunity proposes deletion of the one post which deals with the non-statutory duties, and looking at income generation options with the remaining post. Income would be raised by charging other organisations (eg other councils) for training and other expert input currently delivered free of charge by the service.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
The change would enable the continuation of input from the African Families Service in case work, but reduce capacity carry out community development work with African communities. There is a risk that the forecast income generation is not realised, although our projection is based on knowledge of the market for this service and we are confident that it can be achieved.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	Yes	The service would reduce capacity to carry out targeted development of safeguarding work in African communities.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	Yes	As above					
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	Yes	As above					
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	Yes	Revenue would be raised from other organisations wishing to use training/ expert input from the service and would have no impact on the community					
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	There will be a reduction of 1 FTE staff, which would be achieved through voluntary exit. Although the number is small the impact will need to be assessed in the context of other staffing reductions across the Council.					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Mainstream the work of Muslim Families Service</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Children's Social Care					REF: ESCW0018a	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Steve Lidicott	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Mainstream the work of Muslim and African Families service	2,156	20	0	0	20	De-commissioning, Reducing services	Yes
FTE Reductions	1	0			0		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
The Muslim Families service is part of the Child Protection and Reviewing service, and carries out statutory and targeted non-statutory work in the community to improve safeguarding practice. This includes raising awareness of safeguarding issues specific to faith/ culture, and working with community groups to improve safeguarding practice. This opportunity proposes raising income by charging other organisations (eg other councils) for training and other expert input which is currently provided free of charge.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS FOR CMT TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
The change would enable the continuation of the Muslim Families Service whilst reducing the general fund budget requirement. There is a risk that the forecast income generation is not realised, although our projection is based on knowledge of the market for this service and we are confident that it can be achieved.							
<b>A reduction in administrative support for frontline services may impact adversely on the ability to deliver</b>							
	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	Yes	Revenue would be raised from other organisations wishing to use training/ expert input from the service and would have no impact on the community					
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						



# **Budget Savings Proposals**

## **Full Equality Analysis**

### **Section1: General Information**

#### **1a) Name of the savings proposal:**

018: Muslim and African Families Service

#### **1b) Service area**

Children's Social Care, Education, Social Care and Wellbeing

### **Section2: Information about changes to services**

#### **2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

This savings opportunity proposes to mainstream some functions of the work of the Muslim and African Families Service and to redesign other functions so that income can be generated.

The Muslim and African Families service is part of the Child Protection and Review Service, and carries out targeted non-statutory work in the community to improve safeguarding practice, and also some casework as and when required. The service also works with other Councils and organisations within and outside Tower Hamlets, providing training and expert input. The team has worked with many organisations both in the UK and abroad and as such has gained recognition at European level which means it is well placed to generate income and become self-funding. The team was established to engage a hard to reach section of the community. This opportunity proposes the redesign of the service, which is non statutory. It is estimated that this opportunity would save £115,000 in 2015/16 representing 5% of the total child protection and reviewing budget. The original savings proposal was to mainstream the whole of the Muslim and African Families Service. However, after a period of public consultation and some further analysis, it is now proposed that work done with organisations outside the Council will be charged for. This would generate income that would enable the service to continue, but with a focus that reaches beyond Tower Hamlets. One post in the service will also be deleted.

As the name of the service suggests, the team focuses on two communities: The African community and the Muslim community in Tower Hamlets. Based on the 2011 Census, 3.7% of the Tower Hamlets population is of a Black African background. The section of the team focusing on the African community was established as a result of two identified trends: firstly, that children of a Black African background were at a higher risk of being excluded from school; and secondly that cases from the Black African community within Children's Social Care were escalating quickly. The team was also set up in response to the issues raised in the Laming Report following the Victoria Climbié incident. There are currently 46 children in need from a Black African ethnic background, and 13 with Child Protection Plans. The section of the team focusing on the Muslim community was set up due to the demographics of the borough: Tower Hamlets has the highest percentage of Muslim residents in England at 35% (compared with a national average of 5 per cent). In Tower Hamlets, the majority (83 per cent) of Muslim residents are ethnically Bangladeshi, therefore the work of the service also targets this community. There are currently 580 children in need who are of a Muslim faith, and 161 with Child Protection Plans.

Analysis on the changed proposal to mainstream some elements of the service and to redesign others is at a very early stage; however this initial analysis suggests that at least some of the strategic and outreach functions of the Muslim and African Families Service can become self-funding through offering these services to outside agencies.

## **2b)What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

This savings proposal would slightly reduce the council's capacity to carry out targeted development of safeguarding work within the Muslim and African community in Tower Hamlets in relation to children, due to a greater emphasis being placed on income generation. The aim is that the work that is currently being carried out within the community will continue, albeit some of this will be on a self-funded basis. The casework functions will continue to be undertaken, other functions will be offered to outside agencies with a view to becoming self-funding.

Whilst the team will continue to do casework, there will be a small decrease in capacity. This will be managed by moving to a greater emphasis on providing guidance and specialist support to the mainstream social work teams to enable them to work effectively with Muslim and African Families. The benefit of this approach is that the expertise of the service will be spread more widely to reduce the reliance on a small group of staff to support these families. The service will still be involved in cases of greatest need where this is required.

The team also carry out outreach and strategic work. There will be a review of the outreach and strategic work carried out by the Muslim and African Families service as it is unlikely that this could be maintained at current levels due to the reduced capacity of the teams. Following public consultation on the original proposal to mainstream all the functions of the Muslim and African Families service, it is now being proposed that some or all of the outreach and strategic work be offered out to outside agencies with a view to these functions becoming self-funding, building on successful work already done both in the UK and abroad. Redesigning the strategic and outreach functions in this way enables them to continue with a focus that goes beyond Tower Hamlets. s.

The outreach and strategic work carried out by the service includes:

- Running awareness-raising sessions on child safeguarding/child protection (e.g. how to recognize abuse and neglect, how to deal with it) to religious and community leaders such as Imams, Islamic teachers and community educators.
- Running “Continuing the Dialogue” seminars with community leaders, community teachers, professionals and parents to reinforce the message.
- Running the 18-week “Caring Dads” programme for Bangladeshi fathers who have committed domestic violence and whose children are subject to child protection plans as a consequence of the domestic violence.
- Running the “African Pastor and Community Leaders Safeguarding group” and parenting sessions. These act as awareness-raising on harmful practices child protection such as spirit possession, female genital mutilation and physical chastisement, and also in practice act as support groups for people affected or involved in safeguarding procedures.
- Running the Reflective Practice Group which enables professionals from all LSCB partner agencies to get advice on working with African families.
- Providing LSCB “Safeguarding Black African Children and Families” training to professionals.
- Supporting and facilitating child protection investigations of allegations against imams and community educators (for example, staff use the relationships they have with people in the community to get information quickly).

The proposal to rationalise some functions of the Muslim and African Families and redesign others carries some risks but there are a number of ways these risks can be mitigated against.

- By redesigning some functions of the service, there is a risk that the quality of interactions between professionals (e.g. Social Workers and teachers) and the Muslim and African community would decrease if less expertise on working with Muslim and African families is available. Some of the feedback on this proposal gained through public consultation has been that staff who understand the Muslim and African communities and are able to act in a culturally-sensitive way are highly valued. Feedback was that many people in the community may stop engaging with mainstream children’s social care due to negative perceptions of staff in the service and sometimes high levels of mistrust.
- In redesigning some functions of the service, there is a risk that there will be a short-term reduction in the effectiveness of this work. This is because staff in the team have built up strong relationships with community leaders and professionals over a long period of time (this message came out strongly in the public consultation that was carried out) and these relationships would need time to build back up if new staff were involved. However, this also presents an opportunity for new relationships to be developed. Following the public consultation and revisions to the proposal, the African Families Service Coordinator/Muslim Children’s Safeguarding Coordinator posts will remain, which will prevent this risk from materialising.
- If more of the strategic and outreach functions of the service are offered out to outside agencies, there may be a less dedicated resource for Tower Hamlets. Ultimately this leads to a risk that the number of safeguarding/child protection incidents and alerts in the Muslim and African community for children would rise.

How these risks can be mitigated against:

- There are a number of staff within the mainstream children’s social care team who are Muslim or of a Black African ethnic background in line with having a workforce that reflects the community. These staff would be able to provide a culturally sensitive approach where needed, with ongoing support from the Muslim and African families service. The profile of staff who work in Children’s Social Care is set out below. It may take time for strong relationships between those staff and community leaders to be built up to the same extent, but this also presents an opportunity. Staff from all backgrounds have been provided with extensive training in engaging with these communities in a culturally sensitive way. The organization has the opportunity to make more effective use of the skills of the staff who have already been trained. A shift to enabling these staff to work across our communities will enable greater focus across the entire service on providing a culturally sensitive service, rather than relying on a small number of staff. This has the potential to improve the service to our community.
- Further staff training could be provided to mainstream social work staff to develop their expertise in working with the Muslim and African community.
- When redesigning the service, a full analysis can be carried out to ensure that the core needs of Tower Hamlets can be met. For example, if there is a need for a focus on a particular topic in Tower Hamlets, this can be carried out whilst also being offered to outside agencies.

