

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Streetscene proposals		
Coverage:	Area Care, Waste Collection, Highways Routine Maintenance		
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input type="checkbox"/> Project
	<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 <p>To assess the impact of proposals to reduce standards within the Streetscene service and reshape the service's management structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) <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 the Environmental Protection Act (1990) – duties to arrange collection of waste and recycling, keep land and highways clear of litter and take all reasonable steps to keep controlled waste safe, and if transferred that it only goes to someone authorised to transport, recycle or dispose of it safely. Refuse Disposal Amenity Act (1978) - Duty to provide civic amenity sites. Duty to remove abandoned vehicles. Household Waste Recycling Act (2003) – duties to meet recycling targets. Litter Act (1983) - duties to empty and maintain litter bins and to consult from time to time amongst themselves and with voluntary bodies on taking measures to abate litter. Small Holdings and Allotment Act (1908) – duty to provide a sufficient number of allotments and let them to persons resident in the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences from any previous approach <p>Under the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of bedding plants for all areas other than the Cenotaph, town centre, cemeteries and Crematorium will be ceased (£100,000 saving) • Felled trees will not be replaced (£15,000 saving) • Maintenance of shrubs and hedges will be reduced from annual to bi-annual (£35,000 saving) • Weed applications will be reduced from three times a year to twice a year (£65,000 saving) • The frequency of litter picking and stress cleansing will be halved (£198,000 saving) • Grass-cutting and associated works in public spaces with the exception of formal spaces in the parks, cemeteries and playing pitches will be reduced (£65,000 saving) • Invest in vehicle technology to reduce resources required for road gully cleaning (£60,000 saving) • Terminate subsidy for allotments (£10,000) • Cease maintenance and upkeep of 1 bowling green in Pallister Park and 2 in Albert Park (£10,000 saving) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries <p>Stakeholders: staff within the scope of the review, their Trades Union representatives, members of the public and local businesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended outcomes <p>That services operate more efficiently and continue to ensure streets and open spaces are safe for all, while reducing standards to enable the Council to achieve savings.</p>		
Live date:	From April 2014		
Lifespan:	From April 2014		
Date of next review:	n/a		

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 proposals deal with the Council's environmental services, no impact on Human Rights have been identified.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Impact on the public – Standards reductions will not compromise the accessibility of pathways, open spaces and parks, therefore there are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on those with impaired mobility either because of age or disability.</p> <p>Impact on staff –If implemented the proposal would have an impact on those staff who currently deliver those service affected by the proposal or where a merger of services and management structures has been proposed.</p> <p>Analysis of staffing indicates that the savings can be delivered by deleting vacant posts from structures, accepting ERVR requests and reducing costs of supplies and services as proposals are implemented. If this does not prove to be the case, service reviews will be undertaken to identify additional savings. Impact assessments will be undertaken as part of this process where required.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess the impact has included feedback from service users through the Mayor's consultation period, staff data sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by staff and service data.</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"/>	The proposals deal with the Council's environmental services, no impact on relationships between different groups has been identified.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 proposals include a reduction in service. The 2020 Vision outcome that 'Streets and open spaces are well maintained' will continue to be supported and prioritised, the extent of the reductions do not indicate that there would be a significant reduction in service standards as a result of this proposal.

* 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
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?*	☒	☐	☐	No, the review is being conducted as part of the Council's 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.

Assessment completed by:	Tom Punton	Head of Service:	Tom Punton
Date:	29 January 2014	Date:	29 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Environment Management mergers			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" 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>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To assess the impact of the proposals to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Merge Parks, Streetscene and Cemeteries management (saving £100,000) - Merge Area care and Waste Management services (saving £65,000). • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) • n/a – back office review. • Differences from any previous approach Currently there are separate management structures in place for Parks, Streetscene, Cemeteries, Area Care and Waste Management services. A service review will be undertaken to put in place a streamlined management structure for Environment services within the scope of the proposal. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff and their trades union representatives. • Intended outcomes. To continue provision effective management arrangements for these services 			
Live date:	From July 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	From July 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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"/>	Not applicable to the proposal.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Service users - The proposal to streamline management should have no impact on frontline service capacity and service users. Proposals to revise frontline services are assessed by another Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Staff – It is anticipated that the majority of the savings within the proposal could be implemented by removal of vacancies and accepting ERVR requests. A service review will be required to deliver the remainder and put in place the new organisational structure, this will be subject to the impact assessment process as part of the Service Review process. If the proposal is taken forward HR policies will be used to manage this process, which have been separately impact assessed.</p> <p>Given the above there are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate impact on a group or individuals because they hold a protected characteristic. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of ERVR requests, vacancies, staff data sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by staff and feedback from the consultation process.</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 applicable – the proposal refers to internal reorganisation of management functions.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 supports the priority that the Council is fit for purpose.

* 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
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 has been developed by the Change Programme and is in line with its aims.

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:	Tom Punton	Head of Service:	Tom Punton
Date:	29 January 2014	Date:	29 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Proposal to contract out highways maintenance functions (reducing costs by £600,000)			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities • To assess proposals to contract out highways maintenance functions, which will create an efficiency of £600,000 to either help meet the financial gap or allow more roads to be maintained. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) 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 the Transport Act 2000, Road Traffic Act 1988, Highways Act 1980, Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 • Differences from any previous approach Highways maintenance services are currently provided in house by the Council and through contracts with external providers. If agreed, the proposal would reduce the cost of highways maintenance. Relevant staff would TUPE transfer where this applied. There would be no impact on members of the public as highways maintenance would still continue to be undertaken. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) • Stakeholders, funding bodies, customers, staff and trades union representatives. • Intended outcomes. • To reduce the cost of Highways maintenance services provided for the town. 			
Live date:	April 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	From April 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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"/>	Not relevant to this proposal.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Service users – the proposal would have no impact on the level or quality of maintenance currently provided.</p> <p>Staff - If the proposal is taken forward, any subsequent review(s) necessary to implement the proposal will be carried out in line with existing HR policies.</p> <p>TUPE transfers that may occur will be supported by Legal Services and Human Resources. Analysis of staff within the scope of the review does not reveal any concerns that there could be a disproportionate impact on individuals because they hold a protected characteristic.</p> <p>It is likely that the saving can be delivered through voluntary redundancy requests, vacancies and reductions in supplies and services budgets. However, if this does not prove to be the case, this impact assessment will be revisited as part of any future service review to identify additional savings and / or deliver the contracting out of the service.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess the impact has included feedback from service users through the Mayor's consultation period, staff data sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by staff and road standards data.</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"/>	It is not anticipated that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community relations as the services will continue to be provided.

* 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
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 service supports the Mayor's priority that Middlesbrough should be a town where streets and open spaces are well maintained. This work against this theme will continue to be supported.
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"/>	This decision will support the whole ethos of 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.				

Assessment completed by:	Tom Punton	Head of Service:	Tom Punton
Date:	27 January 2014	Date:	27 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Creation of a new enforcement service (combining Street Wardens, Parking Enforcement and neighbourhood enforcement functions)			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" 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 assess the impact of the proposal for the Council’s Street Warden, Parking Enforcement and neighbourhood enforcement functions to be combined within one enforcement team • Statutory drivers – 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 the Anti Social Behaviour Act, Crime & Disorder Act, Housing Act, Data Protection Act, Environmental Protection Act, Race Relations Act, Disability Discrimination Act & Equality Act 2006. • Differences from any previous approach – Currently the functions are delivered by separate teams, under the proposal they would be delivered by a combined team within a reduced resource to deliver a savings of £200,000 • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries – current and future users of the service, key partner agencies i.e. Police & Fire Brigade, people who live in, work and visit Middlesbrough, staff and their trade union representatives • Intended outcomes – To provide a service that meets the needs of the town and support the Mayor’s 2020 vision. 			
Live date:	April onwards			
Lifespan:	April onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *	☒	☐	☐	<p>It is unlawful for public authorities to act in a way that is incompatible with a Convention right. Many everyday decisions taken by community safety staff are not affected by Human Rights, nevertheless, the Council has an obligation to act in accordance with the Convention rights. All staff have been appropriately trained dependant on service requirements.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the preferred option could have an adverse impact on human rights.</p>

* 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>	☒	☐	☐	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposed decision 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"> (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. <p><u>Residents and users of the services provided</u></p> <p>Crime and disorder figures for the area show that crime and disorder levels overall are continuing on a downward trend overall, this has had a corresponding impact on the Council. When ASB incidents are reported, there are incidents that could be linked to one or more protected characteristics as a reason for the incident or a factor that exacerbates the impact. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ sexual orientation (support for dealing with hate crime) ▪ age - the elderly ▪ disability (either as a reason for the ASB or a requirement for additional support). <p>The combined service will continue to ensure the causes of ASB continue to be monitored to identify where they can be linked to a protected characteristic. It will continue to be duties in relation to prevention of harassment as set out by the Equality Act.</p> <p><u>Staffing</u></p> <p>The services within the scope of the proposal have been operating for some time with a number of vacancies there are also a number of ERVR requests from staff within the scope of the proposal; as a result it is likely that the proposal can be implemented without compulsory redundancies. If this does not prove to be the case, a service review will be undertaken to deliver the savings, a further impact assessment will be undertaken as part of this process.</p> <p>Any process to develop the integrated team would be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. Documents used to support this process could include service review guidance, Middlesbrough Employee etc. There are no concerns that the proposal could impact disproportionately on a staff member / group of staff members because they hold a protected characteristic at this stage based on the information set out above.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess the impact has included feedback from service users through the Mayor's consultation period, staff data sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by staff and service data.</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>	☒	☐	☐	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that this review will increase community tensions. The restructured team would continue to work with Partner agencies to ensure the Council's duties are met.</p>

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 services involved in this review support priority 1, "A town that is clean, safe & healthy". There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on this priority.
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 is in line with the requirements of 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.				

