

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Increasing fees and charges for relevant services over and above 2.5%			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To raise fees and charges over and above 2.5% for Town Hall services, crematorium and pest control services. • Statutory drivers There are no statutory drivers that are relevant to this proposal. • Differences from any previous approach Currently prices for Town Hall services have not been raised for some time due to closure for major refurbishment. There is a commercial market that supports raising of fees for this and the other two services. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Users of these services and potential future users. • Intended outcomes. Continuation of commercially viable discretionary services that generate income to support the Council's statutory services. 			
Live date:	April 2018 onwards			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	Prices are generally reviewed annually			

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal will not impact on human rights As set out in the preamble, the Mayors' Vision for the town will be unaffected and will ensure that the Council is well placed to continue to be able to deliver discretionary services that provide revenue to support the Council's wider objectives in some cases.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. There are no concerns the proposal will not impact on people differently, the provision of free crematory services to under 16s will continue. <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of commercial markets and feedback from staff.</p>
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not directly relevant to this decision. There are no concerns the proposals could impact negatively on community cohesion. The Town Hall will continue to put on a range of subsidised events that support communities from different backgrounds to engage with the arts and each other. The increase in charges will be focussed on commercial events rather than these. <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of commercial markets and feedback from staff.</p>
Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns the proposal could impact negatively on the Mayor's vision. The recommended decision will ensure that the Council is well placed to continue to be able to deliver discretionary services that provide revenue to support the Council's wider objectives. <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of commercial markets and feedback from staff.</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence	
Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its transformation programme? *	☒	☐	☐	The proposal aligns with the commercial theme within the Change Programme.	
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed. This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.					
Assessment completed by:	Geoff Field			Head of Service:	N/a
Date:	5 December 2017			Date:	

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	To assess the proposal to retain the free two hours car parking offer in certain car parks, increase income from short and long stay car parks, reviewing pricing and capacity and usage.			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key aims, objectives and activities To support funding and delivery of the Council's transport agenda by reviewing car parking, while also ensuring local businesses are supported and parking charges are fair. The Council has independent consultants evaluating the parking offer in the town, and advising us on a pricing scheme that reflects patterns of demand for parking in the town centre, and is comparable with other areas similar to Middlesbrough. It is proposed that this pricing scheme is implemented early in 2018/19. Statutory drivers There are no statutory drivers that are relevant to this proposal, however there is statute in place which governs car parking. Proposals will not infringe on these statutory requirements. Differences from any previous approach Change in operational methodology and associated increase in prices including increased enforcement and use of latest technology to meet customer expectations. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Users of these services and potential future users, local businesses. Intended outcomes. Increased income to support the wider transport agenda and enable technological improvements to provide improved services to customers. 			
Live date:	April 2018 onwards			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	Prices are generally reviewed annually			

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal will not impact on human rights As set out in the preamble, the Mayors' Vision for the town will be unaffected and will ensure that the Council is well placed to continue to be able to deliver its transport agenda.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (d) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (e) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (f) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>There are no concerns the proposal will not impact on people differently, the provision of blue badge free parking in car parks will continue for those who qualify no changes are planned to wider policy around enforcement.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes engagement to date with stakeholders and staff.</p>
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not directly relevant to decision. There are no concerns the proposals could impact on community cohesion. The proposal will ensure the Council's approach to car parking continues to support a vibrant town centre.
Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No concerns the proposal could impact on the Mayor's vision. The recommended decision will ensure that the Council is well placed to deliver the transport agenda and economic regeneration agenda.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence	
Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its transformation programme? *	☒	☐	☐	The proposal aligns with the commercial theme within the Change Programme.	
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed. This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.					
Assessment completed by:	Geoff Field			Head of Service:	N/a
Date:	30 January 2018			Date:	

Appendix D

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	To assess the proposal deliver ongoing efficiency improvements within Environment and Commercial Services, with no reduction in service quality.			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To put in place a revisions to the Environment and Commercial Services department that will ensure the service delivering functions that are streamlined and efficient to support the Council's Change Programme theme of commercialism where applicable. • Statutory drivers There are no statutory drivers that are directly relevant to this proposal, however there are a number of statutory functions that fall within the remit of the service. These functions will continue to be delivered. They include, but are not exclusive to, statutory duties in relation to highways maintenance, gully cleaning, street cleansing, property maintenance and asset management, waste and recycling services. • Differences from any previous approach A number of service reviews will be undertaken to revise delivery and staffing structures but there will no impact on the service quality offered to the public. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Users of these services and potential future users, Staff and trade unions. • Intended outcomes. Increased efficiency of service delivery whilst continuing to meet current service quality . 			
Live date:	From April 2018 – elements of revision will require formal staff reviews. Further impact assessments will be completed as necessary			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	n/a service delivery will be regularly monitored and a review triggered if required			

