

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Subject of assessment: | Middlesbrough Council budget 2015-6 | | | |
| Coverage: | Crosscutting | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service | <input type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure | <input type="checkbox"/> Programme | <input type="checkbox"/> Project | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organisational change | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please state) Budget | | |
| It is a: | New approach: | <input type="checkbox"/> | Revision of an existing approach: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| It is driven by: | Legislation: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Local or corporate requirements: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Description:

[Key aims, objectives and activities](#)

By law the Council has to agree a balanced budget annually. The purpose of this Impact Assessment is to assess the cumulative impact of the 2015/16 budget proposals. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) places a statutory duty on the Council to ensure that identified where decisions would impact disproportionately adversely on groups that share a protected characteristic under UK law. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. To ensure compliance with the PSED the Council has to identify what the impact of proposals will be. Where there is a risk that they will have a disproportionate adverse impact, consideration must be given to steps needed to avoid or mitigate that impact. Mitigation will include steps to take account of the different needs of groups and may result in adjustments to meet their needs. Where decisions cannot be fully mitigated or avoided, they must be justified.

Proposals have been developed which protect frontline services and the town's most vulnerable groups as far as possible. To ensure due regard has been given to the requirements of the PSED, and that members are able to fully assess the impact of the proposed budget, each relevant proposal was subject to an Impact Assessment screening in line with the Council's approved policy. 14 stage one Impact Assessments were completed as a result. There are a number of factors which have impacted on the amount of impact assessments that are completed to support the budget proposals:

- a proportion of proposed savings are being achieved from continued implementation of previous decisions
- a number of savings proposals will be realized from in-year decisions on detailed proposals and will be impact assessed at that point before decisions are taken.

Following the screening stage:

- one of the proposals was considered to have a disproportionate adverse impact (removal of Council subsidies for bus services 12, 28, 29A, 537 which is known as the 39, 603/4 and 605/606/607)
- the remainder were found to have no disproportionate adverse impacts either because of the nature of the proposal or because the impact had already been fully mitigated within the final proposal design

The elements of the bus subsidies proposal which were considered within the stage two impact assessment are as follows:

- **29A - Eagle Park diversion on all journeys - Middlesbrough – Stokesley via JCH, Matron & Eagle Park** - higher than average percentage of concessionary fare users (age and disability). Analysis shows that if the bus company decides not to continue this route without subsidy, individuals residing at farthest point in Eagle Park would have to walk 1km to a bus stop on Dixons Bank. This would be an adverse impact on those who are less able to walk this far, therefore this proposal is potentially a disproportionate adverse impact on age and disability because of this particular impact. In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) work was undertaken to assess whether this impact could be avoided and if it could not be avoided, whether it could be mitigated. Work has been undertaken to attempt to identify whether the bus company would be willing to continue to deliver the route without the subsidy. The survey and research indicates that overall the route may be viable and it is likely that the company may continue to operate it. However this could not be verified at the point of completion of this impact assessment therefore it cannot be taken into account as a method of mitigating the impact. As it was not possible to mitigate the impact of the proposal, consideration was given to whether the impact was justified. It is judged that the impact of this proposal is justified as the purpose of the subsidy is to support services that would not otherwise be delivered because they are unprofitable and data available indicates this service has become more popular so is less reliant on the subsidy.
- **603/604 - Sunday Service All journeys: Middlesbrough – Middlesbrough via JCH, Coulby Newham, Hemlington & Acklam** - analysis identified one place of worship where access would be affected (Religion or belief). Two people surveyed indicated that they used this service to access a place of worship (place not identified). Access to Stainton Village Parish Church on a Sunday would be affected by the proposal. Again, consideration was given to whether this impact could be avoided and if not avoided whether it could be mitigated. In this instance, although access to this site would be affected, there are alternative places of worship in the town serviced by a bus route however there will be an adverse impact on those surveyed who use the 603/604 but this is partially mitigated by the availability of access to alternative places of worship and alternatives religious service times, although it may increase journey times. Given the very small number of users, the alternatives available and the need to ensure value for money is achieved, it is judged that the impact of this proposal is justified.
- **603/604**
- **39 - 0602 & 0632 (Mon-Sat) Middlesbrough – Park End, 0703 (Sat) Middlesbrough – Park End, 0515 & 0545 & 0615 (Mon-Sat) Park End – Middlesbrough, 0645 (Sat) Park End – Middlesbrough; Service 605/606/607: All journeys (early morning services): Middlesbrough – Middlesbrough via JCH, Coulby Newham, Hemlington & Acklam**