The table below sets out the ethnic background of staff who work in Children’s Social Care:

Ethnic background	
Asian	9.3%
Bangladeshi	24%
Black	24%
Declined to state / missing	3.5%
Mixed	2.7%
Other	1.1%
Somali	1.3%
White	33.9%

In addition, 24.4% of staff in Children’s Social Care are of a Muslim faith. 32.5% are of a Christian faith. The profile of children in contact with the Children’s Social Care team is on the final page of this document.

**Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?**

The service does not directly address inequality in the borough, however in public consultation several people felt the service provides a “bridge to integration”.

**Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?**

Yes. Less dedicated support will be available to Muslim and African children and families who may be vulnerable and at risk of safeguarding concerns. The support will instead be provided by a smaller team, although the emphasis on growing capacity within mainstream Children's Social Care team has the potential to increase the resource supporting these families.

**Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?**

No

**Does the change alter access to the service?**

No

**Does the change involve revenue raising?**

Yes- from other organisations.

**Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?**

No

**Section3: Equality Impact Assessment**

Target Groups	Impact– Positive or Adverse	Reason(s)
Race	Possibly adverse / positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Adverse:</u> By reducing the capacity to carry out some functions of the service, there is a risk that the quality of interactions between professionals (e.g. Social Workers and teachers) and the Bangladeshi and African community would decrease if less expertise on working with Muslim and African families is available (83% of Muslims are ethnically Bangladeshi). Direct feedback from the families and staff is that families from the Black African community are initially more comfortable engaging with staff from the same community who will have an understanding of their culture and belief systems, and there is therefore a risk of this level of engagement decreasing. People in the community may stop engaging with mainstream children’s social care due to negative perceptions of staff in the service and sometimes high levels of mistrust. This can be mitigated against by utilising the skills and knowledge of the mainstream social work teams, some of whom have worked closely alongside the Muslim and African Families service and have received the training and developing the expertise to continue this work. This can be reinforced through further training.</li> <li>- <u>Positive:</u> Staff in the social work teams include those from an African and Bangladeshi ethnic background in line with having a workforce to reflect the community (please see previous page for more details) which may mean this is less of an issue than it might have been when the service was initially established. Using the expertise of the Muslim and African families services to build the existing capacity in these teams will ensure a more sustainable model for providing a culturally sensitive service to our community.</li> <li>• <u>Adverse:</u> If more of the strategic and outreach functions of the service are offered out to outside agencies, there will be a less dedicated resource for Tower Hamlets. Ultimately this leads to a risk that the number of safeguarding/child protection incidents and alerts in the Muslim and African community for children could rise. Professionals, community leaders and families are at risk of having less awareness and understanding of safeguarding/child protection if this service is deleted and may therefore be a higher risk of incidents (e.g. physical chastisement) occurring and a risk that incidents will not be dealt with as quickly and effectively. This risk can be</li> </ul>

		<p>mitigated against when redesigning the service: A full analysis can be carried out to ensure that the core needs of Tower Hamlets can be met. For example, if there is a need for a focus on a particular topic in Tower Hamlets, this can be carried out whilst also being offered to outside agencies. The option that has been recommended is that these community services are still offered, however may have to be paid for by outside organisations. There is that risk that the community organisations decline to do this, leading to a reduction in our reach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Positive</u>: Placing a greater emphasis of engaging with the African and Muslim communities within the Children's Social Care team gives staff in more teams the opportunity to develop. . This will benefit families from these ethnic backgrounds.</li> </ul>
<b>Disability</b>	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Muslim and African Families Service carries out a series of work designed to address safeguarding Children with a disability and individuals with Mental Health issues. This work will be continued as part of the work carried out by the core Children's Social Care team and through redesigning the service.</li> </ul>
<b>Gender</b>	Possibly adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no impact on this group.</li> </ul>
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no impact to this group.</li> </ul>
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no impact to this group.</li> </ul>
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Possibly Adverse/possibly positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Muslim and African Families service works primarily with the Muslim community and with the African Christian community. Due to the interplay of religion and ethnic background, all the impacts listed in the "race" section also apply to this section.</li> </ul>
<b>Age</b>	Possibly adverse/possibly positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As this proposal is part of Children's Social Care, any change will have the biggest impact on children. The impacts listed in the "race" section all apply to this section, and can be mitigated against in the same way.</li> </ul>
<b>Socio-economic</b>	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no impact to this group.</li> </ul>
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no impact to this group.</li> </ul>
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no impact to this group</li> </ul>

## Section4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Adverse impact	Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact
<p>There is a risk that the quality of interactions between professionals (e.g. Social Workers and teachers) and the Bangladeshi and African families would decrease if less expertise on working with Muslim and African families is available. People in the community may stop engaging with mainstream children’s social care due to negative perceptions of staff in the service and sometimes high levels of mistrust.</p>	<p>This can be mitigated against by utilising the skills and knowledge of the mainstream social work teams, some of whom who have worked closely alongside the Muslim and African Families service and have received the training and developing the expertise to continue this work. This can be reinforced through further training. Staff in these teams include those from an African and Bangladeshi ethnic background, in line with having a workforce to reflect the community.</p>
<p>There is a risk that the effectiveness of functions like safeguarding and criminal investigations for Muslim and African families may be negatively affected in the short-term, as staff in the current team are able to get information quickly and facilitate communication. Staff in the Muslim and African Families service have built up strong relationships with African and Bangladeshi religious and community leaders and families that have built up over time.</p>	<p>The Children’s Social Care team can take on this role, but it will take time to build these relationships back up with new staff. This also presents an opportunity for new relationships to be developed.</p> <p>In the current proposal, two out of the three roles will be retained, further mitigating against this risk.</p>
<p>There is a risk that the number of safeguarding/child protection incidents and alerts in the Muslim and African community for children would rise if the strategic and outreach functions of the service are offered out to outside agencies, as there will be a less dedicated resource for Tower Hamlets. Professionals, community leaders and families are at risk of having less awareness and understanding of safeguarding/child protection if this service is deleted and may therefore be a higher risk of incidents (e.g. physical chastisement) occurring and a risk that incidents will not be dealt with as quickly and effectively.</p>	<p>This risk can be mitigated against when redesigning the service: A full analysis can be carried out to ensure that the core needs of Tower Hamlets can be met. For example, if there is a need for a focus on a particular topic in Tower Hamlets, this can be carried out whilst also being offered to outside agencies.</p> <p>In the current proposal, two out of the three roles will be retained, further mitigating against this risk.</p>
<p>Women may be affected if the Bangladeshi “Caring Dads” programme is cannot be offered to Tower Hamlets residents</p>	<p>This can be mitigated against by reviewing whether the Children’s Social Care team or other statutory bodies have</p>



<p>at current levels. The 18-week rolling programme is for fathers who have committed domestic violence. Women may be at risk of domestic abuse as a result of fewer men attending this programme.</p>	<p>the capacity to help support this programme. The plan is that this service continues and is in fact strengthened by the income generation opportunities that are provided by this proposal. This is a unique service, with an existing track record of work with organisations across Europe, and there is likely to be a strong demand from other LA's for such a service.</p>
<p>The Muslim and African Families Service carries out a series of work designed to address safeguarding Children with a disability and individuals with Mental Health issues.</p>	<p>Some of the mainstream Children Social Care team have worked closely alongside the Muslim and African Families service, receiving the training and developing the expertise to continue this work. This can be reinforced through further training.</p> <p>In the current proposal, two out of the three roles will be retained, further mitigating against this risk.</p>

**Appendix I: Breakdown of children in Children’s Social Care According to Ethnic Background and Religion.**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Child in Need</b>	<b>Child Protection</b>	<b>Looked After</b>
Asian (Any Other Asian Background)	25	2	6
Asian (Bangladeshi)	574	165	139
Asian (Indian)	6	4	1
Asian (Pakistani)	22	4	2
Black (African)	46	13	18
Black (Any Other Black Background)	17	10	3
Black (Caribbean)	29	6	22
Black (Somali)	31	11	4
Mixed (Any Other Mixed Background)	58	24	23
Mixed (White & Asian)	34	10	11
Mixed (White & Black African)	9	7	10
Mixed (White & Black Caribbean)	49	24	25
Other (Any Other Ethnic Group)	15	8	3
Other (Chinese)	7	0	2
Other (Information Not Yet Obtained)	13	5	4
Other (Refused)	1	0	0
Other (Vietnamese)	7	0	0
White (Any Other White Background)	52	11	19
White (Gypsy/Roma)	0	1	3
White (White - British)	189	56	73
White (White - Irish)	7	2	0
Not Recorded	60	3	5
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1251</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>373</b>

<b>Religion</b>	<b>Child in Need</b>	<b>Child Protection</b>	<b>Looked After</b>
Buddhist	1	0	4
Christian	179	51	87
Jewish	3	1	1
Muslim	580	161	165
No Religion	37	6	10
Not Stated	108	50	43
Other Religion	3	0	4
Sikh	1	4	0
Not Recorded	339	93	59
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1251</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>373</b>