Assessment completed by:	Sharon Thomas	Head of Service:	Sharon Thomas
Date:	28 January 2014	Date:	28 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	merge the operation and management of the 5 community hubs, libraries and other facilities with a new model of promoting self-service technology			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" 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>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To assess the impact of the proposal to merge the operation and management of the 5 community hubs, libraries and other facilities with a new model of promoting self-service technology (saving £474,000). • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) 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 Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 and Public Records Act 1958 are relevant to the libraries functions within the scope of the proposal. • Differences from any previous approach Currently there are separate management structures in place for libraries, community development and community hubs, the proposal is to merge these structures. In addition there will be increased promotion of self-serve technology. There will be a £474,000 saving as a result; the majority of this will be in staffing costs. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff, current users of the services within the scope of the project, potential future users of services. • Intended outcomes. To continue provision of access to hubs and the services within them, within a more efficient staffing structure that utilises technologies to reduce costs. 			
Live date:	From April 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	From April 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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"/>	Not applicable to the proposal.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Part of the savings target reflects decisions made as part of the 13/14 budget setting process and subject to a service review during 2013/14. This was separately impact assessed for its impact on staff and service users as part of the review process.</p> <p>Service users - The proposal to streamline staffing should have no impact on service users. Provision of any self serve solution will be designed to meet accessibility standards and will be supported by staff on site.</p> <p>Age – additional assistance with self-serve terminals may be required for the elderly and the very young who are unfamiliar with the technology. Staff would continue to be present at the hubs and would be trained to assist those experiencing difficulty using self-service. Disability – Accessibility issues for the above will be considered as part of the development of detail self-serve solutions, in particular the issues that self-serve would cause for those with a hearing and or visual impairment.</p> <p>Staff – it is anticipated that the majority of the savings in the proposal could be implemented by removal of vacancies and accepting ERVR requests. A service review may be required to deliver the remainder and put in place the new organisational structure, this would be subject to the impact assessment process as part of the Service Review process. If the proposal is taken forward HR policies will be used to manage this process, which have been separately impact assessed.</p> <p>Given the above there are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate impact on a group or individuals because they hold a protected characteristic. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of ERVR requests, vacancies, staff data sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by staff, customer information and feedback from the consultation process.</p>

* 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
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"/>	The hubs will continue to operate under the proposal and there are no concerns that it would reduce access to facilities within the community. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion issues.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 not have negative impact on the 2020 vision. As it will ensure continued access to services.
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 has been developed by the Change Programme and is in line with its aims.
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:	Sandra Cartlidge	Head of Service:	Sandra Cartlidge
Date:	7 February 2014	Date:	7 February 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Redesign and contract out Homelessness services and Welfare and Money advice to save £200,000			
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 checked="" 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 redesign and contract out Homelessness services and Welfare and Money advice to save £200,000 Statutory drivers The Council does not have a statutory requirement to provide advice provision for money advice or trading standards. It does have a statutory duty to provide a homelessness and housing advice service. Differences from any previous approach Currently the Council provides funding to several organisations that provide advice to the public and commissions a Housing and Homelessness advice service. In addition it also has a Welfare Rights advice Team, a Trading Standards Advice team, Housing and Debt Advice Service. The proposal is to redesign and contract out Homelessness services and Welfare and Money Advice, which will save £200,000 by undertaking a full service redesign through a strategic commissioning process. The newly commissioned service by Middlesbrough Council will be fit for purpose and responsive to local needs, taking a flexible approach. This will have implications for Council staff within the scope of the proposal who will be TUPE transferred to any new commissioned service and will change the way in which people are able to access advice services in the town. <p>The Council currently provides c. 30% of the resource towards the provision of advice in Middlesbrough. It is likely that this will be reduced by at least 30%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries Stakeholders: staff within the scope of the review, other staff across the Council and partner organisations in the public sector and VCS, citizens, The Mayor, elected members. Individuals that will access provision of information and advice. Intended outcomes Local advice provision that is financially supported by the Council and fit for purpose in meeting the needs of Middlesbrough people through high quality and effective services. 			
Live date:	November 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	To be determined by the commissioning process			
Date of next review:	To be determined by the commissioning process			

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"/>	<p>The services within the scope of the proposal provide advice to individuals that may assist them to safeguard their human rights. Advice provision will continue to be supported by the Council, however this will be undertaken with a streamlined model. It is anticipated that the savings can be delivered with minimal impact on the advice capacity that is currently present.</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? *	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Impact on current and potential future service users - There continues to be an increase in the number of people accessing advice services at the stage of crisis. The proposal is to re-design the local landscape of advice provision by moving to a model where people can help themselves (for example through online support) and providing early intervention to prevent issues from escalating, and therefore helping to reduce demand issues elsewhere in the system. It is anticipated that savings can be delivered with minimal impact on the advice capacity that is currently present. There will also be an opportunity to improve support for complex cases that require advice that currently sits across several different teams in different organisations.</p> <p>This will improve the accessibility and interactivity of information on line, signposting where necessary to other forms of support and information. Access, either via telephone or person to person will still be available. Further work will be required before finalised proposals are developed to understand the detailed structure of the new model and the implications this will have for accessibility compared to current levels of accessibility and capacity. These issues will be considered as part of the development of the new model, along with consideration of the potential impact on vulnerable groups that may require additional support e.g. people with learning disabilities, people where English is not their first language and / or people with physical disabilities.</p> <p>Impact on staff - If the proposal is taken forward any subsequent review(s) necessary to implement the proposal will be carried out in line with existing HR policies. It is likely that the saving can be delivered through voluntary redundancy requests, vacancies and reductions other budgets. However, if this does not prove to be the case, this impact assessment will be revisited as part of any future service review to identify additional savings and / or deliver the contracting out of the service.</p> <p>TUPE transfers that may occur will be supported by Legal Services and Human Resources. Analysis of staff within the scope of the review does not reveal any concerns that there could be a disproportionate adverse impact on those with a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess the impact has included feedback from service users through the Mayor's consultation period, staff data is sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by staff and initial analysis of advice services in Middlesbrough undertaken by an external partner.</p>

* 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
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 that the proposal could impact negatively on relationships between different groups or communities of interest.
2020-The Mayor's vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough? Does the decision impact on statutory duties associated with these key objectives? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There is national recognition of the positive impact of good quality advice provision in improving health and wellbeing outcomes for local people, including mental health. The continued provision of advice services at an appropriate level is important in supporting local public health priorities. The proposal is designed to have minimal impact on advice capacity.
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 transformation programme? *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal was developed as part of the Council's Change Programme and as such there are no concerns that it could impact negatively on this. The proposal may have a subsequent impact on the Council's organisational management which will have to be addressed as part of implementation, however there are no concerns that this impact could be adverse.

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:	Sharon Thomas	Head of Service:	Sharon Thomas
Date:	28 January 2014	Date:	28 January 2014

Stage 1 Impact Assessment

Subject of assessment:	Revised Regeneration service model			
Coverage:	Economic Development, Housing and Regeneration Programmes			
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 type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p>Key Aims, Objectives and Activities To assess the impact of proposals to move to a reduced 'fixed cost' service and 'variable cost' project model of working.</p> <p>Statutory Drivers None directly, although the discharging of statutory responsibilities has been considered as part of the review.</p> <p>Differences From Previous Approach The Council currently operates a model dominated by fixed cost services, with some capital projects being delivered through a dedicated team. The proposed model would reverse this balance to have a smaller number of fixed cost services and a greater proportion of time limited projects (capital and revenue). Implementing this would mean that a number of activities would be ceased or reduced, with a single service developed to cover remaining activity. This service would be developed around three key elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • service – functions that the Council needs delivered on an ongoing basis; • response – capacity to respond to enquiries, corporate and unforeseen day to day issues that arise; and, • projects – planned, programmed, time limited actions that the Council chooses to take. <p>The service element would be minimised and would largely be based on discharging minimum statutory responsibilities and ongoing functions that cannot be delivered by partners. This would represent a fixed cost and would cover as little as 20% of what the three services currently deliver. The response element would involve the retention of a small degree of capacity in addition to the service element to address corporate issues, respond to day to day issues, mayoral enquiries and inward investment opportunities. This would represent a fixed cost and would cover as little as 5% of what the three services currently deliver.</p> <p>The project element would enable the prioritisation of everything else and enable provision (internal or external) to be tailored to meet demand and resources. This element would include the programming, procurement and resourcing of capital and revenue projects in a similar way to private sector providers such as Capita. An internal pool of flexible project staff would be supplemented by external expertise, pre-procured resource arrangements, secondments (in and out) from other partners and external delivery where appropriate. All activity would be undertaken and managed through professional project management arrangements, utilising genuine resource allocation processes and enabling activity to start and stop as programmed. This would enable complete flexibility over the cost of the service, yet still allow transformational activity to be prioritised.</p> <p>In practical terms, all current activity would be categorised as either ceasing, continuing as an ongoing fixed cost 'service' or be scoped as a potential time-limited project – to be prioritised and scheduled in line with demand and resources. The delivery options for each element of variable cost project delivery would be</p>			

	<p>considered to identify the most efficient route.</p> <p>Key Stakeholders and intended beneficiaries Key stakeholders include North East Chamber of Commerce, Fabrick, Tees Valley Unlimited, staff, trades union representatives, the public and Business Rates payers.</p> <p>Intended Outcomes The intended outcomes of the model are that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets all statutory obligations at minimum level; • allows minimisation of fixed cost services and maximises potential to fund variable cost projects; • increases the Council's ability to drive change and increases focus/balance towards transformational activities; • enables better strategic decision making, through the ability to prioritise, schedule and deploy resources more effectively; • allows the shape and responsibilities of the service to respond to the future development of a combined authority function Presents the best opportunity to implement the Change Programme objectives; and, • represents a relatively low risk option, with the potential for incremental implementation if external circumstances change. 			
Live date:	1 st April 2013 initially			
Lifespan:	Between 1 st April 2013 and 31 st March 2015,			
Date of next review:	No review is planned.			
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 preferred option does not directly impact upon anyone's human rights.