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal will not impact on human rights As set out in the preamble, the Mayors' Vision for the town will be unaffected and will ensure that the Council is well placed to continue to be able to deliver environmental and commercial services
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (g) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (h) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (i) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>All staff within the ECS department will be encompassed by this proposal and there will be a number of separate service reviews undertaken to implement changes where required. Each service review will be impact assessment and the Council's HR policies will be applied, which have also been separately impact assessed. There are no concerns that proposals could impact on individuals or groups differently because they hold one or more protected characteristics.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes informal engagement to date with stakeholders and staff.</p>
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not directly relevant to decision. There are no concerns the proposals could impact on community cohesion. The proposal will ensure the Council's approach to provision of services is maintained, while improving efficiencies.
Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No concerns the proposal could impact on the Mayor's vision. The recommended decision will ensure that the Council is well placed to continue to positively contribute to the Mayor's vision.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence	
Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its transformation programme? *	☒	☐	☐	The proposal aligns with the commercial theme within the Change Programme.	
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed. This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.					
Assessment completed by:	Geoff Field			Head of Service:	N/a
Date:	30 January 2018			Date:	

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	To assess the impact of the proposal to cease of parts of the Ayresome Industries operation due to lack of demand for goods produced and to remove continuing budget pressure, ensuring the staff are redeployed into other Council services, or supported to obtain appropriate alternative employment.			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>Description:</p>	<p>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities <p>The proposal is to withdraw from manufacturing of mechanical brushes, retention of commercial waste functions relocated within the wider Environment services both structurally and geographically. The objective are to reduce the current deficit experienced by the service and further embed disabled employees within Environment services in roles that enable them to progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) <p>There are no statutory drivers in relation to provision of the service, however there are legislative requirements which govern disabled employees rights. The service is a bespoke part of the Council set up originally to support disabled people in employment and assist them into moving into the wider workplace. This model has not been effective in delivering this aim for many of the current employees. The proposal seeks to improve the way the Council supports disabled employees. Under the proposal, employees needs will be assessed and suitable redeployment opportunities identified, including provision of support and other adjustments that might be necessary to meet their needs. It is not anticipated that any employee with a disability will be made statutorily redundant as a result of this review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences from any previous approach <p>Previously brush making and confidential waste services provided by Ayresome Industries. Under the proposal the brush making would cease all staff would be supported through this process and offered redeployment opportunities that are suitable for their needs, matching current hours and grades. The proposal will involve a physical move of premises and staff will also be supported in this as well, with provision of support to ensure that staff understand transport options available to them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) <p>Staff affected by the proposal and their families and carers who will be engaged where staff need additional support to understand the proposals. Current customers of the services. Shaw Trust, current providers of new employees through the referral process</p> <p>Intended outcomes.</p> <p>Withdrawal from the manufacture of mechanical brushes, redeployment of staff into other appropriate roles and provision of an improved route into employment with wider supported opportunities for employment of people with additional support needs in Environment services.</p>
<p>Live date:</p>	<p>Staff consultation is planned to commence by the beginning of June 2018, implementation to commence from September 2018 though dates may extend depending on employee needs around the consultation process and any transition period</p>
<p>Lifespan:</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Date of next review:</p>	<p>n/a service delivery of relevant elements will be regularly monitored and a review triggered if required</p>