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Public Health - Mainstreaming early diagnosis</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	ESCW						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	PUBLIC HEALTH - CANCER ENHANCED SERVICE				REF:CD/PH007/15-16		
<b>TEAM:</b>	PUBLIC HEALTH				LEAD OFFICER: PAUL IGGULDEN		
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Administrative Efficiencies	130	90			90	Lean: Service Re-Design and Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The proposed savings derive from the end of a one year £60,000 pilot programme during which additional funding is provided to the eight GP Networks to deliver enhanced work on the early diagnosis of cancer. The work involves using decision support tools and audit of new cancer cases to improve referrals, and targeted outreach and endorsement to increase the uptake of bowel cancer screening. The aim was that the pilot would last one year and the benefits of an improved process for inviting and tracking patients at risk with then be mainstreamed in to the cancer early diagnosis contracts with GPs which will continue.</p> <p>These benefits were realised and now the pilot will end; we are not therefore anticipating significant impact.</p> <p>We will continue to monitor the take up of bowel cancer screening and work with primary care to promote take up particularly amongst the lower participation groups.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS FOR CMT TO CONSIDER</b> (Summarise impact on services provided, service users and health outcomes. Outline any risks to achievement of the saving. )							
None							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	Yes	Yes but the aim is that NHS England will deliver the service in future if it proves effective.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

## **Budget Savings Proposals**

### **Full Equality Analysis**

#### **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal: Service Challenge Savings Proposal - GP Cancer Pilot Programme**

**1b) Service area: ESCW Public Health**

#### **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

**2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

The proposed savings derive from the end of a one year pilot programme during which additional funding is provided to the eight GP Networks to deliver additional work on the early diagnosis of cancer. The work involves using decision support tools and audit of new cancer cases to improve referrals, and targeted outreach and endorsement to increase the uptake of bowel cancer screening. The aim is that the pilot will last one year and the benefits of an improved process for inviting and tracking patients at risk will then be mainstreamed in to the cancer early diagnosis contracts with GPs which will continue.

**2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

All savings proposals have been screened for equalities relevance using the test of relevance questionnaire attached (Appendix A).

Please go back to each of the test of relevance questions and **using evidence** please provide a more detailed analysis of the equality impact of your proposal.

Older people and ethnic minority elders particularly benefit from the service but the lessons from the pilot will improve targeting of those groups and be mainstreamed and therefore negative impacts will be minimal. The pilot is funded for one year to trial and then mainstream improved targeting of screening and early diagnosis. As benefits are mainstreamed we do not anticipate significant impacts. The main primary care service will continue and we are investigating whether elements of the pilot programme can be continued for a longer period with other sources of funding..

No feedback on this saving proposal was received through the public consultation exercise.

**Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment**

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
Race	Neutral	No additional adverse impact identified
Disability	Neutral	No additional adverse impact identified
Gender	Neutral	No additional adverse impact identified
Gender Reassignment	Neutral	No additional adverse impact identified
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	No additional adverse impact identified
Religion or Belief	Neutral	No additional adverse impact identified
Age	Neutral	No additional adverse impact identified
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Neutral	No additional adverse impact identified
Pregnancy and Maternity	Neutral	No additional adverse impact identified
Other Socio-economic Carers	Neutral	No additional adverse impact identified



#### Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

Adverse impact	Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact <i>(all the actions below will be included within the overall action plan for the closure of Aldgate Hostel)</i>
None	

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

### **Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring**

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.  
See above action plan.

**Impacts will be monitored through the regular (quarterly) monitoring process that is undertaken with the GP network public health services.**

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Second Phase of Planned Finance Reorganisation</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	RES						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Corporate Finance					REF: RES004	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Barry Scarr	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	3,939	350			350	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions	102	10			10		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The finance re-organisation implemented during 2013-14 achieved savings of £500k pa. There needs to a period of bedding in following these changes. However a second phase of change has been discussed and agreed as a preferred way forward by FSG, which could significantly rationalise head count.</p> <p>This is estimated to achieve gross annual savings of £945K with a one off investment of £650K. This could be higher (albeit generating savings to the HRA) if THH were to be included.</p> <p>The rationale is based on the principle that the current structure of 112 FTE (including trainees and fixed term contracts) is comparatively still high when benchmarked with other Councils, with opportunities for further reductions through streamlining processes supported by systems change, alongside reductions in non-essential controllable spend.</p> <p>Reorganisation and consolidation could be achieved in 2 stages. By building on our HR policies including ER/VR, savings across the Council could be achieved from April 2015 saving £150-£200k, with formal processes for phase 2 consolidation commencing mid-year 2015/16 with target completion of the 3rd quarter. The overall savings target for 2015/16 would be £350k, with a further £595k delivered in 2016/17. An overall saving of £945k.</p> <p>Therefore to achieve Phase 2 it is necessary to :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significantly improve process efficiency both within finance and also within all the connections finance have with stakeholders</li> <li>• Invest in system changes to achieve a significant proportion of the process improvements</li> <li>• Further develop supportive culture change initiatives across all areas</li> </ul> <p>This therefore requires specific investment in people, process and system change consistent with the original principles set out in the overall case for finance transformation in 2011/12 which highlighted the necessity for a second Phase to move beyond a basic start point</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
<b>including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT</b>							
<p>The work involved in streamlining financial process, will therefore refocus the work of all finance personnel on priorities and effective servicing of those priorities. There is therefore a secondary effect from the proposal in strengthening finance support to the Council's and Mayor's strategic priorities.</p> <p>Risks area: • That not all members of the Financial Strategy Group and Resources DMT buy into Phase 2 rationalisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That Agilisys are unable to satisfy the Council that they have the skills and expertise to provide the changes needed to the standard, quality, time and cost required</li> <li>• That CMT do not support the further centralisation of Resources services therefore limiting opportunities</li> <li>• That the development of Agresso and other systems and interfaces are delayed or not focussed on reducing opportunities and efficiencies which will realise the required savings</li> </ul>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						

Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	A further reduction of the establishment for Financial Services, regardless of transfer to a third party will transfer some functionality to the business and will change the way in which finance support is provided within the organisation included access to these services.  It is not expected that any equality strand will be adversely affected.
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?		As part of the project business case, assessment of sourcing options will form a component of the business case
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	It is not expected that any equality strand will be adversely affected.
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	It is not expected that any equality strand will be adversely affected.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Reduction of Controllable Costs - Supplies and Services</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	RES						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Reduction of controllable costs – Supplies and					REF: RES008	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: TBC	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	833	150			150	Better Budget Management	No
FTE Reductions	N/A	N/A			N/A		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The Resources budget for 2012/13 identifies £3.9m in Supplies and Services. Of which, £833K has been identified as controllable and a reduction of 15% is proposed. The CIPFA subjective breakdown for supplies and services includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equipment, furniture and materials</li> <li>• Catering</li> <li>• Clothes, uniform and laundry</li> <li>• Printing, stationery and general office expenses</li> <li>• Services</li> <li>• Communication and computing</li> <li>• Members' allowance</li> <li>• Expenses</li> <li>• Grants and subscriptions</li> <li>• Private Finance Initiatives and Public Private Partnership schemes</li> <li>• Contribution to provisions</li> <li>• Miscellaneous expenses</li> </ul> <p>This would include, for example, a reduction in the costs of printing, paper, envelopes and postage for bills and reminders in respect of Council Tax &amp; Business Rates by issuing SMS and electronic reminders and increasing electronic contact through improved online services and auto updates from online forms.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
None							

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Recovery of Court Costs</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	RES						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Revenue Services					REF: RES009	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: Roger Jones	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
	1,400	100			100	Income Optimisation	Yes
FTE Reductions	N/A	N/A			N/A		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>This proposal involves reviewing options for increasing revenue through increasing court costs to residents who fail to pay Council Tax and Business Rates. Revenue Services collect in the region of £1.4m each year in respect of Court Costs charged to residents who fail to pay Council Tax and Business Rates payments. The level of costs charged has not been increased for 4 years. This proposal is to add £10.00 per summons resulting in the costs of a summons for Council Tax being £100.00 and £160.00 for Business Rates.</p> <p>Vulnerable residents will not be affected as the council currently has measures in place to exempt those residents who are unable to pay Council Tax due to being on low incomes. This means that people in households with a low income receive up to a 100% discount on their council tax. There is clear guidance on dealing with vulnerability in the Council's Corporate Debt Recovery Policy and there is always opportunity to negotiate with the taxpayer on the level of costs charged, where it can be demonstrated that it would be unreasonable to charge the full level of costs.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
This increase would have to be agreed by Thames Magistrates' Court in advance of passing the charge on to the debtor. Some courts have refused applications to increase costs.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

## **Budget Savings Proposals** **Full Equality Analysis**

### **Section 1: General Information**

**1a) Name of the savings proposal**

Recovery of court costs

**1b) Service area**

Revenue Services

**1c) Service manager**

Roger Jones

**1d) Name and role of the officer/s completing the analysis**

Roger Jones

Head of Revenue Services

### **Section 2: Information about changes to services**

**2a) In brief please explain the savings proposals and the reasons for this change**

Revenue Services collect in the region of £1.4m each year in respect of Court Costs charged to residents who default on Council Tax and Business Rates payments. The level of costs charged has not been increased for 4 years. This proposal is to add £10.00 per summons resulting in the costs of a summons for Council tax being £100.00 and £160.00 for Business Rates. Based on the number of summons issued in 12/13 we would expect to generate additional income in the region of £100K.

**2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

All savings proposals have been screened for equalities relevance using the test of relevance questionnaire attached (Appendix A).

Please go back to each of the test of relevance questions and **using evidence** please provide a more detailed analysis of the equality impact of your proposal.