<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Consideration of this duty has shaped the proposals.</p> <p>Service users – The preferred option provides a model of working that would enable equality issues to be factored into decisions about whether particular projects are taken forward or not, and would be subject to the normal processes for doing so. Feedback from consultation undertaken to date with stakeholders has informed this judgement. The service will continue to provide support through different projects that are targeted at different issues within its remit e.g. the lower than average proportion of female business start-ups.</p> <p>Staff - staff will be subject to a formal review process in order implement proposals. This will be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy and redundancy policy. There are no concerns that the proposal could impact disproportionately on a staff member / group of staff members because they hold a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of staffing and feedback from stakeholders.</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>The preferred option does not itself impact upon particular groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods. Any decisions on whether to undertake specific project activity would take such issues into account.</p>
<p>Middlesbrough 2020 – Our Vision</p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough? *</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The preferred option has been chosen as the one with the greatest potential to impact positively on the vision for Middlesbrough, which was one of the key criteria in the options appraisal.</p>
<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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The option has been put forward within the framework of the Change Programme and therefore has taken organisational issues into account at the appropriate stage. No negative impact is expected.</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.

Assessment completed by:	Richard Horniman	Head of Service:	Sandra Cartlidge
Date:	8 October 2013	Date:	31 January 2014

Draft Impact Assessment

Subject of assessment:	Ayresome Industries merger with Streetscene			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" 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 assess the impact of the proposal to Integrate Ayresome Industries within the Environment Services department to achieve efficiencies • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable. • Differences from any previous approach If agreed this proposal would entail merger of Ayresome Industries with Streetscene. A saving of £54,000 would be achieved from the service review to restructure the management as part of implementation. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff within the scope of the proposal and their trades union representatives. Intended outcomes. To integrate the service with Streetscene to improve efficiency and reduce management costs. 			
Implementation	From April 2014			
Lifespan:	N/a			
Date of next review:	N/a			

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"/>	Not applicable to this proposal.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Consideration of this duty has been undertaken within this options appraisal.</p> <p>The Ayresome Industries service provides employment primarily for disabled people. Therefore disability is relevant to this proposal.</p> <p>Disability –the PSED that requires authorities to consider the particular steps that need to be taken to ensure that people with a disability can achieve equal outcomes. This duty will shape the approach to subsequent work to implement the proposal and staff from Ayresome Industries will continue to receive appropriate support and reasonable adjustments will continue to be made to support them in their work.</p> <p>The proposal is to achieve savings in management and accommodation changes, The saving is likely to be achieved from accepting ERVR requests and undertaking a service review to embed the two structures. This will be subject to a separate impact assessment process as part of the Service Review process.</p> <p>Given the above there are no concerns that this could have a disproportionate adverse impact on people with a disability or any other protected characteristic and officers are satisfied that consideration will be given to the particular needs of those with a disability as part of work to embed the proposal.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the staff within the service, the business model operating figures and discussions with managers.</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"/>	There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 function supports “children and vulnerable adults are safeguarded” and ‘reduction in unemployment’ themes.
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 proposed options will support the objectives of the Change Programme to varying degrees. The preferred option will provide the required saving while minimising employment.
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:	Victoria Robertson	Head of Service:	Tom Punton
Date:	10/12/2013	Date:	28 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Proposal to reduce costs of Sports Centres and venues by £700,000			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Description:	<p>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities • To assess proposals to reduce leisure centre opening hours and reduce staffing levels (saving £700,000). • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable. • Differences from any previous approach <p>If agreed the proposal would reduce the operating costs of the centres, reduce the number of staff as set out above and there would be a reduction in the opening hours which will be staggered across the centres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce Southlands Leisure Centre opening hours. Currently the centre opens from 8a.m until 10.30pm during the week. Under the proposal the centre will operate as a community centre during the day with access to gym facilities restricted to sports intervention work, public users of the gym will be redirected to the Neptune Centre 0.9miles away. The community will continue to be able to hire rooms within the building during the day e.g. sports hall, meeting rooms etc. • Reduce Neptune and Rainbow Leisure Centre opening hours by 1% • Maintain Golf course opening hours and reduce the bar opening hours • Many of the savings will reduce staffing requirements. Vacancies and ERVR requests will be used to facilitate this. Service reviews may be required to implement new structures / new places / ways of working for staff or reduce staffing if savings cannot be achieved through ERVR requests and removal of vacant posts. Staffing reviews will be undertaken during the year and will be impact assessed as required by the Service review policy. • The small gym at Hemlington will close at 4pm two nights a week. The gym currently opens until 8pm Monday to Thursday and until 5pm Friday to Sunday. • Prissick cycle track, self-management with the cycle clubs will be explored to reduce costs • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) • Stakeholders, funding bodies, customers, staff and trades union representatives. • Intended outcomes. • To reduce the cost of Leisure services provided by the Council within the town. 			
Live date:	From April 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	From April 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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"/>	Not relevant to this proposal.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Consideration of this duty has been undertaken within this options appraisal.</p> <p>Service users – the preferred option would see some reduction in access to services as detailed previously. The impact of this will be minimised by staggering reduced operating hours to enable service users to access leisure facilities in nearby locations. The reductions have also been based on analysis of customer usage to select times when there is minimal usage of these facilities.</p> <p>Sports development work with disadvantaged groups and sports intervention work (e.g. sport on prescription) will be protected as part of the proposal and will continue to operate from the Southlands Centre location and is unaffected by the proposal.</p> <p>The facilities at Southlands Centre will continue to be available for community hire during the day and customers can use the gym facilities at the Neptune Centre during the day which is less than a mile away from the Southlands Centre.</p> <p>Given the above it is not considered that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a customer group or individuals because they hold a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Staff - If the proposal is taken forward any subsequent review(s) necessary to implement the proposal will be carried out in line with existing HR policies and the HR policies. Analysis of staff within the scope of the review does not reveal any concerns that there could be a disproportionate impact on those with a protected characteristic. It is likely that the saving can be delivered through voluntary redundancy requests, vacancies and reductions in supplies and services budgets. However, if this does not prove to be the case, this impact assessment will be revisited as part of any future service review(s) to identify additional savings and / or deliver the contracting out of the service.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess the impact has included feedback from service users through the Mayor's consultation period, staff data known to date and customer usage data.</p>

* 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
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"/>	It is not anticipated that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community relations as the services will continue to be provided and reductions in service provision will be undertaken when services use is minimal. The proposal also includes provision to maintain community access to the Southlands Centre.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 service supports the Mayor's priority that Middlesbrough should be a town where people live longer and healthier lives. This work against this theme will continue to be supported.
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"/>	This decision will support the whole ethos of 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.				

Assessment completed by:	Sandra Cartlidge	Head of Service:	Sandra Cartlidge
Date:	28 January 2014	Date:	28 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Proposal to contract out Fleet Management and Vehicle maintenance services, Building Cleaning services and Property Maintenance services			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" 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>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities • To assess proposals to contact out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fleet Management and Vehicle maintenance services (saving £156,000) - Building cleaning services (saving £400,000) - Property services (saving £252,000) • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not directly applicable. There are duties that apply to the maintenance of these services because the Council has chosen to deliver them rather than procuring them from another provider e.g. vehicle maintenance requirements. • Differences from any previous approach The services are currently provided in house by the Council. If agreed the proposal would reduce the cost of these services and they would be contracted out. Relevant staff would TUPE transfer where this applied. There would be no impact on members of the public as these services would still continue to be delivered by an alternative provider. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) • Customers, staff and trades union representatives. • Intended outcomes. • To reduce the cost of Fleet management and maintenance, building cleaning and property cleaning services provided for the Council. 			
Live date:	From October 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	From October 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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"/>	Not relevant to this proposal.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Service users – while some of the reductions will be achieved as a result of building closures proposed, the proposal would have an impact on the level / quality of service currently provided. These will be looked at in detail as part of a service review.</p> <p>Staff - If the proposal is taken forward any subsequent review(s) necessary to implement the proposal will be carried out in line with existing HR policies.</p> <p>Frontline workers within the cleaning service are more likely to be female, while in Property maintenance and fleet management, staff are more likely to be male. The impact of proposals on these groups and their relevance to the gender protected characteristic will be considered as part of plans to implement proposals.</p> <p>TUPE transfers that may occur will be supported by Legal Services and Human Resources. Analysis of staff within the scope of the review reveals no concerns overall that overall there could be a disproportionate impact on those with a protected characteristic, however the impact of this will on considered within each service review.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess the impact has included feedback from service users through the Mayor's consultation period, staff data is sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by staff and service data.</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"/>	It is not anticipated that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community relations as the services will continue to be provided albeit it a lower level.

