

Subject of assessment:	Middlesbrough Council budget 2013-14			
Coverage:	Crosscutting			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please state) Budget		
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:	<p>Key aims, objectives and activities</p> <p>By law the Council has to agree a balanced budget annually. The purpose of this Impact Assessment is to assess the cumulative impact of the 2013/14 budget proposals. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) places a statutory duty on the Council to ensure that its decisions do not impact disproportionately adversely on groups that share a protected characteristic under UK law. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. To ensure compliance with the PSED the Council has to identify what the impact of proposals will be. Where there is a risk that they will have an adverse impact, consideration must be given to steps needed to avoid or mitigate that impact. Mitigation will include steps to take account of the different needs of groups and may result in adjustments to meet their needs.</p> <p>The Mayor has clearly stated that in developing his budget reduction proposals he has sought to protect frontline services and the town's most vulnerable groups as far as possible. The proposals have also been subject to extensive consultation, resulting in several changes. This is in line with the Mayor's commitment to real engagement with local people in budget setting. To ensure due regard has been given to the requirements of the PSED, and that members are able to fully assess the impact of the proposed budget, each relevant proposal was subject to an individual Impact Assessment screening in line with the Council's approved policy. The Mayor's final proposals were subject to an impact assessment where there was judged to be a possible impact on people and/or service levels. 35 Impact Assessments were completed as a result, covering 47 proposals (some were combined into one impact assessment because they were closely related). Following the screening stage, no proposals were considered to have any disproportionate adverse impact, either because of the nature of the proposal or because the impact had already been fully mitigated within the final proposal design.</p> <p>Because of the nature of the process, some proposals will be brought forward for decision and implementation during 2013-14. Reports will be brought forward in year on these issues and an impact assessment undertaken at that time if necessary.</p> <p>Appendix 1 sets out a brief summary of the findings from the screening process and all individual Impact Assessments. Full copies of each individual impact assessment are also available for inspection in the members' library and will be published on the Council's website.</p>			

Description (continued):	<p>Statutory drivers</p> <p>Budget setting - Local Government Act 1972 Individual proposals – various as set out in individual Impact Assessments Impact Assessment process – Equality Act 2010</p> <p>Differences from any previous approach</p> <p>The budget sets out a range of changes to services and functions as a result of financial pressures on the Council. These are outlined in the main body of the report.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</p> <p>All residents of Middlesbrough. Some proposals are more relevant to certain groups than others and this is set out within the individual assessments, which are available to members. Proposals for reorganisation or redundancies will also impact on staff.</p> <p>Intended outcomes</p> <p>To present a budget to Council that has given full consideration to the impact of proposals and gives proper consideration to the Council’s equality duties.</p>
Live date:	April 2013
Lifespan:	April 2013 – March 2014
Date of next review:	March 2014