There is currently no equalities data available on residents receiving a courts summons. The change to the level of costs will affect all taxpayers equally who default on their payments and progress through the enforcement process. This is an automated process and will follow a clearly defined statutory process. It is worth noting that the Council is only making an application for costs which the Magistrate can refuse or reduce to a lower amount. within the authority of the magistrate to determine the level of the settlement owed to the Council.

The council also has a legal duty to carry out consultation with service users and employees as part of developing its programme to deliver significant savings, which are set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan. This took place as part of the Your Borough Your Voice campaign in September and October 2014. This savings opportunity was included as part of the consultation and in total eight people responded to questions relating to the proposed increase of Court Costs. The responses were all supportive of the proposal, but suggested caution over the potential impact for low income families and vulnerable residents.

There is clear guidance on dealing with Vulnerability in the Council's Corporate Debt Recovery Policy and there is always opportunity to negotiate with the taxpayer on the level of costs charged, where it can be demonstrated that it would be unreasonable to charge the full level of costs.

The consultation also raised the potential of changing the enforcement process. The collection of Council Tax, however, is governed by a statutory process by which all local authorities must operate. There is very limited scope to make any changes without legislative amendments.



--

### Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact. This analysis will inform the decision making process

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

<b>Target Groups</b> What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users and staff?	<b>Impact – Positive or Adverse</b>	<b>Reason(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making</li> </ul>
Race	Possibility of Adverse Effect	Court Costs will be payable by all Council Tax Payers and Ratepayers where payment has not been made as requested and the accounts has progressed through the enforcement process. The Civica Open Revenues System does not hold equalities data but this change will affect all local taxpayers equally and will progress in accordance with the statutory process.
Disability	Possibility of Adverse Effect	Court Costs will be payable by all Council Tax Payers and Ratepayers where payment has not been made as requested and the accounts has progressed through the enforcement process. The Civica Open Revenues System does not hold equalities data but this change will affect all local taxpayers equally and will progress in accordance with the statutory process.
Gender	Possibility of Adverse Effect	Court Costs will be payable by all Council Tax Payers and Ratepayers where payment has not been made as requested and the accounts has progressed through the enforcement process. The Civica

		Open Revenues System does not hold equalities data but this change will affect all local taxpayers equally and will progress in accordance with the statutory process.
Gender Reassignment	Possibility of Adverse Effect	Court Costs will be payable by all Council Tax Payers and Ratepayers where payment has not been made as requested and the accounts has progressed through the enforcement process. The Civica Open Revenues System does not hold equalities data but this change will affect all local taxpayers equally and will progress in accordance with the statutory process.
Sexual Orientation	Possibility of Adverse Effect	Court Costs will be payable by all Council Tax Payers and Ratepayers where payment has not been made as requested and the accounts has progressed through the enforcement process. The Civica Open Revenues System does not hold equalities data but this change will affect all local taxpayers equally and will progress in accordance with the statutory process.
Religion or Belief	Possibility of Adverse Effect	Court Costs will be payable by all Council Tax Payers and Ratepayers where payment has not been made as requested and the accounts has progressed through the enforcement process. The Civica Open Revenues System does not hold equalities data but this change will affect all local taxpayers equally and will progress in accordance with the statutory process.
Age	Possibility of Adverse Effect	Court Costs will be payable by all Council Tax Payers and Ratepayers where payment has not been made as requested and the accounts has progressed through the enforcement process. The Civica Open Revenues System does not hold equalities data but this change will affect all local taxpayers equally and will progress in accordance with the statutory process.
Socio-economic	Possibility of Adverse Effect	The Council operates a Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme which is a means tested discount operating in the same way as Council Tax benefit. Up to 100% discount can be awarded and currently the total award is £28m to council tax payers on low income. At annual billing this year there were 24,661 cases receiving 100% discount and 10,569 receiving partial discount.
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Possibility of Adverse Effect	Court Costs will be payable by all Council Tax Payers and Ratepayers where payment has not been made as requested and the accounts has progressed through the enforcement process. The Civica Open Revenues System does not hold equalities data but this change will affect all local taxpayers equally and will progress in accordance with the statutory process.
Pregnancy and Maternity	Possibility of Adverse Effect	Court Costs will be payable by all Council Tax Payers and Ratepayers where payment has not been made as requested and the accounts has progressed through the enforcement process. The Civica Open Revenues System does not hold equalities data but this change will affect all local taxpayers equally and will progress in accordance with the statutory process.
Other		

#### Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

Adverse impact	Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact
<b>Increase the level of debt to the taxpayer</b>	There is clear guidance on dealing with Vulnerability in the Council's Corporate Debt Recovery Policy and there is always opportunity to negotiate with the taxpayer on the level of costs charged, where it can be demonstrated that it would be unreasonable to charge the full level of costs.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

#### Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.

The level and number of cases progressing through the enforcement process is monitored every year. Explore the possibility of introducing a module to support the collection of equalities data. The cost of introducing this could, however, undermine the potential level of savings.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Delivering NVQ Support through Local Providers</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	RES						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	HR & WD				REF: RES011		
<b>TEAM:</b>	Workforce Development				LEAD OFFICER: Simon Kilbey		
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Reducing the Capacity of NVQ Centre		205			205	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	Yes
FTE Reductions	11	4			4		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The Vocational Team provide support to the delivery of NVQ programmes for Apprentices in Health &amp; Social Care and Business Admin. The level of support required to facilitate the Apprenticeship programme has reduced as a result of the WFRC action plan to develop and grow our own talent. Managers, as part of their succession planning, have identified a need for professional apprenticeships rather than the more traditional business admin. Retention rates should increase as roles are identified at the end of apprenticeships. New Apprenticeships are developed for which the qualification training is provided by external colleges because it is not within functional capability of existing assessors. There are currently 8 Vocational Officers, 1 Centre Co-ordinator and 2 team leaders and this proposal reduces the overall number to 7. All posts are occupied. It is proposed that 4 posts are deleted from this structure and qualification training ( 1 training day per week) assessments and additional training currently carried by the service will be provided through local colleges.</p> <p>Essentially the Vocational Team in Workforce Development provides support to the delivery of NVQ programmes for Apprentices in Health &amp; Social Care and Business Admin. The numbers of Apprentices supported on these programmes is reducing as new Apprenticeships are developed for which the qualification training is provided by external colleges because it is not within the functional capability of existing Training (Vocational) Officers in the team.</p> <p>New Apprenticeships are being developed in the context of workforce and succession planning. This gives wider opportunities for the community generally and also enhances the opportunities for continued employment once the Apprenticeship is completed. The opportunities for continuing employment for Business Admin Apprentices within the Council are becoming increasingly limited although our Apprentices are, of course, well equipped to find employment with other organisations in close proximity. The number of Apprentices supported by the team is currently 39. Others are receiving their training through local colleges. A further 14 are planned, only 8 of which will be Business Admin. As outlined above the functional capability of the team only allows them to support Business Admin and Health and Social Care Apprentices and apprenticeships are now being developed in areas linked to workforce planning to provide greater opportunity for continued employment, for example, Youth Work, Building Control and Catering.</p> <p>The above demonstrates that there is currently a low ratio of Apprentices to Vocational Officers – even with the new intake this is just under 6 Apprentices to 1 Vocational Officer. It should be noted that generally Apprentices receive 1 day's training per week, with the remainder of the time spent on gaining experience in the workplace.</p> <p>Increasing the ratio of Apprentices to Vocational Officer produces significant savings without impacting on the number of apprenticeships which can be offered. The proposal would involve reducing the number of Vocational Officers to 5 and combining the duties of the 2 Team Leaders so as to reduce the number of Managers within the team, resulting in the deletion of 4 posts in total.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>The level of Apprenticeships delivered through the local authority, will not be impacted. There is a risk, however, that the identified employees affected do not take up voluntary redundancy.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						

Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	Yes	Assessments and additional training currently carried by the service will be provided through local colleges.
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	There are currently 8 Vocational Officers, 1 Centre Co-ordinator and 2 team leaders and this proposal reduces the overall number to 7. All posts are occupied. It is proposed that 4 posts are deleted from this structure and qualification training ( 1 training day per week) assessments and additional training currently carried by the service will be provided through local colleges.
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Rationalise Structure of Consultancy Services</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	RES						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	HR & WD				REF: RES012		
<b>TEAM:</b>					LEAD OFFICER: Simon Kilby		
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
		130			130	Lean: Downsizing Teams	Yes
FTE Reductions	23	3			3		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The Consultancy Service currently has 5 tiers of staff. It is proposed to combine the current roles of Business Partners and Assistant Business Partners. Volumes of casework and organisational change mean that the service still needs to be available to support managers but it is envisaged that the number of posts for 15/16 can be reduced by three with limited impact on managers. However, there will need to be additional training for managers to ensure compliance with council procedures. That training will be delivered within existing resources.</p> <p>At a time when Business Partner resources will be diverted to support the savings programme and organisational change this reduction will impact on business as usual services such as support to managers dealing with sickness cases grievances and disciplinarys.</p> <p>These changes can take effect from 1st April 2015</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b>							
including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>Managers will need to take more ownership for performance management of staff. HR will have reduced time to monitor compliance with HR procedures</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	This leads to overall reduction in services provided to managers e.g. sickness interviews, letters, basic casework.					
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	reduction of 3 posts					
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	Not significantly, structure will be flatter					