* 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
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 service supports the Mayor's priority that the Council is fit for purpose. This work against this theme will continue to be supported.
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"/>	This decision will support the whole ethos of 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.				

Assessment completed by:	Tom Punton	Head of Service:	Tom Punton
Date:	28 January 2014	Date:	28 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Merger of Environmental Health and Trading Standards management and administration (saving £106,000)			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" 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 assess the impact of the proposal to merge Environmental Health, Trading Standards management and administration to save £106,000 • Statutory drivers – 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 the Consumer Credit Act 1974, Environmental Protection Act 1990, Clean Air Act 1993, Environment Act 1995, Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010, Health Protection (Local Authority Powers) 2010, Health Protection (Part 2A Orders) Regulations 2010, Food Safety Act 1990. • Differences from any previous approach – Currently the functions are delivered by separate teams, under the proposal they would be delivered using a combined management and administration function saving £106,000 • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries – current and future users of the service, key partner agencies, people who live in, work and visit Middlesbrough, staff and their trade union representatives • Intended outcomes – To provide a service that meets the needs of the town and supports the Mayor’s 2020 vision. 			
Live date:	May 2014			
Lifespan:	May 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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"/>	It is not anticipated that the preferred option could have an adverse on human rights. The proposal will be delivered in the main by deleting vacant posts, the level of service provided to the public will not be reduced as a result.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p><u>Residents and users of the services provided</u> The proposal will protect front line capacity with savings made through vacancies in the main and by streamlining management and administration. As such there are no concerns that this proposal could have an impact on the service provided to the public.</p> <p><u>Staffing</u> The services within the scope of the review have been operating for some time with a number of vacancies; as a result savings are likely to be achieved by deleting vacancies and accepting ERVR requests and without significantly reducing levels of service provided. It is acknowledged however that this will remove the services' ability to improve service standards should demand levels increase. The</p> <p>Staff may be subject to a formal review process in the future in order to embed the new structure. If required it would be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. This would also be subject to the Impact Assessment process.</p> <p>Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy and redundancy policy.</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"/>	There is no evidence to suggest that this review will impact on community relationships. The restructured team would continue to ensure the Council's duties are met.

* 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
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 services involved in this review support priority 1, "A town that is clean, safe & healthy".
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"/>	This review is in line with the Change Programme principles. The impact on staff will be minimised by proposals.
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:	Sharon Thomas	Head of Service:	Sharon Thomas
Date:	28 January 2014	Date:	28 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Renegotiate joint management arrangements with Tees Esk and Wear Valley Mental Health Trust, which will save £100,000.			
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 checked="" 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>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities <p>To assess the impact of proposals to implement revised arrangements for discharging the council's mental health duties following renegotiation of our joint management costs with Tees Esk and Wear Valley Mental Health Trust (saving £100,000).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) <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 the Mental health Act 1983, Mental Health (Hospital, Guardianship and Treatment) (England) Regulations 2008, Mental Health (Approved Mental Health Professionals) (Approval) (England) Regulations 2008.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences from any previous approach <p>Currently mental health duties are discharged through joint arrangements with TEWV. If agreed the proposal would result in the Council withdrawing from these joint arrangements and the Council and TEWV would separately deliver their statutory duties. In some cases this may mean that individuals may require both a social worker and a community nurse. Currently there is only one case worker assigned. Formal consultation with TEWV and service users will be undertaken as part of plans to develop the proposals and a formal decision will be taken in year following this consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) <p>Members of the public who currently access the services within the scope of the proposal and possible future service users, staff within scope of the proposal and TEWV.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended outcomes. <p>To restructure the way this service is provided across social care to improve service data and understanding of needs within a more cost efficient structure.</p>			
Live date:	From September 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	From September 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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 Human Rights Act has been analysed and there is nothing in the proposal that relates to the Articles. There is no evidence to suggest it will negatively impact on Human Rights.
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Consideration of this duty has shaped the proposals.</p> <p>Service users – the proposal is particularly relevant to disability protected characteristics because of the nature of the service. The proposal is designed to ensure that there will not be a reduction in the level or quality of service provided to service users or in the measures put in place to ensure the Council’s mental health duties are discharged effectively. Savings will be achieved by reduced management costs from ending the joint service delivery with TeWV and acceptance of ERVR requests. The proposal is linked to the Adult Social Care proposals which will reshape front line staffing. The proposal will change the way in which adults in Middlesbrough access mental health services and the location of these services. Different elements of the overall service are delivered at each site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parkside (psychosis team) - Woodside (older people with mental health problems) - Lakeside (affective disorders) <p>Under the proposal these services would relocate to one property whose location is still to be determined, the impact of this on service users is unknown at this time as the relocation site has yet to be identified, as a result further work will be required to identify the site and understand the implications of this on current and potential future service users before the decision can be taken to implement this proposal. Appropriate consultation with current service users and / or their carers / guardians will be undertaken where necessary as part of the process for developing final proposals before a final decision is taken on implementation in September 2014. While there is no evidence at this stage to indicate that service users could be disproportionately adversely affected as a result of the proposal, this issue will be revisited at a later stage to ensure proposals and the impact assessment are informed by service user and other stakeholder views and information on the proposed location of the service and the impact of this on service users.</p> <p>Staff – staff will be subject to a formal review process in order to implement the proposal this is subject to a separate impact assessment process and will be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy and redundancy policy. It is likely that the proposal could be implemented by deleting vacant posts, reduced management costs post separation and acceptance of ERVR requests. There are no concerns that the proposal could impact disproportionately on a staff member / group of staff members or service users because they hold a protected characteristic.</p>

* 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
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 is no evidence to demonstrate that the proposed changes would affect community cohesion. The Council will continue to discharge its mental health duties if the proposal is implemented, however the way in which these duties are discharged will change.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 should not have a negative impact on any of the areas outlined in the Vision, as users will have access to the same services as previously. The proposal specifically relates to ensuring ‘children and vulnerable adults are safeguarded’.
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 is in line with the Council’s Change Programme. It is not expected there would be any negative effect on organisational management. The proposal has been brought forward in recognition of the fact that management costs are not fairly spread between the two parties and the proposals present an opportunity for the Council to improve its access to data which will improve its understanding of service delivery needs going forward.

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:	Colin Holt	Head of Service:	Colin Holt
Date:	28 January 2014	Date:	28 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	New operating model for Adult Social Care			
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 checked="" 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>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities <p>To assess the proposal to create a new operating model for Adult Social Care to reduce the work that is required to be undertaken by fully qualified Social Workers which will save £597,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) <p>Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970, National Assistance Act 1948, NHS and Community Care Act 1990, Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 Section 21, Ordinary Residence Disputes (National Assistance Act 1948) Directions 2010, Community Care, Services for Carers and Children's Services (Direct Payments) England Regs 2009, Local Authority Social Services and NHS Complaints (England) Regs 2009, Care Quality Commission (Registration Regulations) 2009 [SI 2009/3112] regulation 10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences from any previous approach <p>The proposal would structure the service differently to reduce management costs and remove duplication. The saving will be achieved by deleting vacant posts, efficiencies and restructuring the service's workforce, this may include redundancies and reskilling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) <p>Members of the public, staff within scope of the proposal and service users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended outcomes. <p>To restructure the way this service is provided across social care to avoid duplication and ensure continued provision of services.</p>			
Live date:	June 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	June 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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 Human Rights Act has been analysed and there is nothing in the proposal that relates to the Articles. There is no evidence to suggest it will negatively impact on Human Rights.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Consideration of this duty has shaped the proposals.</p> <p>Service users – the will be particularly relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics because of the nature of the service. The proposal is designed to ensure that there will not be a reduction in the level or quality of service provided to service users or in the measures put in place to ensure adults are safeguarded within Middlesbrough. Whilst the internal structure providing these services will be reviewed, the restructure will improve the responsiveness and of the service provided and the quality of service received. There will be an improved use of reablement which will have a positive impact on service users. There will also be an increase in the capacity of social workers.</p> <p>Staff – staff will be subject to a formal review process in order to implement the workforce restructure this is subject to a separate impact assessment process and will be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy and redundancy policy.</p> <p>There are no concerns that the proposal could impact disproportionately on a staff member / group of staff members or service users because they hold a protected characteristic. The proposal will have a positive impact on service users, improving their user experience.</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"/>	There is no evidence to demonstrate that the proposed changes would affect community cohesion. The responsiveness and quality of the service will improve a result of the changes and it is anticipated that greater use of reablement will support more people to remain living in their local communities.