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>There are no concerns that the proposal could impact negatively on human rights. The proposals have been designed to positively support people with additional needs in Employment. It is anticipated that opportunities for the current group of Ayresome Industries employees will be enhanced by the proposal to further embed them into the core environment services and these opportunities will continue to be provided to potential future employees through continued engagement with Shaw Trust.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current additional needs of employments that have been mapped against integration opportunities within the service, this will be further developed in partnership with the employees and their representatives.</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
<p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>This proposal is particularly relevant to the disability protected characteristic because of the nature of the service. The makeup of the service means that it is also relevant to the gender protected characteristic, the vast majority of whom are male. There are 17 staff affected by this proposal. At this stage impacts are uncertain at an individual level. While it is not anticipated that any individuals will be adversely impacted because of the commitment to maintenance of current hours and grades and redeployment into appropriate roles, work will need to be undertaken to explore in further detail, with individuals, their needs to enable an assessment of appropriate redeployment opportunities. Following completion of this exercise a stage 2 will be completed to assess the impact of the detailed proposal, prior to formal consultation with staff. A project group has been established to manage this project and ensure the needs of employees in Ayresome Industries are identified, recognised and accommodated throughout this review and implementation.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes current understanding of needs of service users, feedback to date from staff and the public.</p>
<p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion. The workforce in question are employed from across the Tees Valley. Under the proposals employment opportunities for those with additional needs will be maintained and enhanced.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes current understanding of needs of service users, feedback to date from staff and the public..</p>

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
Middlesbrough 2025 – Our Vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal will impact positively on the Mayor’s vision, increasing the diversity of employment opportunities for employees with additional needs and increasing opportunities to progress within the organisation. The proposal will move away from the traditional model which has not successfully supported the current employees to move into mainstream employment which was its key aim. Evidence used to inform this assessment analysis of staff turnover and engagement with stakeholders to date.
Organisational management / Change Programme Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council’s services as set out in its Change Programme?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal is in line with the Change Programme. The review is to address the current declining income and the resultant deficit of £100k per annum, while aiming to mitigate the impact on staff. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes budget figures for the services and engagement to date with stakeholders.
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.				

Assessment completed by:	Martin Shepherd	Head of Service:	n/a
Date:	30 January 2018	Date:	n/a

Appendix D

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	To assess the impact of the proposal to make savings from joint commissioning of Public Health services with Redcar and Cleveland BC.			
Coverage:	Cross-cutting			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To exploit economies of scale to deliver improved services at lower cost while also increasing the resilience of public health teams in Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland. • Statutory drivers Public health functions were transferred to local authorities for delivering public health functions by the Health and Social Care Act 2012. • Differences from any previous approach Currently two separate services have been merged and are in transition to fully merge, merging of commissioning is the logical next step to provide improved commissioning for residents in both areas. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Users of these services and potential future users. Staff that will be delivering joint commissioning and external partners who work on a south tees footprint that have an interest in the commissioned services and are impacted by them including CCG, police, NHS trust and TEWV. • Intended outcomes. Long term sustainability of the service and increasing in capacity to ensure effective future public health services for the South Tees. 			
Live date:	April 2018 onwards			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	Commissioning intentions to be regularly reviewed along with effectiveness of commissioned services. If concerns were raised by these processes a fundamental review of joint commissioning would be undertaken.			

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal will not impact negatively on Human Rights. It will ensure that the Councils are well placed to continue to be able to commission services and directly deliver, based on fundamental assessments of needs and emerging needs to support families and individuals to have more positive outcomes in life. The proposals will indirectly support human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (j) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (k) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (l) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The proposal is potentially relevant to all protected characteristics because of the nature of the service. The proposal will positively on individuals and communities, using the JSNAs to understand population needs and where they differ in outcomes that can be related back to one or more characteristics. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes engagement to date on the merger of the two services, feedback from JSNA delivery groups and staff consultation.
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns the proposals could impact negatively on community cohesion. The proposal is that joint commissioning will use an asset based approach, engaging the communities in design delivery of services to enhance outcomes and community engagement. This should have a positive impact on cohesion which will be measures as part of project delivery assessments. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes engagement to date with staff, current providers and key stakeholders on the approach of the merged service.
Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There are no concerns the proposal could impact negatively on the Mayor's vision. The recommended decision will ensure that the Council is well placed to be able to deliver its public health services which contribute directly to deliver of the vision's key aims. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of commercial markets and feedback from staff.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response	Evidence			
<p>Organisational management / transformation</p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its transformation programme? *</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="background-color: #90EE90; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="background-color: #FFD700; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="background-color: #FFD700; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal aligns with the partnership theme within the Change Programme.</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed. <p>This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.</p>					
<p>Assessment completed by:</p>	<p>Lindsay Cook</p>	<p>Head of Service: N/a</p>			
<p>Date:</p>	<p>21 December 2017</p>	<p>Date:</p>			