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Vacancy Management - Customer Access</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	RES						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Customer Access					REF: RES0024	
<b>TEAM:</b>	Customer Access					LEAD OFFICER: Keith Paulin	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Administrative Efficiencies	4,544	125			125	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	No
FTE Reductions	77.8	2.6			2.6		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
There are currently four vacant posts (2.6 FTE) in the One Stop Shop structure which are not being covered by agency or temporary staff. Deleting these posts from the permanent structure will generate a saving of £104k As the posts are not being covered, their deletion will not impact on staffing levels, service delivery or performance. The balance of the saving requirement will be made from continued savings on the Out Of Hours telephony contract.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Temporary &amp; Agency Staff contract</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	<b>RES</b>						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	<b>Finance and Procurement</b>					<b>REF: RES025</b>	
<b>TEAM:</b>	Procurement					<b>LEAD OFFICER: Zamil Ahmed</b>	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Temporary & Agency Staff contract		800			800	Lean: Service Re-Design & Consolidation	No
FTE Reductions	N/A	0			0		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
Following the expiry of the Council's Temporary and Agency contract in March 2013, Council entered into a new three year contract with Comensura in April 2013 following approval by Competition Board.							
The new framework pricing resulted in achieving 42% reduction in Management Fees previously paid to Comensura and an estimated £800k savings from reduction in agency margins.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
The above savings will only be possible if we can continue to capture the savings centrally as done since April 2013 to date. The savings outlined above is based on reduction on current rates without any reduction in staff or transfer of staff.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
Does the change involve direct Impact on front line services?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
Does the Change involve Local Suppliers being affected ?	No						
Does the change affect the Third Sector?	No						
Does the change affect Assets?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						



<b>TITLE:</b>		<b>Corporate Reserves Contingency Review</b>					
<b>DIR:</b>		RES					
<b>SERVICE:</b>						REF: CD002/15-16	
<b>TEAM:</b>		Corporate Finance				LEAD OFFICER: Chris Holme	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Review of Corporate Contingencies	5,152	3,000			3,000	Financial Adjustments	No
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
Review and reduction of current corporate general contingencies by £3m. The change is a budgetary adjustment and can be implemented immediately once cabinet approval is secured. A benchmarking exercise has been undertaken to review how much other local authorities hold as corporate contingencies to cover unforeseen risks in the year. The amount proposed reduces the total budget retained and aligns it with similar local authorities.							
<b>IMPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
This opportunity will reduce the councils overall provision in contingencies to cover unforeseen risks. However, with decreasing resources, it is necessary to reduce the levels of general contingencies to help reduce the impact on front line services. The success of this change will be dependent on managing directorate and corporate risks more effectively, particular the need for all approved savings to be delivered and non-delivery risks managed within directorates. There is a risk to the MTFP if the council's growth pressures increase as a result of changes in legislation or funding.							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No						
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

TITLE:		Council Tax Efficiencies					
DIR:		RES					
SERVICE:		Revenues				REF: RES022/15-16	
TEAM:		Council Tax				LEAD OFFICER: Roger Jones	
SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY	BASE BUDGET £000	Net Savings 15/16 £000	Net Savings 16/17 £000	Net Savings 17/18 £000	Total Saving	THEMES:	Is an EA Req?
Council Tax Income Optimisation	66,396	335			335	Income Optimisation	No
FTE Reductions							
DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY							
<p>There are large numbers of student exemptions and disregards in Tower Hamlets reducing the yield from the Taxbase. Currently we have 1800 students receiving a 25% discount and 6000 students receiving 100% discount on their council tax bills. A complete audit of certificates and educational establishments and qualifying courses needs to be carried out to help minimise fraudulent activity in this area and increase the yield from the Taxbase.</p>							
IMPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>It is possible that the current 7,800 students receiving either 25% or 100% discounts may all be fully entitled to the discount and no additional income can be generated, however, this is unlikely. A similar exercise was carried out recently in a neighbouring borough with similar student demographics. The borough was able to generate an additional £500k council tax income through review and verification of student discount exemptions.</p>							
EQUALITIES SCREENING							
TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES/NO	IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	Yes	One additional invest to save post.					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	Yes						
CHANGES TO A SERVICE							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	Yes	Within existing parameters.					
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
CHANGES TO STAFFING							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Employment Options Programme</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	RES						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	HR & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT					REF: RES023	
<b>TEAM:</b>						LEAD OFFICER: MARK KEEBLE	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Administrative Efficiencies		3,900	0	0	3,900	Lean: Downsizing Teams	Yes
FTE Reductions		104			104		
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>This savings opportunity will contribute additional savings opportunities and provide information to support delivery of Service Challenge options that have staffing implications.</p> <p>Over 800 requests were submitted by staff for voluntary redundancy/early retirement, flexible retirement, flexible working (reduced hours and term-term only working) and premature retirement, 500 of which have expressed an interest for leaving or changing their hours before the end of March 2015.</p> <p>Directorates have provisionally identified 100 requests that can be supported to progress either through further restructures (in addition to those identified in the Service Challenge process) or without significant changes to structures.</p> <p>Requests are only being supported if they provide a genuine saving to the general fund and do not have an impact on service delivery. Staff in posts that are suitable for providing a bumped redundancy opportunity have also been identified.</p> <p>Service based criteria are in place to take into account requests from those employees working in areas of skills shortages, recruitment or retention difficulties or delivering the Council's strategic priorities. Employees working in roles in traded or income generating services are also unlikely to be released unless they provide a 'bumped' redundancy opportunity.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>The approach has been agreed with Trade Union representatives.</p> <p>Internal Audit have identified the key stages and processes that will be used to manage staff exits to ensure robust controls are in place for making payments and evidencing delivery of savings to the General Fund.</p> <p>Decisions on specific budget savings proposals to deliver the MTFP are an executive function which will require approval from Cabinet to pursue. Cabinet can decide on a strategy of delivering budget savings with an aim of avoiding compulsory redundancies and can consider staffing issues within the general duty of local authorities to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination under the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>Staffing is a non-executive function by virtue of the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000. All staffing matters up to Chief and Deputy Chief Officer (broadly up to Service Head level) are delegated to the Head of Paid Service. See Para 3.1.1.11 Item 37 of the Constitution (page 78). The Head of Paid Service has power to implement an ER/VR programme for the staff within his remit if he decides that is an appropriate way to achieve the savings required by the Executive. By virtue of the corporate scheme of delegation ER/VR is delegated on to Directors and Heads of Service. See para 6.5 (page126). Chief and Deputy Chief Officer posts (those referred to in Item 37 as being appointments reserved to the Appointments Sub-Committee) are not delegated to officers.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No						

Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
Does the change involve revenue raising?	No	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No	
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No	
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	Yes	An initial equality impact assessment has been completed and has been updated to reflect the profile of employees submitting requests. This will be compared against the outcomes agreed by People Board once outcomes are known. Each savings opportunity (restructure) that requires formal consultation will have a separate equalities assessment completed.
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	Any staffing changes that would have this impact will be progressed as separate savings opportunities

# Employment Options Programme Full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)

## Section 1: General Information

### 1a) Area of reorganisation

Employment Options Programme which aims to inform Council wide workforce savings through voluntary redundancy, early retirement, flexible working and flexible retirement to minimise the risk of compulsory redundancies and inform workforce planning.

### 1b) Service area

All Services

### 1c) Service Head

Simon Kilbey, lead Service Head.

### 1d) Name and role of the officer/s completing the EQIA

Mark Keeble, Senior HR&WD Business Partner, Project Lead

## Section 2: Information about changes

### 2a) In brief please explain the reorganisation and the reasons for this change

On 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2014, the Council's Cabinet were informed that during the three financial years from 2011/12 to 2013/14 the Council has successfully delivered savings in the region of £25m each year to ensure it has a balanced budget. At a national level, the Government's deficit reduction policies (austerity) are set to continue for the foreseeable future. The Council's estimated savings requirement in 2015/16 and beyond, even after planned use of general reserves, is expected to be £28m for 2015/16 with further significant savings required thereafter.

Following a period for employees to submit expressions of interest, Directorate's reviewed the requests which were then subject to scrutiny and challenge by People Board who decided whether the outcome would be either:

1. In scope of Service Challenge – the process through which senior managers have put developed and forward savings options as part of the Medium Term Financial Plan;
2. Additional Restructure – situations where an opportunity to review the structure of a team was identified when considering an employee's request;
3. Progress outside Restructure – the employee's request can be accepted without the need for wider changes to a team's structure or the duties or workloads of other team members;
4. Suitable for Bumped Redundancy – situations where the needs of the service do not allow a post to be deleted but the nature of the post in terms of skills and experience required indicate it could be suitable as a redeployment opportunity for an employee at risk of compulsory redundancy with a reasonable period of time and funding provided for additional training;
5. Future request – the employee's request is for one of the two years after 1 April 2015 and is not in scope of a Service Challenge savings option; or,
6. Cannot be Progressed – the employee's post cannot be deleted without an adverse impact on service deliver or would not deliver a saving to the General Fund. The skills and experience required to carry out the duties of the post are specialist in nature and/or require specific qualifications that are not available elsewhere in the Council's workforce so are not suitable for bumped redundancy.