* 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
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 should not have a negative impact on any of the areas outlined in the Vision, as users will have access to the same services as previously. The proposal specifically relates to ensuring 'children and vulnerable adults are safeguarded'.
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 is in line with the Council's Change Programme. It is not expected there would be any negative effect on organisational management as whilst job losses would be expected to impact on staff through the merging of services, the level of service would not change. Similarly, it would not affect the council's ability to deliver its priorities.
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:	Colin Holt	Head of Service:	Colin Holt
Date:	28 January 2014	Date:	28 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	New operating model for Children's Safeguarding services			
Coverage:	Children, Families and Learning			
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 checked="" 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>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities <p>To assess the proposal to create a new operating model for Children's Safeguarding services that reduces duplication and management costs, which will save £575,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) <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: the Children Act 1989 imposes a series of safeguarding duties on the Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences from any previous approach <p>The proposal would structure the service differently to reduce management costs and remove duplication. Savings will be achieved by accepting ERVR requests where appropriate, not hiring to vacant posts and efficiency measures.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</p> <p>Members of the public, staff within scope of the proposal and service users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended outcomes. <p>To restructure the way this service is provided across social care to avoid duplication.</p> <p>To assist in the provision of a targeted, family approach to services where one social worker will provide services to the whole family.</p>			
Live date:	From April 2014			
Lifespan:	From April 2014			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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 Human Rights Act has been analysed and there is nothing in the proposal that relates to the Articles. There is no evidence to suggest it will negatively impact on Human Rights.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Consideration of this duty has shaped the proposals.</p> <p>Service users – the proposal will be particularly relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics because of the nature of the service and the additional needs that children with disabilities have. The proposal is designed to ensure that there will not be a reduction in the level of service provided to service users or in the measures put in place to ensure children are safeguarded within Middlesbrough.</p> <p>Staff – it is likely that the savings can be achieved within the need for compulsory redundancies. However staff may be subject to a formal review process going forward if savings cannot be achieved and/or to implement revised structures. If this was required it would be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty.</p> <p>Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy and redundancy policy.</p> <p>There are no concerns that the proposal could impact disproportionately on a staff member / group of staff members because they hold a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment has included feedback from service users through the Mayor's consultation period, staff data sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by staff, safeguarding best practice guidance and service data.</p>

* 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
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 is no evidence to demonstrate that the proposed changes would affect community cohesion. The level of service would not be affected as a result of the changes.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 should not have a negative impact on any of the areas outlined in the Vision, as users will have access to the same services as previously. Although the proposal specifically relates to ensuring 'children and vulnerable adults are safeguarded', 'crime and anti-social behaviour is reduced' and 'families are supported to succeed', the targeted "family" approach would actually be expected to improve the benefits to service users.
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 would form part of the Council's transformation, as it would help to achieve the required financial savings. It is not expected there would be any negative effect on organisational management as whilst job losses would be expected to impact on staff through the merging of services, the level of service would not change. Similarly, it would not affect the council's ability to deliver its priorities.
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:	Neil Pocklington	Head of Service:	Neil Pocklington
Date:	3 February 2014	Date:	3 February 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	0-19 Service Review			
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 type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" 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>Key aims, objectives and activities To reconfigure services to ensure we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide family focussed services across the 0-19 age range • provide effective early help and early intervention within a targeted service to manage demand on other services such as safeguarding, Youth Offending Service etc. • have cost effective services that contribute to achieving the Council's objectives and reduce the cost of the service in line with savings targets agreed within budgets for 2013/14 and beyond. <p>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) 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 the Childrens Act 1989, Childrens Act 2004, Childcare Act 2006, Education and Skills Act 2008.</p> <p>Differences from any previous approach This review makes a number of proposal to alter structures as part of steps to create one integrated 0-19 service. The proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of generic job roles where possible to increase service flexibility while reducing costs to minimise reductions in frontline provision where possible. • Greater targeting of the most vulnerable service users to ensure that they continue to receive services that meet their needs. <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key Stakeholders - staff within the scope of the review, families and children currently supported by services, future and past users of the service, partner agencies, the courts. - Key Beneficiaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – vulnerable children and young people and their families through a more targeted, flexible service offer that works with their identified needs – the council who will ensure the identified savings are achieved <p>• Intended outcomes. A service that is fit for purpose and provides an improved level of support to stop children and families from requiring other intervention services within an efficient and flexible model</p>			
Live date:	April 2014			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	A desktop review will be undertaken 6 months after implementation. If this reveals any unintended consequences a formal review will be launched.			

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights</p> <p>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 restructure will have an impact on the structure of the organisation and on the overall service model that is put in place going forward. There is no anticipated impact on frontline services that could be relevant to human rights legislation.</p>
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Consideration of this duty has shaped the proposals.</p> <p>Service users – The proposal is relevant to the age protected characteristic because the services are age targeted. The purpose of the review was to revise services to increase the age scopes covered. Currently there is patchy provision for children from 5 – 11. The service will create a service that covers children from 0-19. There will be an impact on those children and their families who do not have an identified need for the support that the 0-19 service will be delivered. The proposal is to make service more targeted to ensure those families at risk of coming into contact with other services are targeted for support work. As a result, children and families where there are no concerns about childcare, educational needs, parenting etc, will have reduced access to services within the scope of the review. This would be an adverse impact. A stage two IA will be developed that will be informed by feedback during the staff consultation process and to assess whether this adverse impact can be avoided in line with the statutory duty.</p> <p>The service will have a positive impact on vulnerable children and their families by providing improved support as part of the Council's commitment to the early help / early intervention agendas. The review will make the service model more efficient, flexible and responsive. It is hoped that this will ultimately reduce the number of children and families that move to within the scope of other services such as safeguarding, Youth Offending services etc.</p> <p>Staff – The review process will be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy and redundancy policy. Analysis of the staff within the scope of the review indicates that the gender characteristic is relevant to the review. There are a disproportionate number of female employees within this service compared to the gender split across all Council services. The initial proposal indicate that the number of posts within the service will be reduced. The more generic job roles for the service will also mean that some staff will have salary increases while some will have salary reductions where they form part of the proposed structure. These issues will be considered within a further impact assessment in line with the Council's equality duty.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess this evaluation includes equality analysis of staffing included within the review and data on outcomes achieved. HR policies have been separately impact assessed. Consultation will be undertaken on initial proposals with staff and relevant partners as part of the service review and feedback will shape final proposals.</p>

* 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
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"/>	The revised structure will increase the flexibility and efficiency of the focus on supporting families and children. The aim of this approach is increase resilience within the most vulnerable families in the town. This proposal is therefore relevant to community cohesion and it is not anticipated that community cohesion will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 is in line with the 2020 vision aim Middlesbrough will be a learning town in which families and communities thrive by ensuring that families are supported to succeed
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 will result in a creation of a new service model. It is in line with the Council's 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.				

Assessment completed by:	Ann-Marie Johnstone	Head of Service:	Richenda Broad
Date:	12 September 2013	Date:	24 September 2013

Template for Impact Assessment Level 2: Full impact assessment

Subject of assessment:	0-19 Service Review			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organisational change			
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>Key aims, objectives and activities To reconfigure services to ensure we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide family focussed services across the 0-19 age range • provide effective early help and early intervention within a targeted service to manage demand on other services such as safeguarding, Youth Offending Service etc. • have cost effective services that contribute to achieving the Council's objectives and reduce the cost of the service in line with savings targets agreed within budgets for 2013/14 and beyond. <p>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) 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 the Children's Act 1989, Childrens Act 2004, Childcare Act 2006, Education and Skills Act 2008.</p> <p>Differences from any previous approach This review makes a number of proposals to alter structures as part of steps to create one integrated 0-19 service. The proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of generic job roles where possible to increase service flexibility while reducing costs to minimise reductions in frontline provision where possible. • Greater targeting of the most vulnerable service users to ensure that they continue to receive services that meet their needs. <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key Stakeholders - staff within the scope of the review, families and children currently supported by services, future and past users of the service, partner agencies, the courts. - Key Beneficiaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – vulnerable children and young people and their families through a more targeted, flexible service offer that works with their identified needs – the council who will ensure the identified savings are achieved <p>• Intended outcomes. A service that is fit for purpose and provides an improved level of support to stop children and families from requiring other intervention services within an efficient and flexible model</p>			
Live date:	full implementation by April 2014			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	A desktop review will be undertaken 6 months after implementation. If this reveals any unintended consequences a formal review will be launched.			