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Description (continued):</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact assessment identified a potential adverse impact on the Mayor's vision because of the potential impact on those travelling for employment and the local economy. There are alternative services however these would involve significant de tours or increased walking distances. It is hoped the Bike to Work scheme will partially mitigate this impact along with negotiations with the bus companies to encourage them to maintain these routes, however it is not possible to mitigate this impact fully. The proposal is justified on the grounds that the Council needs to ensure value for money and research indicates that a number of routes are likely to be viable for the bus companies to continue in the long run. <p>Because of the nature of the process, some proposals will be brought forward for decision and implementation during 2015-16. Reports will be brought forward in year on these issues to relevant decision makers and an impact assessment undertaken at that time if necessary.</p> <p>Appendix 1 sets out a brief summary of the findings from the screening process for all individual Impact Assessments and the stage 2 assessment for the bus subsidy removal proposal. Full copies of each individual impact assessment are also appended.</p> <p>Statutory drivers</p> <p>A number of statutory duties, guidance, legislation and regulations are relevant to this proposal which will be considered, these include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget setting - Local Government Act 1972 Individual proposals – various as set out in individual Impact Assessments Impact Assessment process – Equality Act 2010 <p>Differences from any previous approach</p> <p>The budget sets out a range of changes to services and functions as a result of financial pressures on the Council. These are outlined in the main body of the report.</p> <p>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</p> <p>All residents of Middlesbrough and customers of MBC. Some proposals are more relevant to certain groups than others and this is set out within the individual assessments, which are also appended and the excel table. Some proposals also impact on staff.</p> <p>Intended outcomes</p> <p>To present a budget to Council that has given full consideration to the impact of proposals and gives proper consideration to the Council's equality duties.</p> |
| <p>Live date:</p> | <p>April 2015</p> |
| <p>Lifespan:</p> | <p>April 2015 – March 2016</p> |
| <p>Date of next review:</p> | <p>March 2016</p> |

| Assessment issue | Impacts identified | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | | Uncertain |
| | | | Justified | Mitigated | | |
| Human Rights | | | | | | |
| Engagement with Convention Rights | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | A number of proposals indirectly relate to human rights, for example the proposal to use alternative funding to provide communication support for children with complex needs. None of the assessments have identified that there could be an adverse impact on human rights as a result of a proposal. |
| Equality | | | | | | |

| Assessment issue | Impacts identified | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence | |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | | Uncertain |
| | | | Justified | Mitigated | | |
| Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Seven of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals except one either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.</p> <p>Proposals potentially relevant to this group included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacement of core funding for services with public health funding • transfer of Stewart Park maintenance functions to Askham Bryan College • reduction in trade union facility time • reconfiguration of the re-ablement service • use of health funding for the telecare brokerage service • use of DfE funding to provide communication support for children with complex needs • remove Council subsidies for bus services 12, 28, 29A, 537, 5603, 605, 606 and 607. <p>The proposal to remove bus subsidies from the 29A bus route was identified as having an adverse impact on individuals with a disability because of the potential increase in distance to the nearest bus stop if the subsidised diversion through Eagle Park was removed (a maximum of 1Km distance potentially) as 3.6% of those surveyed identified that they had a disability. A stage 2 impact assessment was undertaken in line with the PSED to assess whether this impact could be avoided and ensure the element of the duty requires due regard to be given to where the steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities. Work has been undertaken to attempt to identify whether the bus company would be willing to continue to deliver the route without the subsidy. The survey and research indicates that overall the route may be profitable and it is likely that the company may continue to operate it. However this could not be verified at the point of completion of this impact assessment therefore it cannot be taken into account as a method of mitigating the impact.</p> <p>As it was not possible to mitigate the impact of the proposal, consideration was given to whether the impact was justified. It is therefore judged that the impact of this proposal is justified as the purpose of the subsidy is to support services that would not otherwise be delivered because they are unprofitable and data available indicates this service has become more popular so is less reliant on the subsidy.</p> <p>Given the above and the actions put in place to mitigate the impact of reductions as part of the development of the proposals it is considered that people with a disability will not be disproportionately adversely affected by the budget as a result of their having a protected characteristic with the exception of the removal of the 29A bus service subsidy.</p> |