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Assess the impact of the proposal to jointly commission with local partners a single offer to adults with multiple complex needs, achieving a 20% saving in current expenditure			
Coverage:	Cross-cutting.			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>Description:</p>	<p>Key aims, objectives and activities</p> <p>To take a partnerships approach by providers and commissioners that places the person at the centre of planning and shares responsibility for risks and outcomes, moving from individual packages of support currently in place for people with highly complex presentations.</p> <p>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</p> <p>Statutory drivers include, but are not exclusive to, a statutory obligation through the Homelessness Act 2002 and the Homelessness (Priority Need for Accommodation) (England) Order 2002 to strengthen the assistance available to people who are homeless or threatened with homelessness by extending the priority need categories to homeless 16 and 17 year olds; care leavers aged 18,19 and 20; people who are vulnerable as a result of time spent in care, the armed forces, prison or custody, and people who are vulnerable because they have fled their home because of violence.</p> <p>Differences from any previous approach</p> <p>Currently the Council and partners commission a range of services individually, leading to duplication and gaps in provision. Existing services do not effectively and efficiently support people with multiple needs and are not integrated around the needs of the person, so do not improve individual outcomes or ensure the best use of resources. Under the proposal one coherent service would be put in place.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries</p> <p>Internal -Public Health, Adult’s Social Care, Children’s Social Care, Early Help, Economic Development, Welfare Rights, Housing Benefits</p> <p>External – Current and potential future customers, existing Allied Services, Health, Customers, Best Practice/Academia/Research, Criminal Justice, Landlords, Local and Central Government, Voluntary Sector</p> <p>Intended outcomes</p> <p>To establish a more collaborative, integrated and strategic approach to how the organisation commission and deliver services, with the aim of reducing costs, improving service user experience and improving outcomes of local residents.</p>
<p>Live date:</p>	<p>March 2019</p>
<p>Lifespan:</p>	<p>March 2019 – March 2024</p>
<p>Date of next review:</p>	<p>January 2023</p>

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal will be designed to ensure human rights are better supported through delivery of services that are person centred. However, it is uncertain at this stage that proposals could impact adversely on human rights.</p>
<p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>This duty will be considered in the development of the new service and any tenders, restructures or partnership working arrangements that are put in place to deliver it. During the next 6 months negotiations with partners will be undertaken to refine the structure. Therefore at this point the impact on equalities is unknown, however it is likely to be positive, supporting those less likely to achieve good outcomes. Prior to any final decision to implement, a stage two impact assessment will be completed and considered by an appropriate decision maker at that point</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is uncertain at this stage that a person centred approach to the provision of services could result in an adverse impact on community cohesion.
Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposals will impact positively on the Mayor's vision. Implementation of improved services for those with complex needs will have a positive impact on a number of elements within the vision.
Organisational management / Change Programme Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its Change Programme?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal is in line with the partnerships theme of the change programme and will be delivered within its programme management structure.
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.				

Assessment completed by:	Julie Marsden	Head of Service:	Marion Walker
Date:	21/12/17	Date:	21/12/17

Appendix D

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Assess the impact of the proposal to establish a more effective and efficient money advice service, through an improved customer journey and a proactive approach to improving outcomes of local residents, achieving a £40,000 saving in current expenditure.			
Coverage:	Cross-cutting.			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p>Description:</p>	<p>Key aims, objectives and activities</p> <p>To ensure the development of welfare rights/financial inclusion takes place within a strategic framework that encourages joined-up, evidence-based and outcome-focused approaches, which respond to need and complement existing provision, especially with future anticipated increase in demand as a result of the welfare reform changes. This should include developing more consistent approaches to strengthen partnership working and contractual agreements between funders and providers, by re-establishing a service delivery model to improve access to provision.</p> <p>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference)</p> <p>Statutory drivers include, but are not exclusive to, Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 – contains a duty to provide information to clients; Local Authority Social Services Act 1970 – fairer charging guidance requires the LA to ensure benefit advice is available from staff; Children (Leaving Care) Act 2000 – a duty to help care leavers including appropriate benefits advice; and Courts consider whether benefits advice has been offered to tenants facing repossession. In addition the Welfare Reform Act 2012 and the roll out of Universal Credit.</p> <p>Differences from any previous approach</p> <p>There currently exists a diverse landscape of money advice provision in Middlesbrough, comprising national providers, local networks, the local authority and third sector providers. Benefits of having multiple providers can include greater innovation, improved choice, more resilience and more effective targeting of niche groups and services. Equally, however, it can also result in elements of duplication, gaps, customer confusion and unevenly distributed provision. Under the proposal there is an opportunity to simplify the customer journey and ensure, via an effective triage system, that need is properly identified and acted upon efficiently.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries</p> <p>Internal -Public Health, Adult’s Social Care, Children’s Social Care, Community Support, Housing Benefits, Estates</p> <p>External – Current and potential future customers, existing Allied Services, Health, Customers, Landlords, Local and Central Government</p> <p>Intended outcomes</p> <p>To establish a more effective and efficient money advice service, through an improved customer journey and a proactive approach to improving outcomes of local residents.</p>
<p>Live date:</p>	<p>March 2019</p>
<p>Lifespan:</p>	<p>March 2019 Ongoing</p>
<p>Date of next review:</p>	<p>March 2020</p>