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Human Rights						
Engagement with Convention Rights (as set out in section 1, appendix 2 of the Impact Assessment Policy).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The restructure will have an impact on the structure of the organisation and on the overall service model that is put in place going forward. There is no anticipated impact on frontline services that could be relevant to human rights legislation.
Equality						
Sex	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The stage 1 IA identified that there are a disproportionate number of female employees within this service compared to the gender split across all Council services.</p> <p>The review process will be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy and redundancy policy. Analysis of the staff within the scope of the review indicates that the gender characteristic is relevant to the review.</p> <p>In line with the Council's equality duty, steps were taken to identify whether the impact of the proposal could be avoided. Because of the scale of the savings that are required to be achieved it will not be possible to avoid a redundancy situation. The impact of this will be partially mitigated by the Council's policies that will be used to populate the structure and assist those staff that are not successful in potentially securing a post within the new structure. While the proposal will have a disproportionate impact on women, it is viewed as justified because the nature of the service means that there are a disproportionate number of women employed and otherwise the savings required would not be achieved.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess this evaluation includes equality analysis of staffing included within the review and data on outcomes achieved. HR policies have been separately impact assessed. Consultation was undertaken on initial proposals with staff and relevant partners as part of the service review and feedback shaped final proposals.</p>
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>As set out in the level 1 impact assessment, the proposal was to make service more targeted to ensure those families at risk of coming into contact with other services are targeted for support work. As a result, children and families where there are no concerns about childcare, educational needs, parenting etc., will have reduced access to services within the scope of the review. This would be an adverse impact. A stage two IA will be developed that will be informed by feedback during the staff consultation process and to assess whether this adverse impact can be avoided in line with the statutory duty. At this stage it has been identified that the proposal will have a small reduction in front line capacity for the service, the extent of the reduction will be mitigated by the merger of Sure start services with Youth Services and the fact that the bulk of the required savings will be delivered by reducing management numbers, however it will not be possible to fully avoid an adverse impact on those families with no concerns about childcare, educational needs, parenting etc. In line with the Council's equality duty, steps were taken to assess whether the impact 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>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Pregnancy / maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Surestart provides services for women who are pregnant. The proposal would reduce access to those women with no additional needs. 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.
Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The level 1 impact assessment did not identify that the proposal could have an uncertain or disproportionate adverse impact on these protected characteristics. Evidence used to inform this judgement was taken from review data and feedback from staff consultation. The current proposals are about changing the way that services will be delivered in the future, and do represent a change in service levels. However, they are not about the withdrawal or cessation of services.
Gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Marriage / civil partnership**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Criminal record / offending past**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods						<input type="checkbox"/>
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The revised structure will increase the flexibility and efficiency of the focus on supporting families and children. The aim of this approach is increase resilience within the most vulnerable families in the town. This proposal is therefore relevant to community cohesion and it is not anticipated that community cohesion will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal.
Middlesbrough 2020						
Theme 1 - town that is clean, safe and healthy						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Theme 2 – a learning town, in which families and communities thrive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal is in line with the 2020 vision aim Middlesbrough will be a learning town in which families and communities thrive by ensuring that families are supported to succeed
Theme 3 – a town that continues to transform	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainability • One Planet Living principles Climate Change risk assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
• Organisational management / Change Programme						
Partnership working						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Employees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal will have no impact on this issue.

** 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		
Accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposal is to reduce the number of staff; therefore there will be an adverse impact on employees who will be at risk of redundancy as a result of the review. Steps have been taken to assess whether this could be avoided and the Council's HR policies are in place which are designed to reduce the risk of compulsory redundancy, however it may not be possible to do this because of the scale of cuts required.</p> <p>It has not been possible to fully mitigate the impact of the decision on those communities that currently receive. However given the level of the savings that the Council has to make over the next three years, the level of mitigation that it has been possible to put in place and analysis of likely future demands from new communities in Middlesbrough, it is felt that the proposal is justified.</p>
ICT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposal will have no impact on this issue.

Next steps:

- If the answer to some questions remains Uncertain, then further work must be undertaken to clarify impacts. Repeat the process until there is certainty, but ensure that the amount of work undertaken is proportionate to the decision required. No relevant report should be submitted for approval until there is a satisfactory level of certainty around the impacts of the recommended decision.
- Be sure that any likely differential impacts identified through the process (positive or negative) are well evidenced and clearly marked in the template.
- Where the impact is negative, be clear that this can be justified with the justification outlined. If it cannot, the recommended decision must be reviewed.
- Where negative impacts are unjustified and *unavoidable*, actions must be put in place to remove or mitigate impacts. These should be listed in the action plan below.
- The results of the IA process (including changes made to the proposed approach and further actions) should be outlined the main body of the report, and the completed IA template appended to that report.

Further actions		Leads	Deadline
Mitigating actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation of relevant HR policies to implement the review and support staff through the process ▪ continue to provide information and advice ▪ Signpost to activities provided by other agencies 	John Keelty	From December 2013 onwards.
Promotion	As the services within the new service are reshaped, appropriate promotion exercises will be undertaken with current users and potential future users	John Keelty	From April 2014 onwards.
Monitoring and evaluation	The impact of the proposed new structure will be carried out through monitoring the use made of the service through the service management data.	John Keelty	From April 2014 onwards.

Assessment completed by:	John Keelty	Head of Service:	Richenda Broad
Date:	15 December 2013	Date:	16 December 2013

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Reduction in administration support to save £1.4m			
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 checked="" 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 assess the impact of proposal to implement reduced admin support by automating overly bureaucratic processes and removing those that have no value (saving £1.4m). • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable. • Differences from any previous approach If agreed this option would reduce admin support required as the Council's overall size reduces and as more processes are automated or removed. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff within the scope of the review, trades union representatives, service areas, Mouchel, the Council's strategic partner which provides admin support. • Intended outcomes. To ensure the cost of administration services is reduced 			
Live date:	From April 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	From April 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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"/>	Not applicable. Administration staff provide back office support for frontline services. The impact of staff levels on these frontline services would be considered as part any service review to implement revised admin support requirements
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>Staff – If the proposal is approved then work will be undertaken to redesign Council processes that will in turn redefine admin requirements for the Council then a formal review / reviews would be undertaken. In some cases staff delivering administrative functions are currently Council employees, while some are Mouchel.</p> <p>Where the review process impacts on Council employees it will be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy and redundancy policy. Analysis of the staff within the scope of the review indicates that the gender characteristic is relevant to the review and the impact of proposals on gender will be considered as part of reviews. Staff may also be TUPE transferred as a result of a review. HR and Legal support will be used to manage the TUPE process if it is required.</p> <p>Where a proposal impacts on Mouchel staff findings will be subject to negotiations with Mouchel to implement. Where Mouchel implements staffing reviews they will follow a series of HR policies which they have put in place.</p> <p>The initial proposals indicate that the number of posts within the service will be reduced. There are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on staff because they hold a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess this evaluation includes equality analysis of staffing included within the review and data on outcomes achieved. HR policies have been separately impact assessed. Consultation will be undertaken on initial proposals with staff and relevant partners as part of the service review and feedback will shape final proposals.</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 applicable. The staff within the scope of the review provide back office functions which support services that may be relevant to this. Service needs will be considered as part of a review of admin needs.

* 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
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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"/>	Admin services provide support to other services and support the 2020 vision underlying theme that the Council should be fit for purpose.
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 proposals will support the change Programme principles to transform Council services. If a decision NOT to proceed is taken the speed at which the council is able itself to drive change around the customer will be impacted
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:	Paul Mitchell	Head of Service:	Karen Whitmore
Date:	25th October 2013	Date:	28 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Creation of a single commissioning unit			
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"/>
Description:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To assess the impact of proposals to create a single commissioning unit, saving £600,000. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable. • Differences from any previous approach Under the proposal commissioning expertise is located within a number of teams located in different parts of the Council. In order to increase resilience and capture opportunities for efficiencies and co-ordination, it is proposed to create a single commissioning unit which will span the whole Council and will subsequently develop a 'risk based' approach to commissioning activity (saving £600,000). • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries Stakeholders: staff within the scope of the review, their Trades Union representatives, services that require commissioning support. • Intended outcomes To create a single commissioning unit that meets the needs of the Council while reducing the overall cost of the commissioning process. 			
Live date:	April 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	April 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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 proposed solution relates to back office functions and will not impact on front line service provision, therefore there are no concerns that it could have an impact on human rights.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Impact on staff –If implemented the proposal would have an impact on those staff who currently within the scope of the proposal. Analysis of staffing indicates that while some of the savings can be delivered by deleting vacant posts from structures and accepting ERVR requests a service review will be required to deliver the remainder and implement a new service delivery structure. Analysis of staff within the scope of the proposal reveals no concerns that individuals or groups could be disproportionately adversely affected because they hold a protected characteristic. Impact assessments will be undertaken as part of the service review process where required.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess the impact has included analysis of staffing and staff data sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by 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"/>	The proposed solution relates to back office functions and will not impact on front line service provision, therefore there are no concerns that it could have an impact on community cohesion.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 proposed solution is a continuation of the current system of in-house commissioning, but through a central rather than fragmented system. The proposal supports the ‘fit for purpose’ theme 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 proposed solution is a continuation of the current system of in-house commissioning, but through a central rather than fragmented system.
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:	Tony Parkinson	Head of Service:	Tony Parkinson
Date:	3 February 2014	Date:	3 February 2014

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Reduction in the cost of Finance and Accountancy activity			
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 checked="" 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 assess the impact of proposal to reduce the cost of Finance and Accountancy to save £600,000. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable. • Differences from any previous approach If agreed this option would increase the automation of finance and accountancy processes where appropriate and empower senior officers to operate with greater autonomy, leading to a reduction in the support requirements for this service. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff within the scope of the review, trades union representatives, service areas. • Intended outcomes. To ensure the cost of Finance and Accountancy is reduced while ensuring the Council continues to have appropriate finance and accountancy arrangements. 			
Live date:	From April 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	From April 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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"/>	Not applicable. Finance and accountancy staff provide back office support for frontline services. The impact of staff levels on these frontline services would be considered as part any service review to implement revised support requirements.
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>Staff – If the proposal is approved then work will be undertaken to redefine Finance and Accountancy requirements for the Council. A formal review / reviews would then be undertaken.</p> <p>Where the review process impacts on employees it will be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy and redundancy policy.</p> <p>The initial proposals indicate that the number of posts within the scope of the proposal will be reduced significantly. There are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on staff because they hold a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess this evaluation includes equality analysis of staffing included within the review and data on outcomes achieved. HR policies have been separately impact assessed. Consultation will be undertaken on initial proposals with staff and relevant partners as part of the service review and feedback will shape final proposals.</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 applicable. The staff within the scope of the review provide back office functions which support services that may be relevant to this. Service needs will be considered as part of any review to implement revised arrangements.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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"/>	Finance and Accountancy services provide support to other services and support the 2020 vision underlying theme that the Council should be fit for purpose.

