

<b>Subject of assessment:</b>	<b>Middlesbrough Council budget 2014-5</b>			
<b>Coverage:</b>	Crosscutting			
<b>This is a decision relating to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state) Budget</b>		
<b>It is a:</b>	<b>New approach:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>It is driven by:</b>	<b>Legislation:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Description:</b>	<p><a href="#">Key aims, objectives and activities</a></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 2014/15 budget proposals. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) places a statutory duty on the Council to ensure that identified where decisions would 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. Where decisions cannot be fully mitigated or avoided, they must be justified.</p> <p>The Mayor has previously stated that in developing his budget reduction proposals he will seek to protect frontline services and the town's most vulnerable groups as far as possible. The proposals have also been subject to public consultation, resulting two being withdrawn. This is in line with the Mayor's commitment to 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 Impact Assessment screening in line with the Council's approved policy. 25 Impact Assessments were completed as a result, (some proposals were combined into one impact assessment because they were closely related). Following the screening stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one of the proposals was considered to have a disproportionate adverse impact (merger of surestart and youth services to create a new service model)</li> <li>• three proposals will require further work before they can be assessed and a stage 2 impact assessment will be undertaken during 2014-15 and a decision on this proposal will be taken in year (redesign and contracting out of advice services, renegotiation of management costs with TEWV Mental Health Trust and reduction in the cost of finance / accountancy).</li> <li>• the remainder were found to have no disproportionate adverse impacts either because of the nature of the proposal or because the impact had already been fully mitigated within the final proposal design.</li> </ul> <p>Because of the nature of the process, some proposals will be brought forward for decision and implementation during 2014-15. Reports will be brought forward in year on these issues to relevant decision makers 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 appended to the budget report.</p>			

<b>Description (continued):</b>	<p><a href="#">Statutory drivers</a></p> <p>A number of statutory duties, guidance, legislation and regulations are relevant to this proposal which will be considered, these include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget setting - Local Government Act 1972</li> <li>• Individual proposals – various as set out in individual Impact Assessments</li> <li>• Impact Assessment process – Equality Act 2010</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Differences from any previous approach</a></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><a href="#">Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</a></p> <p>All residents of Middlesbrough and customers of MBC. Some proposals are more relevant to certain groups than others and this is set out within the individual assessments, which are also appended and the excel table. Some proposals also impact on staff.</p> <p><a href="#">Intended outcomes</a></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>
<b>Live date:</b>	<p>April 2014</p>
<b>Lifespan:</b>	<p>April 2014 – March 2015</p>
<b>Date of next review:</b>	<p>March 2015</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
<b>Human Rights</b>						
Engagement with Convention Rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A number of proposals indirectly relate to human rights, for example the proposal to seek alternative funding for Middlesbrough Intermediate Care Centre. None of the assessments have identified that there could be an adverse impact on human rights as a result of a proposal.
<b>Equality</b>						
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <sup>1</sup>	<p>11 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. Two of the relevant proposals will require further work in year before a decision can be taken (redesigned advice services model and renegotiation of management costs with TEVV Mental Health Trust). Stage 2 impact assessments will be completed as part of this process.</p> <p>Proposals potentially relevant to this group included reduction in service standards in Environment, creation of a new enforcement team, introduction of a new operating model in Adult Social Care and increased use of ICT. Increased use of ICT will improve on line access to services and will benefit those who have difficulties travelling to access services. ICT solutions will also meet accessibility requirements. Creation of a new enforcement team will ensure the Council continues to provide services that assist in meeting its duties in relation to prevention of harassment as set out in the Equality Act 2010. As part of implementation of proposals consideration will be given to the particular needs of those with a disability in particular where they will differ as a result of this protected characteristic and steps will be taken to reflect this within service delivery.</p> <p>Given the above and the actions put in place to mitigate the impact of reductions as part of the development of the proposals it is considered that people with a disability will not be disproportionately adversely affected by the budget as a result of their having a protected characteristic. Where the impact of the proposal is uncertain, further work will be undertaken prior to a decision being taken in year, hence the selection of the mitigated and the uncertain boxes for this section.</p>
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	One of the proposal was identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic; the proposal to redesign advice services. The impact assessment found that the additional needs that might occur as a result of holding this protected characteristic would need to be explored within a stage 2 as part of the redesign process, before a decision could be taken to implement. This will be subject to a separate decision making process. There were no concerns that the remainder of the proposals could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a group or individuals because of their race.