Comprehensive guidance was produced to support the decision making process. This set out the service focused criteria against which requests were considered. The guidance was produced following discussions with all Directorate Management Teams and was finalised following a period of consultation with Trade Unions. A total of 811 requests were received.

## **2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?**

Employees aged 55 and over are more likely to request voluntary redundancy in order to access their pension benefits under early retirement provisions of the LGPS. The impact this could have on the workforce is considered in Section 3 below. However, because of the high number of staff aged 55 and over expressing an interest, those employees who applied are more likely to be White, Christian or Disabled because of the increased representation of these groups above this age. It should be emphasised that this is a voluntary process for staff to express an interest.

An initial equalities assessment was undertaken at the start of the Programme which included an analysis of the Council's workforce against which decisions and future changes could be benchmarked. This EQIA is the second for the programme, which analyses requests from staff and the impact of People Board decisions on the workforce. EQIAs will also be undertaken for every restructure as part of the formal consultation process with employees and trade unions, including analysis of the job matching lists.

A further EQIA will be undertaken to assess the composition of the workforce once the outcome of the consultation processes have been implemented.

For comparison, between 2010 and 2012 when 329 staff left due to redundancy during the LEAN programme, 39% were aged 55 or over compared to 24% of the workforce overall being in this age group. 7.3% had declared a disability compared to 5.4% of the workforce – the information in section 3 below shows a direct correlation between age and disability.

### Recommendation

#### 2c) What is the cumulative equality impact of your proposal?

The cumulative impact of decisions to date on Workforce to Reflect the Community Indicators is below. These figures are indicative at this time as they assume all staff who have an outcome of: 1. In scope of a service challenge restructure; 2. Additional Restructure; or, 3. Progress outside of a formal restructure leave the Council. In reality this is unlikely as not every post in scope of Service Challenge/or Additional Restructure will be deleted and only approximately 80% of staff who will go through an Additional Restructure are expected to have VR/ER agreed.

**Table 1: Current Workforce to Reflect the Community Performance Indicators and Predicted Impact of Employment Options Programme**

Workforce to Reflect the Community Performance Indicator*	Current Performance %	Predicted Impact of Decisions %	Target %
% of senior managers grade LPO7 and above that are BME	25.4	27.4	30.0
% of senior managers grade LPO7 and above that are Disabled	5.6	6.4	6.2
% of senior managers grade LPO7 and above that are Female	49.5	50.5	50.0
% of all employees that are Bangladeshi	23.3	24.5	27.0
% of all employees that are BME	54.8	56.2	49.0
% of all employees that are Disabled*	5.4	5.1	5.5

*\*Notes - the Council's workforce diversity indicators are calculated based on guidance published by the Audit Commission for Best Value Performance Indicators. Therefore, employees with multiple posts (jobs) are only counted once and excludes some temporary employees e.g. those with short contracts. Other figures quoting the size of the workforce in other documents will be higher as they are based on the number of posts. The data used to analyse the equalities impact of Employment Options in Section 3 provides a breakdown of all employees equalities monitoring responses. For disability this includes those employees who have failed to respond to the question on whether they are disabled.*

The above shows the overall impact on workforce to reflect the community indicators would be positive in 5 out of 6 areas. The reduction in the % of the workforce that is disabled is a result of 23 employees who declared a disability that could leave the Council. The reasons for this and the impact on other aspects of the council's workforce are explored in Section 3 below.

Analysis in Section 3 below has identified a potential adverse impact in terms of gender for which mitigating actions are being put in place to address any issues identified with specific Service Challenge options. It is hoped that the Council will be able to retain all staff that want to remain through a combination of redeployment, bumped redundancy and retraining. Staff that wish to move on will be offered support to help find alternative employment for which the Council will identify and work with partner organisations that can offer assistance.



### Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

<p><b>Race</b></p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the policy on different racial groups.</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on specific ethnic groups? <b>None identified at this stage that cannot be justified/explained.</b></p>									
	<p>The profile of the Council's workforce at the start of the Programme is as detailed in Table 2 below. Also detailed below is a percentage breakdown of expression of interests received (% of the total number of expression of interests received).</p>									
	<p><b>Table 2: Ethnicity Profile of the Council's Workforce and Employment Options Requests (all figures %):</b></p>									
		<b>Asian %</b>	<b>Bangladeshi %</b>	<b>Black %</b>	<b>Declined to state %</b>	<b>Missing %</b>	<b>Mixed %</b>	<b>Other %</b>	<b>Somali %</b>	<b>White %</b>
	<b>Workforce (March 2014)</b>	6	22.7	18.7	0.7	4.6	2.3	1.1	1.1	42.8
<b>Employment Options Requests</b>	4.3	8.4	22.2	0.4	1.9	1.9	0.4	0.8	59.7	
<b>Difference</b>	-1.7	-14.3	3.5	-0.3	-2.7	-0.4	-0.7	-0.3	16.9	
<p>The age profile of staff impacts significantly on the ethnicity profile at age 55 and above and this is the age at which pension benefits are released in the event of an employee being made redundant (whether voluntary or compulsory) and has resulted in 57.6% of Employment Options Requests coming from employees aged 55 and over compared to 17.6% in the workforce.</p> <p>Under age 55, 26% of staff are Bangladeshi compared to 6% over age 55. The figures for Asian staff (excluding Bangladeshi) are 7.3% and 4.9% respectively whilst White staff make up 38% of the workforce under age 55 compared to 63% over age 55. There is no difference in the % of the workforce that is Black over or under 55. Initial analysis has not identified any explanation for the higher proportion of Black staff submitting requests although this EQIA will be discussed with Trade Unions and Staff Equality Forums.</p> <p>The profile of the employees within each outcome is detailed in Table 3 below (% of the number of employees that received</p>										

each outcome).

**Table 3: Ethnicity Profile of the Employment Options Outcomes (all figures %):**

Employment Options Outcome	Asian %	Bangladeshi %	Black %	Declined to State %	Missing %	Mixed %	Other %	Somali %	White %
1. In scope of Service Challenge (154 employees)	4.08	7.14	25.51	1.02	3.06	3.06	0.00	1.02	55.10
2. Additional Restructure (120 employees)	6.00	6.00	11.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	70.00
3. Progress outside Restructure (43 employees)	6.82	11.36	22.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	59.09
4. Suitable for Bumped Redundancy (178 employees)	3.66	6.81	19.37	0.00	1.57	2.09	0.00	1.05	65.45
5. Future request (183 employees)	3.10	12.83	30.97	0.00	1.77	2.21	0.44	0.88	47.79
6. Cannot be Progressed (133 employees)	6.58	9.87	17.11	0.66	2.63	0.66	1.32	0.66	60.53

The representation of each ethnicity within each outcome can fluctuate although in broad terms are in line with the overall proportion of requests from each group. None of the workforce indicators that monitor ethnicity are expected to be negatively impacted by the decisions (see section 2c above).

**Disability**

*Identify the effect of the policy on different disability*

Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on disabled people? **None identified at this stage that cannot be justified/explained.**

The profile of the Council's workforce at the start of the Programme is as detailed in Table 4 below. Also detailed below is a percentage breakdown of expression of interests received (% of the total number of expression of interests received).

groups

**Table 4: Disability Profile of the Council's Workforce and Employment Options Requests (all figures %):**

	<b>Yes %</b>	<b>No %</b>	<b>No Data %</b>	<b>Declined to State %</b>
<b>Workforce</b>	4.3	75.9	10.5	9.3
<b>Employment Options Requests</b>	6	77.2	4.6	12.6
<b>Difference</b>	1.7	1.3	-6.9	3.3

There is proportion of disabled employees submitting a request is higher than their representation in the workforce as a whole. The figure of 4.3% is different to that reported in section 2c above. This is because the performance indicator excludes staff who have provided no data on whether they are disabled. The reason for the higher representation amongst requests is due to the 5.9% of employees in the workforce aged 55 and over who are disabled compared to 3.9% below this age.

The profile of the employees within each outcome is detailed in Table 5 below (% of the number of employees that received each outcome).

The representation of disabled staff within each outcome can fluctuate although in broad terms are in line with the overall proportion of requests from each group. The adverse impact on the workforce indicator for the % of the Council's workforce that is disabled is explained due to the age profile of employees submitting requests and the increased incidence of disability as employees get older. However, there is a positive impact on the % of senior managers that are disabled (see section 2c above). There are still 9% of the Council's workforce that have not responded to the disability question on the Council's monitoring questionnaire. This will be addressed through the next staff equality data audit. An additional questionnaire will be introduced to check the reasons why disabled staff wish to leave the organisation to ensure that work related issues are not the main driver.

**Table 5: Disability Profile of the Employment Options Outcomes (all figures %):**

Employment Options Outcome	Yes %	No %	No Data %	Declined to State %
1. In scope of Service Challenge (154 employees)	8.16	75.51	1.02	15.31
2. Additional Restructure (120 employees)	6.00	79.00	6.00	9.00
3. Progress outside Restructure (43 employees)	6.82	70.45	2.27	20.45
4. Suitable for Bumped Redundancy (178 employees)	7.33	76.96	3.66	12.04
5. Future request (183 employees)	4.42	76.99	3.10	15.49
6. Cannot be Progressed (133 employees)	6.58	78.95	1.97	12.50

**Gender**

*Identify the effect of the policy on different gender groups (inc Trans) groups*

Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on men or women? **None identified at this stage that cannot be justified/explained.**

The profile of the Council's workforce at the start of the Programme is as detailed in Table 6 below. Also detailed below is a percentage breakdown of expression of interests received (% of the total number of expression of interests received).