* 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>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>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposals will support the change Programme principles to transform Council services. Successful delivery of the proposal is dependent on the successful delivery of the Middlesbrough Managers Model. The proposal reduces the level of Finance support to managers and places increased reliance on Senior managers. The provision of information needed by managers is being reviewed as part of this proposal to ensure the model implemented addresses needs within a reduced cost model.</p> <p>As a result of the above and because the solutions to implement Middlesbrough Manager are still being developed that will provide this alternative model of support, the impact of this proposal on the organisational management of the Council cannot be fully assessed at this stage. Further work will be undertaken to develop the detail of the proposal.</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>				

Assessment completed by:	Paul Stephens	Head of Service:	Paul Slocombe
Date:	13 January 2014	Date:	31 st January 2014

Subject of assessment:	Reduction in ICT support			
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 checked="" 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 assess the impact of the proposal to reduce the number of systems that the Council operates and the associated resources required to support these systems (saving £700,000). • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable. • Differences from any previous approach If agreed this proposal will reduce the number of systems in operation, requiring some services to switch to new systems as part of steps to deliver efficiency savings. The resources in place across the Council would also be reduced as system support requirements are reduced and may need a service review to implement. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff within the scope of the ICT support review both within the Council and Mouchel, the current service provider – Mouchel, current and potential providers of ICT software and hardware • Intended outcomes. To ensure the ICT service support for Council services meets the needs of the organisation within a reduced resource. 			
Live date:	From April 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	From April 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	N/a			
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 does not directly impact on frontline services, but it provides one avenue of access to Council services. There are no concerns that the proposal could infringe any human rights.

<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 ICT proposal does not directly impact on frontline services, ICT provides one avenue of access to Council services. Service users will not be impacted by the proposal.</p> <p>Impact on staff –If implemented the proposal would have an impact on those staff who currently sit within the scope of the proposal. Analysis of staffing indicates that while some of the savings can be delivered by deleting vacant posts from structures, accepting ERVR requests and reducing non-staffing budgets, a service review will be required to deliver the remainder. Analysis of staff within the scope of the proposal reveals no concerns that individuals or groups could be disproportionately adversely affected because they hold a protected characteristic. Impact assessments will be undertaken as part of the service review process where required.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess the impact has included analysis of staffing and staff data sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by 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 that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion. ICT support is a function which does not directly impact on frontline services, but which provides one avenue of access to Council services.</p>
<p>Middlesbrough 2020 – Out Vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough?</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>ICT support, along with other functions within the service support theme, provides services which ensure the Council is fit for purpose, an underpinning theme of the 2020 vision.</p>
<p>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?</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>The proposed options support the objectives of the Change Programme and have been developed in line with Change Programme requirements.</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>				

Assessment completed by:	Ann-Marie Johnstone	Head of Service:	Karen Whitmore
Date:	30 September 2013	Date:	9 October 2013

Subject of assessment:	Implement a risk based approach within Legal Services			
Coverage:	All activities covered by Legal Services			
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 checked="" 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 assess the impact of proposal to implement a risk based approach within Legal Services to save £300,000. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable. • Differences from any previous approach If agreed this option would reduced recourse to legal advice by adopting a risk based approach and changing commissioning practices. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff within the scope of the review, trades union representatives, service areas that currently access legal advice. • Intended outcomes. • To ensure the cost of legal services is reduced. 			
Live date:	From April 2014			
Lifespan:	From April 2014			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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 function does not directly impact on frontline services, but provides support to them. The proposal will ensure services are supported. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on human rights.
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 focus of the proposal is on a function which does not directly impact on frontline services, but support for services. Impact on staff – If implemented the proposal would have an impact on those staff who currently sit within the scope of the proposal. Analysis of staffing indicates that while some of the savings can be delivered by deleting vacant posts from structures, accepting ERVR requests and reducing non-staffing budgets, a service review will be required to deliver the remainder and implement a new service delivery structure. Analysis of staff within the scope of the proposal reveals no concerns that individuals or groups could be disproportionately adversely affected because they hold a protected characteristic. Impact assessments will be undertaken as part of the service review process where required. Evidence used to assess the impact has included analysis of staffing and staff data sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by staff.
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 that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion. Functions do not directly impact on frontline services.
Middlesbrough 2020 – Out Vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal services provide advice to ensure the Council is fit for purpose, an underpinning theme of the 2020 vision. This advice will continue to be provided within a risk based approach.
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 will support the objectives of the Change Programme.

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. 		

Assessment completed by:	Karen Whitmore	Head of Service:	Karen Whitmore
Date:	27 January 2014	Date:	27 January 2014

Subject of assessment:	Creation of a single Marketing and Communications unit			
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 checked="" 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 assess the impact of proposal to create a single marketing and communications unit spanning the Council, which will replace the individual units currently in place to save £300,000. Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable. Differences from any previous approach If agreed this option would mean the streamline and consolidation of all marketing, communication and business development functions into one central team. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff within the scope of the review, staff, citizens, The Mayor and elected members Intended outcomes. To ensure the marketing, communications and business development functions meets the objectives within the Change Programme. 			
Live date:	From April 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	N/a			
Date of next review:	N/a			
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 function does not directly impact on frontline services, but it promotes access to Council services. The proposal will improve the ability of the Council to offer services which are customer centric, maximising use of resource. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on human rights.

<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 focus of the proposal is on a function which does not directly impact on frontline services, but which provides one avenue of access to Council services. The proposal will improve the ability of the Council to offer services that are customer centric and digitally by default and also maximise use of resources that will be available going forward.</p> <p>Impact on staff –If implemented the proposal would have an impact on those staff who currently sit within the scope of the proposal. Analysis of staffing indicates that while some of the savings can be delivered by deleting vacant posts from structures, accepting ERVR requests and reducing non-staffing budgets, a service review will be required to deliver the remainder and implement a new service delivery structure. Analysis of staff within the scope of the proposal reveals no concerns that individuals or groups could be disproportionately adversely affected because they hold a protected characteristic. Impact assessments will be undertaken as part of the service review process where required.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess the impact has included analysis of staffing and staff data sourced from the employee diversity characteristics data held on SAP where diversity characteristics have been disclosed by 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 that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion. Communications and marketing functions do not directly impact on frontline services, but which provides one avenue of access to Council services.</p>
<p>Middlesbrough 2020 – Out Vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough?</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>Communications and Marketing functions, along with other functions within the customer focus theme, provides services which ensure the Council is fit for purpose, an underpinning theme of the 2020 vision.</p>
<p>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?</p>	☒	☐	☐	<p>The proposed options will support the objectives of the Change Programme to varying degrees. The preferred option will allow the council to meet all the principles of the change programme.</p>
<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.</p>				

Assessment completed by:	Karen Whitmore	Head of Service:	Karen Whitmore
Date:	27 January 2014	Date:	27 January 2014

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Reduction in the cost of performance management and policy development activity			
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 checked="" 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>Key aims, objectives and activities To assess the impact of proposal to reduce the cost of performance management and policy development to save £800,000.</p> <p>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable.</p> <p>Differences from any previous approach If agreed this option would reduce the amount of performance management / improvement support undertaken and scale the resources to support these processes accordingly.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff within the scope of the review, trades union representatives, service areas,</p> <p>Intended outcomes. To ensure the cost of performance management and policy development is reduced while ensuring the Council continues to monitor key outcomes to support service improvement.</p>			
Live date:	From April 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	From April 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	n/a			

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"/>	Not applicable. Staff provide back office support for frontline services. The impact of staff levels on these frontline services would be considered as part any service review(s) to implement revised support requirements.
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>Staff – If the proposal is approved then work will be undertaken to redesign Council performance management processes that will in turn redefine performance management and policy development requirements for the Council then a formal review / reviews would be undertaken.</p> <p>Where the review process impacts on employees it will be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy and redundancy policy.</p> <p>The initial proposals indicate that the number of posts within the scope of the proposal will be reduced significantly. There are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on staff because they hold a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess this evaluation includes equality analysis of staffing included within the review and data on outcomes achieved. HR policies have been separately impact assessed. Consultation will be undertaken on initial proposals with staff and relevant partners as part of the service review and feedback will shape final proposals.</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 applicable. The staff within the scope of the review provides back office functions which support services that may be relevant to this. Service needs will be considered as part of any review to implement revised arrangements.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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"/>	Performance Management and Policy development services provide support to other services and support the 2020 vision underlying theme that the Council should be fit for purpose.