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal will be designed to ensure human rights are better supported through a joined-up, evidence-based and outcome-focused approaches to service delivery. There are no concerns at this stage that proposals could impact adversely on human rights.

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
<p>Equality</p> <p>Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>This duty will be considered in the development of the new service and any tenders, restructures or partnership working arrangements that are put in place to deliver it. During the next 6 months negotiations with partners will be undertaken to refine the structure. Therefore at this point the impact on equalities is unknown, however it is likely to be positive, supporting those less likely to achieve good outcomes. Prior to any final decision to implement, a stage two impact assessment will be completed and considered by an appropriate decision maker at that point</p>
<p>Community cohesion</p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no concerns that a through a joined-up, evidence-based and outcome-focused approaches to the provision of services could result in an adverse impact on community cohesion.</p>

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposals will impact positively on the Mayor's vision. Implementation of improved services for those in financial hardship will have a positive impact on a number of elements within the vision.
Organisational management / Change Programme Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its Change Programme?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal is in line with the partnerships theme of the change programme and will be delivered within its programme management structure.
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.				

Assessment completed by:	Julie Marsden	Head of Service:	Marion Walker
Date:	20/12/17	Date:	20/12/2017

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	To assess the proposal to establish a joint Community Safety service with one or more local partners in line with the Mayor's promise on this issue.			
Coverage:	Service specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u></p> <p>To transform the future operation Community Safety services, delivering them in partnership going forward and achieving efficiencies as a result and an improved service to the public by removing duplication and bottle necks where there is overlap in service delivery using process mapping.</p> <p><u>Statutory drivers</u> The service contributes towards delivery of a number of statutory duties that are placed upon the Council including, but not exclusive to, the Crime and Disorder Act and Selective landlord legislation.</p> <p><u>Differences from any previous approach</u> Currently services are in house, they will remain in house but integrated with other partners more effectively which will in changes to the way the service works and financial savings.</p> <p><u>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</u> Key stakeholders include the public, staff within the service and partners that will be involved who are already engaged in multi-agency meetings.</p> <p><u>Intended outcomes</u> A remodelled local authority nursery provision that does not undercut the market and have an appropriate staffing structure to support delivery to enable them to maintain their good and outstanding Ofsted ratings.</p>			
Live date:	April 2018 onwards			
Lifespan:	Ongoing until service monitoring identifies the need for a further review			
Date of next review:	A desktop review of the changes to be undertaken 6 months from implementation, to assess whether there had been any unforeseen disproportionate adverse impacts. Non anticipated but if any are found the review will be formalised.			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *</p>	☒	☐	☐	The proposal will indirectly support human rights by improving the service offered to the public in particular those with multi-agency needs / engagements with different agencies that come into contact with the service and the services of partners. There are no concerns that this proposal could have an adverse impact on these rights. Evidence to support this includes analysis of the proposal and feedback from partners.

Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

<p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; • advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and • foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; • taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and • encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. <p>This proposal will improve delivery of the service to all, it is anticipated that the proposals will improve services delivered to the public, providing and joined up approach to community safety across partners.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment local best practise, feedback from partners, feedback from stakeholders including local businesses and analysis from the pilot put in place to test this proposal.</p>
---	---	---	---	--