The gender profile of staff does not change significantly at age 55 and the requests received are not disproportionate.

**Table 6: Gender Profile of the Council's Workforce and Employment Options Requests (all figures %):**

	Female %	Male %
<b>Workforce</b>	62.2	37.8
<b>Employment Options Requests</b>	63.7	36.3
<b>Difference</b>	1.5	-1.5

The profile of the employees within each outcome is detailed in Table 7 below (% of the number of employees that received each outcome).

**Table 7: Gender Profile of the Employment Options Outcomes (all figures %):**

Employment Options Outcome	F %	M %
<b>1. In scope of Service Challenge (154 employees)</b>	<b>74.49</b>	<b>25.51</b>
<b>2. Additional Restructure (120 employees)</b>	<b>65.00</b>	<b>35.00</b>
<b>3. Progress outside Restructure (43 employees)</b>	<b>61.36</b>	<b>38.64</b>
<b>4. Suitable for Bumped Redundancy (178 employees)</b>	<b>60.21</b>	<b>39.79</b>
<b>5. Future request (183 employees)</b>	<b>65.04</b>	<b>34.96</b>
<b>6. Cannot be Progressed (133 employees)</b>	<b>59.87</b>	<b>40.13</b>

Although the representation of staff of each gender within each outcome can fluctuate and is broadly in line with the overall proportion of requests, 75% of requests from female employees who are in scope of a service challenge. This is due to the

two service challenge proposals that have the most staff in scope (Home Care and Day Nurseries) having high levels of female staff in the services (77% and 98% respectively).

There has been a meeting with Trade Unions to discuss the how the process of redeployment, bumped redundancy and retraining for staff at risk of redundancy in the Home Care can be managed proactively to avoid the need for compulsory redundancy. A similar approach will be undertaken for Day Nursery employees if there are insufficient volunteers for redundancy. It should be noted that at the time of writing there has been not Cabinet decision to progress with these Service Challenge savings options.

There is a positive impact on the % of women that are in senior manager grades at LPO7 and above (please refer to section 2c above).

**Sexual Orientation**

*Identify the effect of the policy on members of the LGB community*

Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on lesbian, gay or bisexual people? **None identified at this stage that cannot be justified/explained.**

The profile of the Council’s workforce at the start of the Programme is as detailed in Table 8 below. Also detailed below is a percentage breakdown of expression of interests received (% of the total number of expression of interests received).

**Table 8: Sexual Orientation Profile of the Council’s Workforce and Employment Options Requests (all figures %):**

	Bisexual %	Gay %	Heterosexual %	Lesbian %	Decline to State %	No Data %
<b>Workforce</b>	1.1	1.4	69.5	0.8	13.1	14.1
<b>Employment Options Requests</b>	0.3	1.7	64.1	0.8	18.1	15
<b>Difference</b>	-0.8	0.3	-5.4	0	5	0.9

The age profile of staff is not significantly different at age 55 when sexual orientation is considered. There are small reductions in the numbers of staff in each category over age 55. This is due to the impact of more staff aged 55 and over Declining to State (17%) or who provided No Data (14.7). The requests from each group are therefore in line with their overall representation in the workforce.

The profile of the employees within each outcome is detailed in Table 9 below (% of the number of employees that received each outcome).

Although the representation of staff of different sexual orientations within each outcome can fluctuate and is broadly in line with the overall proportion of requests, there are some higher %s for employees who are Bisexual or Lesbian being given an outcome of progressing outside a restructure. As only 43 employees have this outcome, 1 or 2 employees can have a significant impact on the % calculated. Given the relatively small numbers within these groups there is not believed to be a statistically significant variation. There are still 14% of the Council's workforce that have not responded to the sexual orientation question on the Council's monitoring questionnaire. This will be addressed through the next staff equality data audit.

**Table 9: Sexual Orientation Profile of the Employment Options Outcomes (all figures %):**

Employment Options Outcome	Bisexual %	Gay %	Heterosexual %	Lesbian %	Decline to State	No Data %
1. In scope of Service Challenge (154 employees)	0.00	1.02	67.35	2.04	16.33	13.27
2. Additional Restructure (120 employees)	1.00	2.00	63.00	1.00	17.00	16.00
3. Progress outside Restructure (43 employees)	2.27	0.00	56.82	4.55	13.64	22.73
4. Suitable for Bumped Redundancy (178 employees)	0.00	1.57	61.78	0.52	17.28	18.32
5. Future request (183 employees)	0.00	2.21	61.50	0.44	22.12	13.72
6. Cannot be Progressed (133 employees)	0.66	1.97	71.71	0.00	16.45	9.21

<b>Religion and Belief</b>	Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on people who practice a religion or belief? <b>None identified at this stage that cannot be justified/explained.</b>
----------------------------	---

*Identify the effect of the policy on different religious and faith groups*

The profile of the Council's workforce at the start of the Programme is as detailed in Table 10 below. Also detailed below is a percentage breakdown of expression of interests received (% of the total number of expression of interests received).

The age profile of staff varies significantly at age 55 for Christian and Muslim staff. Under age 55, 30% of staff are Christian compared to 44% over age 55. Muslim staff make up over 26% of the workforce under age 55 compared to 7% over age 55. This explains the higher proportion of Christians and the lower number of Muslim staff amongst Requests.

**Table 10: Religion or Belief Profile of the Council's Workforce and Employment Options Requests (all figures %):**

	Buddhist %	Christian %	Hindu %	Jewish %	Muslim %	No Religion %	Other %	Sikh %	Decline to State %	No Data %
<b>Workforce</b>	0.7	32.9	1.5	0.6	22.9	14.2	4.4	0.6	8.3	13.9
<b>Employment Options Requests</b>	0.7	44.3	1	0.5	8.9	13.3	5.4	0.7	10.3	15
<b>Difference</b>	0	11.4	-0.5	-0.1	-14	-0.9	1	0.1	2	1.1

The profile of the employees within each outcome is detailed in Table 11 below (% of the number of employees that received each outcome).

**Table 11: Religion or Belief Profile of the Employment Options Outcomes (all figures %):**

Employment Options Outcome	Buddhist %	Christian %	Hindu %	Jewish %	Muslim %	No Religion %	Other %	Sikh %	Decline to State %	No Data %
<b>1. In scope of Service Challenge (154 employees)</b>	2.04	38.78	1.02	0.00	9.18	14.29	5.10	1.02	13.27	15.31
<b>2. Additional Restructure (120 employees)</b>	1.00	41.00	1.00	2.00	7.00	17.00	6.00	1.00	9.00	15.00
<b>3. Progress outside Restructure (43 employees)</b>	0.00	52.27	2.27	0.00	13.64	6.82	2.27	0.00	4.55	18.18
<b>4. Suitable for Bumped</b>	0.52	49.21	1.05	0.00	5.24	9.95	3.14	0.52	11.52	18.85



	<b>Redundancy (178 employees)</b>										
	<b>5. Future request (183 employees)</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>42.48</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>12.83</b>	<b>11.95</b>	<b>6.19</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>10.62</b>	<b>13.72</b>
	<b>6. Cannot be Progressed (133 employees)</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>40.79</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>12.50</b>	<b>16.45</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>9.87</b>	<b>10.53</b>
<p>The representation of staff from different religions/belief within each outcome can fluctuate although in broad terms are in line with the overall proportion of requests from each group. There are still 13% of the Council's workforce that have not responded to the religion or belief question on the Council's monitoring questionnaire. This will be addressed through the next staff equality data audit.</p>											

<p><b>Age</b></p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the policy on different age groups using the prompts above</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on specific age groups? <b>None identified at this stage that cannot be justified/explained.</b></p>																																																	
	<p>The profile of the Council's workforce at the start of the Programme is as detailed in Table 12 below. Also detailed below is a percentage breakdown of expression of interests received ( % of the total number of expression of interests received).</p>																																																	
	<p><b>Table 12: Age Profile of the Council's Workforce and Employment Options Requests (all figures %):</b></p>																																																	
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Band</th> <th>&lt;=20 %</th> <th>21 – 24 %</th> <th>25 – 34 %</th> <th>35 –44 %</th> <th>45 – 49 %</th> <th>50 – 54 %</th> <th>55 – 59 %</th> <th>60 – 64 %</th> <th>65+ %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Workforce</b></td> <td>0.7</td> <td>3.7</td> <td>26</td> <td>24.2</td> <td>13.7</td> <td>14.1</td> <td>11.1</td> <td>4.9</td> <td>1.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Employment Options Requests</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>12.1</td> <td>9.7</td> <td>16.5</td> <td>31.6</td> <td>18.1</td> <td>7.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Difference</b></td> <td>-0.7</td> <td>-3.7</td> <td>-21.9</td> <td>-12.1</td> <td>-4</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>20.5</td> <td>13.2</td> <td>6.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Band	<=20 %	21 – 24 %	25 – 34 %	35 –44 %	45 – 49 %	50 – 54 %	55 – 59 %	60 – 64 %	65+ %	<b>Workforce</b>	0.7	3.7	26	24.2	13.7	14.1	11.1	4.9	1.6	<b>Employment Options Requests</b>	0	0	4.1	12.1	9.7	16.5	31.6	18.1	7.9	<b>Difference</b>	-0.7	-3.7	-21.9	-12.1	-4	2.4	20.5	13.2	6.3									
	Age Band	<=20 %	21 – 24 %	25 – 34 %	35 –44 %	45 – 49 %	50 – 54 %	55 – 59 %	60 – 64 %	65+ %																																								
<b>Workforce</b>	0.7	3.7	26	24.2	13.7	14.1	11.1	4.9	1.6																																									
<b>Employment Options Requests</b>	0	0	4.1	12.1	9.7	16.5	31.6	18.1	7.9																																									
<b>Difference</b>	-0.7	-3.7	-21.9	-12.1	-4	2.4	20.5	13.2	6.3																																									
<p>In general terms, requesting VR/ER is a more attractive option for employees aged over 55. This explains why 57.6% of staff submitting requests are aged 55 and over compared to 17.6% in the workforce as a whole. Similarly, flexible retirement can only be requested by employees aged over 55 – the minimum age at which retirement benefits can be paid by law. Age is not expected to be a specific factor in relation of Flexible Working requests. The age in relation to other protected characteristics is explored in above in other parts of Section 3</p>																																																		
<p>The profile of the employees within each outcome is detailed in Table 13 below (% of the number of employees that received</p>																																																		