<sup>1</sup> Refers to the two proposals where further work is required and a stage 2 assessment will be undertaken as part of this.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified				Rationale and supporting evidence	
	None	Positive	Negative			Uncertain
			Justified	Mitigated		
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>3 of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. Most of the 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>The proposal to the merge surestart and youth services to create a revised service model will improve the focus on early intervention to reduce the amount of children who are later subject to safeguarding concerns; however it does mean that access levels for those families with no additional needs will be reduced. The impact assessment found that this impact on the age protected characteristic was justified because of the scale of the savings that need to be achieved by the Council and the need to focus resources on those families with additional needs to reduce the amount of children that are considered to be at risk.</p>
Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>None 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.</p>
Sex	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>One of the proposals was identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. Most 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. The proposal to merge Surestart and Youth Services to create a new service model was identified as having a disproportionate adverse impact on women because the staff gender split would mean that women would be at disproportionate risk of redundancy as a result of the service review. It was justified by the impact assessment because of the overall disproportionate number of women in the service compared to the Council gender split and because of the scale of the savings that have to be achieved. Other proposals recognised that the impact of reductions in staffing could have different impacts on gender where services had a disproportionate amount of female or male workers, however overall there are no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately because of gender.</p>
Pregnancy / maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>One of the proposals was identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. The merger of the surestart and youth services to create a 0-19 service proposal would potentially reduce access to those women with no additional needs as the service shifted to a model that maintained universal access but within a targeted model. In line with the Council's Equality Duty it was considered whether this proposal could be avoided. Unfortunately because of the scale of savings that the Council is facing and the need to increase focus on those families that are more at risk of accessing safeguarding services in future, it has not been possible to avoid this impact. The new service will mitigate the impact as far as is possible by protecting front line capacity. It is felt that this proposal is justified as the new service model will target those families with support needs. The service will continue to signpost alternative resources to parents with no additional needs in addition to the services currently offered.</p>
Gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>None 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.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None 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
Marriage / civil partnership**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None 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.
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None 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.
Criminal record / offending past**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None 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.
<b>Community cohesion</b>						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal to create one Enforcement team was relevant to community cohesion. The impact assessment found that there were no concerns that creation of one team would have an adverse impact on the Council's ability to meet its duties in relation to harassment. 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"/>	
<b>Sustainable Community Strategy objectives</b>						
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"/>	The proposal to create one Enforcement team was relevant to this. The impact assessment found that there were no concerns that creation of one team would have an adverse impact on the Council's ability to meet its duties in relation to its duties under section 17.
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.

\*\* 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		
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One Planet Living principles</li> <li>Climate Change risk assessment</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Organisational management / transformation</b>						
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, seeking a fairer contribution to the cost of a service from a partner in line with their statutory duties and responsibilities or cessation of a partnership. 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"/>	19 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 as far as is possible. In the main mitigation will be undertaken by deleting vacant posts and accepting ERVR requests to reduce the number of compulsory redundancies required. Some staff will be subject to TUPE processes as a result of proposals. To date 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 reductions in the amount of accommodation required by the Council. 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"/>	Some proposals will require ICT investment to realise savings as a result of automation of processes, implementation of new / alternative ICT solutions etc. These investments will be reflected within the Council's ICT work programme.

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
<b>Mitigating actions</b>	Mitigating actions identified within the Impact Assessment process are sets out within the individual impact assessments.	Individual IA leads	Various
<b>Promotion</b>	Promotion of the changes where there is an impact on service delivery will be undertaken.	Individual IA leads	Various
<b>Monitoring and evaluation</b>	Overall monitoring of the impact will be embedded within performance management arrangements for 2014/15	Paul Stephens	May 2014
<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	Ann-Marie Johnstone	<b>Chief Executive:</b>	Paul Slocombe
<b>Date:</b>	28 January 2014	<b>Date:</b>	3 February 2014