Appendix D

				<p>Staff – 26 staff work across within the community safety team that will be integrated more closely, either as a result of locality changes or process changes, with partners as a result of this proposal. No formal staffing review is anticipated to be required to deliver this new model of service. If in the future one id required a separate impact assessment will be completed as part of a formal service review.</p>
<p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal will have a positive impact on community cohesion. By moving to multi-agency model, the approach to community cohesion will be strengthened across the town by improving the ability of the Council and its partners to work across organisations on community safety matters that can impact on community cohesion.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that service users and / or the wider community have any concerns about the impact of the proposals on community cohesion.</p>
<p>Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The service contributes to the Middlesbrough 2025 Visions of a Fairer, Safer, Stronger Middlesbrough, supporting all three aims of the vision, supporting the Mayor’s promise to further reduce the impact of crime and ASB. This proposal delivers the specific promise of the Mayor to pool resources with partners including the police to tackle crime and ASB.</p> <p>The service contributes to the Early Help Strategy in Middlesbrough.</p>
<p>Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council’s services as set out in its transformation programme? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>This proposal aligns with the principles of the Change Programme and is included within the scope of Change Programme phase 3.</p>
<p>Next steps:</p> <p>➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.</p> <p>➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.</p>				
<p>Assessment completed by:</p>	Marion Walker		<p>Head of Service:</p>	Marion Walker
<p>Date:</p>	28 November 2017		<p>Date:</p>	28 November 2017

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	To assess the proposal to implement a service review within the Performance and Partnerships service to realise savings from digital initiatives such as online self-serve for customers			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To put in place a service review that will ensure the service is well placed to meet the ambitions of the Council, providing services that ensure good corporate governance processes are in place and that the change programme and the themes within it are effectively supported and service structures are aligned with the Change Programme's strategic direction, in particular the Digital by Design theme, in particular the ongoing implementation of Business Intelligence, the Information and Customer Strategies. • Statutory drivers There are no statutory drivers that are directly relevant to this proposal, however there are a number of statutory functions that fall within the remit of the service. These functions will continue to be delivered. They include, but are not exclusive to, statutory duties in relation to risk management, data protection, business continuity, freedom of information, corporate complaints, Subject Access Requests and Environmental Information Request Regulations. • Differences from any previous approach The review will ensure the Council increases the use of digital initiatives such as online self serve to reduce back office costs. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Users of these services and potential future users, Staff and trade unions. • Intended outcomes. Increased provision of digital services which improve services for internal and external customers, streamlining processes where possible. Provision of a service which is able to continue to provide services that ensure compliance with statute and case law, within a reduced cost envelope . 			
Live date:	Staff consultation to commence from February 2018 prior to a final decision being taken on structures from April 2018 onwards			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	n/a service delivery will be regularly monitored and a review triggered if required			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>The proposal will not impact on human rights As set out in the preamble, the Mayors’ Vision for the town will be unaffected and will ensure that the Council is well placed to continue to be able to deliver the digital agenda and continue to provide services that contribute towards effective corporate governance across the Council.</p>
<p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (m) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (n) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (o) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>There are circa 60 staff within the scope of the proposed review. At this stage there are no concerns that proposals could impact on individuals or groups differently because they hold one or more protected characteristics. Analysis of the equality information provided by staff shows that the group is broadly in line with the gender profile of the organisation, a slightly higher proportion of BME employees and a higher proportion of employees than average with a declared disability. There are no concerns that the review could impact disproportionately on these groups at this stage.</p> <p>As the review is progressed, this will be kept under reviewed and if required a further impact assessment will be completed. The review will be delivered in phases, with the first phase focussing on strategic changes and later stages delivering required budget savings.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes informal engagement to date with stakeholders and staff.</p>
<p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>Not directly relevant to decision. There are no concerns the proposals could impact on community cohesion. The proposal will ensure the Council’s approach to provision of services is improved for customers</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence	
Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?	☒	☐	☐	No concerns the proposal could impact negatively on the Mayor's vision, it should enhance the Council's ability to support delivery of the vision. The recommended decision will ensure that the Council is well placed to deliver the digital agenda.	
Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its transformation programme? *	☒	☐	☐	The proposal aligns with the digital theme within the Change Programme.	
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed. This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.					
Assessment completed by:	Paul Stephens			Head of Service:	N/a
Date:	30 January 2018			Date:	