| Assessment issue | Impacts identified | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | | Uncertain |
| | | | Justified | Mitigated | | |
| Race | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Two of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic; replacement of core funding for services with public health funding and reduction in trade union facility time.</p> <p>There were no concerns that the remainder of the proposals could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a group or individuals because of their race.</p> |
| Age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Ten of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. Most of the proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate with the exception of the subsidised bus services proposal.</p> <p>The proposal to remove bus subsidies from the 29A bus route was identified as having an adverse impact on individuals because of age because of the potential increase in distance to the nearest bus stop if the subsidised diversion through Eagle Park was removed (a maximum of 1Km distance potentially) as 46% of those surveyed identified that they had a concessionary bus pass because they were aged over 60. A stage 2 impact assessment was undertaken in line with the PSED to assess whether this impact could be avoided. It found that work has been undertaken to attempt to identify whether the bus company would be willing to continue to deliver the route without the subsidy. The survey and research indicates that overall the route may be profitable and it is likely that the company may continue to operate it. However this could not be verified at the point of completion of this impact assessment therefore it cannot be taken into account as a method of mitigating the impact.</p> <p>As it was not possible to mitigate the impact of the proposal, consideration was given to whether the impact was justified. It is therefore judged that the impact of this proposal is justified as the purpose of the subsidy is to support services that would not otherwise be delivered because they are unprofitable and data available indicates this service has become more popular so is less reliant on the subsidy.</p> |
| Religion or belief | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Three of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. The proposals to replace core funding for services with public health funding and reduction in trade union facility time would have no disproportionate adverse impact on religion or belief.</p> <p>The proposal to remove bus subsidies from the 603/4 route was identified at stage 1 as having a potential impact which was not fully mitigated as part of the initial proposal. A stage 2 impact assessment was undertaken in line with the PSED to assess whether this impact could be avoided. It found that in this instance, although access to this site would be affected, there are alternative places of worship in the town serviced by a bus route however there will be an adverse impact on those surveyed who use the 603/604 but this is partially mitigated by the availability of access to alternative places of worship and alternatives religious service times, although it may increase journey times.</p> <p>Given the very small number of users, the alternatives available and the need to ensure value for money is achieved, it is judged that the impact of this proposal is justified</p> |

| Assessment issue | Impacts identified | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | | Uncertain |
| | | | Justified | Mitigated | | |
| Sex | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Three of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. Proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacement of core funding for services with public health funding • reduction in trade union facility time • reconfiguration of the reablement service. <p>The proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate. Overall there are no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately because of gender.</p> |
| Pregnancy / maternity | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Two of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacement of core funding for services with public health funding • reduction in trade union facility time. <p>The proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate. Overall there are no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately because of pregnancy or maternity status.</p> |
| Gender reassignment | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Two of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacement of core funding for services with public health funding • reduction in trade union facility time. <p>The proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate. Overall there are no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately because of pregnancy or maternity status.</p> |
| Sexual Orientation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Two of the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacement of core funding for services with public health funding • reduction in trade union facility time. <p>The proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate. Overall there are no concerns that the proposals could impact disproportionately because of pregnancy or maternity status.</p> |