each outcome).

The representation of staff from different age groups within each outcome can fluctuate although in broad terms are in line with the overall proportion of requests from each group.

**Table 13: Age Profile of the Employment Options Outcomes (all figures %):**

<b>Employment Options Outcome</b>	<b>25 – 34 %</b>	<b>35 – 44 %</b>	<b>45 – 49 %</b>	<b>50 – 54 %</b>	<b>55 – 59 %</b>	<b>60 – 64 %</b>	<b>65+ %</b>
<b>1. In scope of Service Challenge (154 employees)</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>14.29</b>	<b>6.12</b>	<b>15.31</b>	<b>37.76</b>	<b>16.33</b>	<b>7.14</b>
<b>2. Additional Restructure (120 employees)</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>33.00</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>
<b>3. Progress outside Restructure (43 employees)</b>	<b>6.82</b>	<b>9.09</b>	<b>9.09</b>	<b>11.36</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>27.27</b>	<b>11.36</b>
<b>4. Suitable for Bumped Redundancy (178 employees)</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>15.18</b>	<b>6.28</b>	<b>10.99</b>	<b>32.46</b>	<b>21.47</b>	<b>10.47</b>
<b>5. Future request (183 employees)</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>11.50</b>	<b>11.95</b>	<b>30.53</b>	<b>24.78</b>	<b>11.06</b>	<b>7.08</b>
<b>6. Cannot be Progressed (133 employees)</b>	<b>6.58</b>	<b>13.16</b>	<b>12.50</b>	<b>9.87</b>	<b>32.89</b>	<b>18.42</b>	<b>6.58</b>

<p><b>Socio-economic</b></p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the policy in relation to socio-economic inequalities</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on people with low incomes? <b>Inconclusive at this stage although there are potential benefits for some employees</b></p> <p>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>The purpose of the proposed approach is to avoid compulsory redundancies which could have a greater impact on employees on low incomes. This includes using bumped redundancies in addition to usual redeployment opportunities. The redeployment process also allows employees to be considered for posts up to two grades higher than their current grade so there is potential for some staff to achieve an increase in grade. Any that are redeployed into a lower grade receive pay protection for two years.</p>
<p><b>Other</b></p> <p><i>Identify if there are groups, other than those already considered, that may be adversely affected by the policy?</i></p>	<p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on any other people (e.g. carers)? <b>No</b></p> <p>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>It is not expected that any other groups will be adversely impacted. The Employment Options Programme encourages employees and managers to explore flexible working options which can be beneficial for working parents, those with caring responsibilities or employees seeking to improve their work/life balance.</p>

<b>Staff</b>	Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on staff? <b>This has been analysed above.</b>
<i>Identify if there are any staff groups that may be adversely affected by the policy?</i>	The Employment Options Programme is focused on achieving reductions in the size of the workforce for the Council to deliver the Medium Term Financial Plan whilst minimising the risk of compulsory redundancy. There is a risk that some staff will dispute the outcome of their request. A review process involving Trade Unions has been included for this purpose. This will require careful management to ensure the bumped redundancy process is transparent and equitable. A meeting has already taken place with Trade Unions to discuss the content of guidance for managers which will be issued in due course.

#### Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered at least one alternative way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

Adverse impact	Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact
Outcomes of job matching (selection for redundancy) and acceptance of voluntary redundancy requests following restructures.	EAs of each staffing restructure ahead of formal consultation. Formal consultation with staff and trade unions will be undertaken ahead of decisions to implement new structures, appoint staff to new roles and make redundancy decisions

Change in composition of the Council's workforce.	Produce Council wide impact of individual restructures and exits through VR/ER and flexible retirement.
Guidance on bumped redundancy process	Produce guidance to enable process to be managed effectively and consistently. Including advice on reasonable training opportunities to be provided to enable staff to obtain qualifications that are mandatory for some posts.
Staff Equality Audit	Next scheduled process to focus on increasing responses to disability, religion or belief and sexual orientation monitoring questions. Also follow up questionnaire for requests from disabled staff
Monitor equalities impact of individual savings options on employees and identify act to address any adverse impact.	Each formal consultation process with employees and Trade Unions has an EQIA produced. Where these identify adverse impact in respect of the risk of compulsory redundancy on specific groups of staff e.g. female or BME employees, actions will be identified to mitigate and remove the risk if all possible.
Share findings of EQIA	Provide copy to Trade Unions to inform on-going consultation process. Provide copy with Staff Equality Forums for discussion.

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

## Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring

Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored.

Equalities impacts will be monitored and reviewed prior to the ratification of all decisions. An evaluation of the entire programme will be undertaken once completed. This is expected to be July 2015 once the restructures required to deliver the Council's savings targets have been implemented.

### APPENDIX A: Equality Impact Assessment Test of Relevance

TRIGGER QUESTIONS	YES / NO	IF YES PLEASE BRIEFLY EXPLAIN.....
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	NO	
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>		
Does the change alter access to the service?	NO	Where additional restructures have been identified they will be subject to a separate impact assessment.
Does the change involve revenue raising?	NO	
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	NO	
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	NO	

<b>Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house?</b>	<b>NO</b>	
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>		
<b>Does the change involve a reduction in staff?</b>	<b>YES</b>	Staffing levels have to be reduced in order for the Council to operate within a balanced budget as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan approved by Cabinet.
<b>Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?</b>	<b>YES</b>	Any substantial changes to job descriptions and structures will be progressed through the Handling Organisational Change Procedure and subject to EAs as part of that process. Only minor changes to roles and structures will take place outside the formal consultation process. Trade Unions will be involved in reviewing proposals for staff to leave through this route.

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Business Rates Efficiencies</b>						
<b>DIR:</b>	RES						
<b>SERVICE:</b>	Revenues					REF: RES024/15-16	
<b>TEAM:</b>	Business Rates					LEAD OFFICER: Roger Jones	
<b>SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>BASE BUDGET £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 15/16 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 16/17 £000</b>	<b>Net Savings 17/18 £000</b>	<b>Total Saving</b>	<b>THEMES:</b>	<b>Is an EA Req?</b>
Business Rates Collection Efficiencies	102,816	1,360			1,360	Income Optimisation	No
FTE Reductions							
<b>DETAILS OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITY</b>							
<p>The introduction of Business Rates Retention provides significant opportunity to grow the Ratebase and gain additional income and also means the Council is open to increased risk to its income through significant numbers of unresolved appeals. This investment is needed to maximise the potential of unidentified RV and also to help with analysing risk of outstanding appeals. An additional role will be created through invest to save, which will be dedicated to improving the accuracy of the local business reduction in the rating list. There are a number of cases identified in the past where assessments have been incorrectly valued or not updated following the award of a temporary reductions. This work will ensure we take a proactive approach to managing the accuracy of the rates base and rateable value to maximise income due to the authority.</p>							
<b>IMPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION</b> including Risks, Audit, Financial, Communications, Legal, HR, Strategy, Procurement, ICT							
<p>There is the possibility that this will not yield any additional income and the risk to the MTFP will remain. However, based on past experience of issues with the rates base this is believed to be unlikely. Currently there are over 580 local businesses that have received a temporary discount that is time limited. There are also numerous instances where the assessments are undervalued or omitted from the list or temporary reductions not reinstated.</p>							
<b>EQUALITIES SCREENING</b>							
<b>TRIGGER QUESTIONS</b>	<b>YES/NO</b>	<b>IF YES - please provide further details on how this impacts on each equalities groups</b>					
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	Yes	One additional staff through invest to save					
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	Yes						
<b>CHANGES TO A SERVICE</b>							
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No						
Does the change alter access to the service?	No						
Does the change involve revenue raising?	Yes	No Change to service. Involves enforcement of current policies.					
Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users?	No						
Does the change affect who provides the service, i.e. outside organisations?	No						
<b>CHANGES TO STAFFING</b>							
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No						
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No						