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	To assess the impact of a proposal to implement digital mail and digital purchasing in tandem, reducing the manual interventions required in these processes and other associated costs.			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To put in place a digital mailroom solution that will ensure the service is well placed to meet the ambitions of the Council, providing an improved back office function with reduced costs and create capacity to automate administration of digital purchasing, reducing manual interventions. • Statutory drivers There are no statutory drivers that are directly relevant to this proposal. • Differences from any previous approach Changes to practices will reduce paper and mail costs will be implemented which will reduce the amount of posts required to manage the mail room and associated functions. It is hoped that redundancies from this review will be minimised in relation to the digital mailroom. For digital purchasing, the council will reduce the level of manual interventions required to administer digital purchasing. There are circa 18 FTEs that will be within the scope of the review that will implement this change. Savings will be achieved from reduced costs of administering automation of digital purchasing where possible and resulting savings from reduced costs of products purchased. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff and trade unions. • Intended outcomes. Increased provision of digital services which improve services for internal and external customers, streamlining processes where possible to improve the efficiency of the mail service as well as reducing time required to receive and send mail. 			
Live date:	Project implementation from April 2018 onwards. Staff consultation on structures to support the ICT solution to commence from April 2018, depending upon the nature of the solution design, prior to a final decision being taken on structures in July 2018.			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	n/a service delivery will be regularly monitored and a review triggered if required			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal will not impact on human rights As set out in the preamble, the Mayors' Vision for the town will be unaffected and will ensure that the Council is well placed to continue to be able to deliver the digital agenda and continue to provide services that contribute towards effective corporate governance across the Council.</p>
<p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (p) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (q) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (r) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>There are circa 7 FTE posts within the scope of the proposed review for digital mail room and 18 FTE for digital purchasing. At this stage there are no concerns that proposals could impact on individuals or groups differently because they hold one or more protected characteristics. Analysis of the equality information provided by staff shows that the group is</p> <p>As the reviews are progressed to implement the proposals, assessments will be prepared which will consider the impact on the staffing groups of the proposed structures.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes informal engagement to date with stakeholders and staff.</p>
<p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Not directly relevant to decision. There are no concerns the proposals could impact on community cohesion. The proposal will ensure the Council's approach to provision of services is improved for customers</p>
<p>Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>No concerns the proposal could impact on the Mayor's vision. The recommended decision will ensure that the Council is well placed to deliver the digital agenda.</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

<p>Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its transformation programme? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal aligns with the digital theme within the Change Programme.</p>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Next steps:

- ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.
- ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.

Assessment completed by:	Paul Stephens	Head of Service:	N/a
Date:	30 January 2018	Date:	

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	To assess the impact of the proposal to continue to move customer (external and internal) processes 'online' where possible in line with the Council's Customer Strategy, reducing administration expenditure.			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To put in place digital customer services that will ensure the service is well placed to meet the ambitions of the Council, providing services that effectively support the Customer Strategy. • Statutory drivers There are no statutory drivers that are directly relevant to this proposal, however there are a number of statutory functions that will be provided through these digital services. For example, the public will be able to log complaints and FoI requests through the digital portal going forward. • Differences from any previous approach The review will ensure the Council increases the use of digital initiatives such as online self serve to reduce back office costs. Other channels of access will remain available for those unable or unwilling to use digital services. Implementation of the Digital Strategy will impact on the administration resources required to meet customer needs as a result, to be addressed by a reduction in the administration resources required to undertake manual interventions to provide these services through a phased implementation. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Users of these services and potential future users, Staff and trade unions. • Intended outcomes. Increased provision of digital services which improve services for internal and external customers, streamlining processes where possible. Provision of a service which is able to continue to provide services that ensure compliance with statute and case law, within a reduced cost envelope . 			
Live date:	From April 2018 onwards.			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	n/a service delivery will be regularly monitored and a review triggered if required			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal will not impact on human rights As set out in the preamble, the Mayors' Vision for the town will be unaffected and will ensure that the Council is well placed to continue to be able to deliver the digital agenda and continue to provide services that contribute towards effective customer services across the Council.</p>
<p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (s) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (t) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (u) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>At this stage there are no concerns that proposals could impact on individuals or groups differently because they hold one or more protected characteristics.</p> <p>Under the proposals there would be a recruitment freeze, alongside a phased implementation of digital solutions, which may result in service reviews to reduce resources, once new solutions go live and the need for manual interventions ceases or is minimised. As and when necessary service reviews will be undertaken, with the aim of minimising staff losses where possible. An impact assessment will be completed for each service review required.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the proposal and the planned implementation process.</p>
<p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Not directly relevant to decision. There are no concerns the proposals could impact on community cohesion. The proposal will ensure the Council's approach to provision of services is improved for customers</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response			Evidence	
Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No concerns the proposal could impact on the Mayor’s vision. The recommended decision will ensure that the Council is well placed to deliver the digital agenda.	
Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council’s services as set out in its transformation programme? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal aligns with the digital theme within the Change Programme.	
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed. This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.					
Assessment completed by:	Paul Stephens			Head of Service:	N/a
Date:	5 January 2018			Date:	