* 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
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 proposals will support the change Programme principles to transform Council services.
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:	Paul Stephens	Head of Service:	Karen Whitmore
Date:	13 January 2014	Date:	27 January 2014

Draft Impact Assessment

Subject of assessment:	Closure of MTLC			
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 checked="" 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 assess the impact of the proposal to close MTLC office accommodation and conferencing facilities (saving £145,000) • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable. • Differences from any previous approach If agreed this option would mean the cessation of conferencing services, transfer of staff based in office accommodation at MTLC to vacant appropriate office space within the Council and redeployment or redundancy of conferencing staff. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Other providers of conferencing facilities within the town, staff within the scope of the project and their trades union representatives. Intended outcomes. To reduce the cost of office and conferencing accommodation within the Council. 			
Live date:	July 2014			
Lifespan:	July 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	N/a			

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 function does not directly impact on frontline services, but which provides conferencing and office space. Some services are provided from MTLC which support human rights. These services will be relocated to alternative accommodation necessary to meet their needs.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>The function does not directly impact on frontline services, it provides conferencing and office space. The proposal would have an impact on staffing and there would be redundancies if there was no interest in TUPE to an alternative provider. If a redundancy, redeployment or TUPE situation occurs, the Council's HR policies would be followed which have been separately impact assessed where required and / or the legal process for TUPE.</p> <p>Functions based within the MTLC will be relocated to locations appropriate for their needs.</p> <p>It is not considered that this option could have a disproportionate adverse impact on staff within the scope or service users. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the MTLC usage and costs, discussions with managers and staff data.</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"/>	There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion. Conferencing and the provision of office space are functions which does not directly impact on frontline services.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 function does not directly support any of the 2020 vision themes.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
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 proposed options will support the objectives of the Change Programme to varying degrees. The preferred option will provide the greatest saving.
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:	Victoria Robertson	Head of Service:	Gill Rollings
Date:	11 October 2013	Date:	12 October 2013

Draft Impact Assessment

Subject of assessment:	Closure of TAD centre, Register Office building, Park House and Albert Terrace buildings and transfer of functions to alternative sites			
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 checked="" 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 assess the impact of the proposal to close: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The TAD centre and transfer Council functions delivered from this site to alternative sites (saving £119,000) - Register Office and transfer Council functions delivered from this site to alternative sites (saving £20,000) - Park House and relocate Children’s Safeguarding teams to alternative sites (saving £30,000) - Albert Terrace and relocate the Families Forward team (saving £10,000) • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Not applicable. • Differences from any previous approach If agreed this option would mean the transfer of staff to vacant appropriate office space within the Council and building staff may be made redundant if their posts are no longer required. Buildings would subsequently be disposed of. Where there are sitting tenants we will either agree their exit from the building or dispose of the building with a sitting tenant. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff within the scope of the project and their trades union representatives, service users and other users of the buildings. Intended outcomes. To reduce the cost of accommodation within the Council. 			
Live date:	July 2014 onwards			
Lifespan:	July 2014 onwards			
Date of next review:	N/a			

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 does not directly impact on frontline services, but will affect the location from which services are delivered. Services will be relocated to alternative accommodation necessary to meet their needs. There are no concerns that this could impact on human rights.	
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>The proposal does not directly impact on frontline services, as it relates to the provision of conferencing and office space. Services would be relocated to suitable accommodation elsewhere that meets the needs of that service. The proposal would have an impact on staffing and there would be redundancies amongst staff employed to manage the buildings. If a redundancy occurs, the Council's HR policies would be followed which have been separately impact assessed. If the service review policy applied this would be separately impact assessed.</p> <p>It is not considered that this option could have a disproportionate adverse impact on staff within the scope or service users. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of usage and costs, discussions with managers and staff data.</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"/>	There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion. Conferencing and the provision of office space are functions which does not directly impact on frontline services.	
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 function does not directly support any of the 2020 vision themes.	
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 proposed options will support the objectives of the Change Programme to varying degrees. The preferred option will provide the greatest saving.	
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:	Sharon Thomas			Head of Service:	Sharon Thomas
Date:	28 January 2014			Date:	28 January 2014

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	New operating model for the Council Tax, Housing Benefit and Social Fund departments			
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 checked="" 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"/>
Desc ription:	<p>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities <p>The purpose of the proposal is to assess the impact of the proposal to implement a new operating model for the Council Tax, Housing Benefit and Social fund departments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) <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 the Local Government Finance Act 1972, Council Tax regulations and Social Security Administration Act 1992. Provision of the Social Fund is a discretionary function.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences from any previous approach <p>Within Revenue Services, the collection and enforcement team has been reviewed with the deletion of one FTE. The debt recovery process is also to be re-evaluated and as a result, will increase the income to the Council over the next three years. The front facing element of the Revenues and Benefits team will be amended to incorporate fully trained advisors across these functions which will provide an improvement to the customer experience as well as providing efficiency savings to the Council. In addition, the Council currently provides a fully trained benefit advisor at three sub offices across the town. This function is to be centralised, reducing costs as a result and ensuring consistency in the advice being provided in one central location.</p> <p>The Council's Benefit Fraud team will be removed, although by deploying fully trained advisors when dealing with all aspects of Revenue and Benefits work, this will allow an increased number of fraudulent claims to be identified at the outset, therefore reducing the need for the Benefit Fraud team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) <p>Staff within the scope of the review, trades union representatives and customers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended outcomes. <p>To ensure the cost of these services is reduced while ensuring the Council continues to have appropriate arrangements in place to meet customer needs.</p>			
Live date:	1 April 2014			
Lifespan:	April 2014 – March 2017			
Date of next review:	January 2016			

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 proposals put forward would have no negative impact on an individual's Human Rights.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>The scheme is relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics. The Council has modelled the impact of the proposed changes to customers and assessed the various options open to it. The proposed model is based on the impact of different options on vulnerable groups within the town.</p> <p>Age (elderly) – The Revenue and Benefit service has considered those who have a protected characteristic due to Age. Although the Benefit Service is to be removed from the 3 sub offices across the town, the service is still accessible by telephone and through the Council website. In addition, the offer of a home visit is to be increased for those residents who are unable to call into Middlesbrough House to discuss their application or Council Tax account. As a result of these actions, it is considered that the proposal's potential to have a disproportionate impact on the Age group has been fully mitigated.</p> <p>Disability – As above. Any resident who is unable to call into Middlesbrough House will be offered a home visit as part of this increased offer.</p> <p>Age (families with young children) – Families with young children are not adversely affected by the proposed changes to the Revenue and Benefits Services. If specific needs are identified, assistance will be offered through a home visit (similar to the elderly and disabled).</p> <p>Given the above there are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on these protected characteristics. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current benefit recipients, the eligibility criteria and feedback from stakeholders.</p>

* 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
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"/>	The proposals do not discriminate against any groups and the service will be sensitive at all times to the needs of all applicants. There are therefore no concerns that the proposals could have a disproportionate adverse impact on community cohesion.
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 adoption of this policy does not have any negative impacts on the vision for Middlesbrough and will support the Council's budget reduction objectives.
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"/>	This decision will not impact negatively on any organisational or transformation services the Council has in place

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 Barker	Head of Service:	Paul Slocombe
Date:	11.02.14	Date:	12.02.14

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Members support			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input checked="" 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>Key aims, objectives and activities To merge the functions of scrutiny support, governance and all other ancillary functions that support Elected Members (saving £217,000).</p> <p>Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) The Local Government Act 1972, 2002, Localism Act 2011, Licensing Act 2003, Gambling Act 2005, Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Access to information Act 1985, the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the Police and Crime Commissioner Elections (Functions of Returning Officers) Regulations 2012, the Police and Crime Commissioner Elections Order 2012, the Representation of the People Acts 1983, 1985, 2000 and 2001 (all as amended), the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (as amended).</p> <p>Differences from any previous approach This review makes a number of proposals to alter structures as part of steps to create one integrated service. The proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> revised management arrangements; combining officer roles around, for example, the Executive, Scrutiny and Governance functions; promoting greater Member self-serve; rationalisation and/or stopping of certain support services; review of the one stop shop; and change in the administration of democratic governance arrangements <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Key Stakeholders - staff within the scope of the review, Members, the Electorate and officers from across the Council</p> <p>Intended outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A service that is fit for purpose and provides an acceptable level of support to the Elected Mayor and Members to ensure they are able to meet their duties as elected representatives, together with meeting those statutory duties placed on the Council to provide open and transparent decision making processes including the delivery of elections and electoral services; and Provision of effective senior management governance arrangements 			
Live date:	April 2014			
Lifespan:	n/a			
Date of next review:	A desktop review will be undertaken 6 months after implementation. If this reveals any unintended consequences a formal review will be launched.			

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 restructure will have an impact on the structure of the organisation and on the overall service model that is put in place going forward. There is no anticipated impact on frontline services that could be relevant to human rights legislation.
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 proposed decision 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"> (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. <p>Consideration of this duty has shaped the proposals.</p> <p>Service users - Under Protocol 1, article 3 the public have a right to Free Elections must be held at reasonable intervals, and they must be by secret ballot. They must be held in conditions which ensure that people can freely express who they want to be the legislature. Changes identified will not impact on the public's right to vote.</p> <p>Staff – The savings are likely to be achieved by deleting vacant posts and accepting ERVR applications. Subsequently a service review will be required to put in place a revised structure for management and delivery of the service. The review process will be supported by a range of HR policies to ensure there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty. HR policies have been separately impact assessed. An impact assessment will be undertaken as part of the service review process.</p> <p>Given the above there are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on individuals or a group because they hold a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Evidence used to assess this evaluation includes equality analysis of staffing included within the review and data on outcomes achieved.</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"/>	The proposal will ensure a streamlined structure is put in place which continues to provide sufficient support to Members. There is no evidence that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion.

* 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
Middlesbrough 2020 – 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 is in line with the 2020 vision underpinning theme that the Council is fit for purpose.
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 preferred option would result in a creation of a new service model. It is in line with the Council's 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.				

Assessment completed by:	Karen Whitmore	Head of Service:	Karen Whitmore
Date:	27 January 2014	Date:	27 January 2014