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Human Rights						
Engagement with Convention Rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A number of proposals relate to human rights. For example the social care proposals relating to services for day care, personal budgets, learning disabilities services etc. While these proposals will change the way some services are delivered, there are no concerns that user needs will not be met effectively under revised proposals and as such there are no concerns that there could be an adverse impact on individual human rights.
Equality						
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>23 of the 47 proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.</p> <p>Proposals relevant to this group include revision of the Learning Disabilities service to reflect a reduction in demand, re-scoping of the employment support to reflect provision elsewhere within the town and the need to focus this type of support in other areas. Revision of access to transport policies which will remove the taxi voucher scheme and replace with a Fair Access to Care assessment. The Taxi voucher scheme replaced the Dial A Ride service provision which was a historical service put in place for those unable to use any other means of transport. It was possible to replace this as there are now an increased number of accessible taxis. Application of the FACs process will ensure that those unable to access other forms of transport, who qualify for support, will continue to have their needs met through a provision of access to transport. Those who are able to travel using taxis and other transport and who are able to pay, will have to pay slightly more in future. Some passengers may have to pay more, however this is necessary in order to address the previous unequal cost of transport for those accessing Council day care compared to those with personal budgets who chose to access other forms of support. In line with the equality duty, consideration was given as to whether this impact could be avoided, however the additional budget cost was considered to be too great. Given the above and the actions put in place to mitigate the impact of proposals it is considered that the proposal impacts have been mitigated.</p>
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 of the 47 proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate. This included proposals to reduce the funding for the Asylum seekers service. The individual impact assessment found that there would be no impact on service users as the saving would be made from increased efficiencies within the service. Similarly the proposal to reduce the level of financial support given to the North East Refugees Service would be mitigated by supporting the service to move to a location with significantly smaller rent costs.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	23 of the 47 proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate. Proposal include reduce post 16 education transport support to statutorily required levels only. Provision at the reduced level will ensure that children within this group are able to continue to access post 16 education provision where they meet the statutory criteria for support either through distance or identified needs. A series of actions have been proposed to further mitigate the impact of the removal of the Teen mover provision on the ability of 16 – 19 year olds to access education. If these actions are delivered they will mitigate the impact of this proposal as far as it is possible to do so. If these actions are not achievable, this element of the impact assessment will be revisited prior to implementation and the necessary reports brought forward for decision as appropriate. Many of the proposals relate to the reshaping of children’s services to improve the focus on early intervention and reflect the transfer of a range of responsibilities from the Local Education Authority to Academies and schools in line with legislative requirements.
Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 of the 47 proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.
Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 of the 47 proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.
Pregnancy / maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 of the 47 proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.
Gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 of the 47 proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.
Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 of the 47 proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.
Marriage / civil partnership**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 of the 47 proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A number of the proposals are potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. Proposals include changes to services such as day care and learning disability to reflect changes in both the level and the type of service demand from service users and their families. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.

** Indicates this is not included within the single equality duty placed upon public authorities by the Equality Act. See guidance for further details.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Criminal record / offending past**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the proposals identified that there would be an adverse impact on community cohesion if they were implemented.
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainable Community Strategy objectives						
Stronger communities • Community cohesion within the single Equality duty	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	See above.
Safer communities • Section 17, Crime and Disorder Act 1998	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the proposals are directly linked to this duty.
Children and Young People • Corporate parenting duty	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A number of the proposals relate to the Council's duties as a corporate parent and in some cases the proposal will amend the way this duty is met. There are no concerns however that this could result in an adverse impact on this duty.
Health and wellbeing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A number of the proposals relate to the health and wellbeing theme. While these proposals will change the way services are delivered, identified needs will continue to be met effectively under revised proposals.
Local economy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A number of proposals are relevant to the local economy theme. Analysis of the individual proposals does not reveal any concerns that they could result in an adverse impact on the local economy.
Environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of the proposals are directly linked to the sustainability themes.
Sustainability • One Planet Living principles • Climate Change risk assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Organisational management / transformation						

Assessment issue	Impacts identified				Rationale and supporting evidence	
	None	Positive	Negative			Uncertain
			Justified	Mitigated		
Partnership working	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A number of the proposals relate to partnership working. Some of the proposals would result in the Council seeking alternative providers for services, return of a service from a provider or seeking a fairer contribution to the cost of a service from a partner in line with their statutory duties and responsibilities. There are no concerns expressed within this process that this could result in an unfair impact on partners.
Employees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	36 of the 47 proposals identify that there could be a possible impact on staff as a result of the proposals. Each individual Impact Assessment sets out how this impact will be mitigated. The overall impact of redundancies has been broadly in line with the overall gender composition of the workforce. It is not considered that there could be an overall disproportionate adverse impact on groups or individuals as a result of their holding a protected characteristic.
Accommodation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A number of the proposals will result in either the closure of a property or transfer to another provider. These proposals form part of the Council's overarching strategic approach to the management of its property. The proposals within the budget will have a positive effect on this area, streamlining council accommodation.
ICT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No direct impact as a result of these proposals.

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	Mitigating actions identified within the Impact Assessment process are sets out within the individual impact assessments.	Individual IA leads	Various
Promotion	Promotion of the changes where there is an impact on service delivery will be undertaken.	Individual IA leads	Various
Monitoring and evaluation	Overall monitoring of the impact will be embedded within performance management arrangements for 2013/14	Paul Stephens	May 2013
Assessment completed by:	Ann-Marie Johnstone	Chief Executive:	Paul Slocombe
Date:	5 February 2013	Date:	8 February 2013