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	To assess the impact of the proposal to signpost families to Department for Work and Pensions as the appropriate agency for the payment of short-term benefit advances, reducing the Council's discretionary expenditure in this area.			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To ensure that families are accessing support from DWP, which they are entitled to, rather than accessing Council discretionary expenditure as the DWP is the correct agency to be providing this support. • Statutory drivers Provision of short term benefit advances is the responsibility of the DWP, there are statutory duties in place which govern this process that ensures it is in the DWP's remit. • Differences from any previous approach Families will continue to be able to access short term benefit advances, however they will be provided by the DWP rather than by the Council. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Users of these services and potential future users. • Intended outcomes. That families continue to receive support to which they are entitled, but that this is provided by the correct government agency. 			
Live date:	April 2018 onwards			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	n/a			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>The proposal will not impact on human rights As set out in the preamble, the Mayors' Vision for the town will be unaffected and will ensure that support is continued to be provided to the same level but that it will be provided by the DWP going forward.</p>
<p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (v) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (w) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (x) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>There are no concerns that proposals could impact on individuals or groups differently because they hold one or more protected characteristics. Families will continue to receive the same levels of support, however going forward DWP will be the provider of that support.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes assessment of current service structures, feedback to date and engagement with staff.</p>
<p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>There are no concerns the proposals could impact on community cohesion. The proposal will ensure that families are continued to be supported with appropriate funding, going forward this will be provided by the DWP rather than the Council.</p>
<p>Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>No concerns the proposal could impact on the Mayor's vision. The recommended decision will ensure that the Council is well placed to deliver the digital agenda.</p>
<p>Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its transformation programme? *</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>The proposal aligns with the Change Programme, ensuring that families are signposted to required support from the correct agency.</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response	Evidence	
<p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed. <p>This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.</p>			
Assessment completed by:	Alison Brown	Head of Service:	N/a
Date:	10 January 2018	Date:	

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	To assess the impact of the proposal to improve efficiency of children's social work support through process improvements,			
Coverage:	Service Specific			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To ensure that processes for safeguarding children are revised to improve efficiencies and provide an improved service to children, young people and their families and carers. • Statutory drivers Provision of safeguarding and early help and prevention services within social work are based in statute, including but not exclusive to Childrens Acts 1989, 2004 • Differences from any previous approach Under the proposals reviews will be undertaken to identify where services can be streamlined to improve access and efficiency and to remove overlaps between services where possible. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Users of these services and potential future users, families of children in contact with services and carers. • Intended outcomes. That families continue to receive support to which they are entitled, but that this revised to ensure that it is as efficient and effective as possible 			
Live date:	April 2018 onwards			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	n/a			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal will not impact on human rights As set out in the preamble, the Mayors' Vision for the town will be unaffected and will ensure that support is continued to be provided to the same level but that it will be reviewed to ensure it is more efficient and streamlined, resulting in reduced costs of service delivery and improved services to children, young people, families and carers.</p>
<p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (y) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (z) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (aa) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. <p>There are no concerns that proposals could impact on individuals or groups differently because they hold one or more protected characteristics. Families, carers, children and young people will continue to receive the services required to meet their needs, but that they will be reviewed to ensure it is more efficient and streamlined, resulting in reduced costs of service delivery and improved services to children, young people, families and carers.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes assessment of current service structures, feedback to date and engagement with staff.</p>
<p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no concerns the proposals could impact on community cohesion. The proposal will ensure that families, carers, children and young people are continued to be supported with appropriate services,</p>
<p>Middlesbrough 2025 – The Vision for Middlesbrough Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for a Fairer, Safer Stronger Middlesbrough?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>No concerns the proposal could impact on the Mayor's vision. The recommended decision will ensure that the Council is well placed to deliver the fairer and safer elements of the vision as they relate to children and young people.</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Appendix D

Screening questions	Response	Evidence	
Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its transformation programme? *	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="background-color: #90EE90; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div> <div style="background-color: #FFD700; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></div> <div style="background-color: #FFD700; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></div> </div>	The proposal aligns with the Change Programme, ensuring that children's services are continuing to deliver services that meet the needs of children, young people, families and carers in the town in relation to social work and intervention services	
<p>Next steps:</p> <p>➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.</p> <p>➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.</p> <p>This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.</p>			
Assessment completed by:	Alison Brown	Head of Service:	N/a
Date:	30 January 2018	Date:	