| Assessment issue | Impacts identified | | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | Uncertain | |
| | | | Justified | Mitigated | | |
| Marriage / civil partnership** | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | None the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate. |
| Dependants / caring responsibilities** | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>A number of the proposals in relation to social care were indirectly relevant to these characteristics. These proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.</p> <p>The proposal to remove bus subsidies from a number of services had an impact on this group because a number of those surveyed used the affected services to travel to provide care for family / friends. The impact of this was considered in stage 2 impact assessment. It found that a small proportion of people indicated that services were used to travel to provide care to family or friends. National statistics indicate that 10% of the population are carers. Survey data did not identify any services which would have an above average adverse impact on carers.</p> <p>Given the above, the impact of the proposal on those who have dependants or caring responsibilities has been considered and it is judged that there is nothing in the proposal that should have a greater or lesser impact on residents depending upon whether they have dependents or are carers.</p> |
| Criminal record / offending past** | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | None the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate. |
| Community cohesion | | | | | | |
| Individual communities / neighbourhoods | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | The impact assessment process found that a number of proposals were relevant to community cohesion. Due regard was given within the impact assessment process to the need to foster good relations between persons |

** 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 | | |
| Relations between communities / neighbourhoods | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:</p> <p>(a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding.</p> <p>For example the nature of the proposal to reduce culture costs was shaped to ensure the service continued to support events that support community cohesion.</p> <p>The stage one assessment found that the proposal to remove bus subsidies would have an adverse impact on community cohesion. In line with the PSED a stage two was undertaken to assess whether this impact could be avoided. It found that 30.4 % of respondents to a bus survey used the services to travel to work. A significant percentage also used it for social reasons: 'Leisure/Social' 14.7%, 'Visit friends' 8.1%, 'To attend school/college' 5.3%, 'Provide care for family/friend' 3.5%, 'Attend church/worship' 1.6%, 'Health appointments' 0.9%. So the combined impact may have an impact on community cohesion.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that when asked about alternatives if the services were to be withdrawn, 21.2% would walk. When considering attending of places of worship and health appointments, many communities have these within close reach. Many of the journeys undertaken for social reasons could be within the more confined area of the community rather than wider reaching travel. Although 22.8% of respondents chose 'No alternative/Don't know' only 8.2% stated that they would 'Give up the activity' suggesting that there are alternatives available.</p> |
| Middlesbrough 2020 | | | | | | |
| Theme 1 • Town that is clean, safe and healthy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | None the proposals were identified as being potentially relevant to this protected characteristic. All proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate. |

| Assessment issue | Impacts identified | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | | Uncertain |
| | | | Justified | Mitigated | | |
| <p>Theme 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A learning town, in which families and communities thrive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| <p>All except one of the proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate, the exception being the proposal to remove bus subsidies on a number of services.</p> <p>The stage one impact assessment identified that the elements of the bus subsidies proposal would have a significant impact on those travelling on the subsidised services to access employment, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of those surveyed on the 603/604 and 605/606/607 routes, 73% (56 people) and 82% (60 people) respectively, of those travelling used the services to access employment. 24.55 and 39.3% of all users surveyed for these services identified that they did not know how they would travel without the provision. Of those surveyed for the service 39 (previously known as the 537) 79.7% (63 people) of users used the service to access employment. <p>This could have an adverse impact on the Mayor's vision, in particular the aim that more people are working – especially young people. There are alternative bus routes for the 39 at a later time and there are other routes that could be accessed but there would be an increase in the walking distance in some cases.</p> <p>If the 603/604 route was removed there would be alternative routes at some points, however there would be no bus access to Stainton village on a Sunday. If the 605/606/607 routes were removed there would be alternative routes at some points, however there would be no early morning bus access to Stainton village on a Monday to Saturday.</p> <p>There are alternative services however these would involve significant de tours or walking distances. It is hoped the Bike to Work scheme will partially mitigate this impact along with negotiations with the bus companies to encourage them to maintain these routes, however it is not possible to mitigate this impact fully.</p> <p>The proposal is justified on the grounds that the Council needs to ensure value for money and research indicates that a number of routes are likely to be profitable for the bus companies to continue in the long run.</p> | | | | | | |

| Assessment issue | Impacts identified | | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | Uncertain | |
| | | | Justified | Mitigated | | |
| Theme 3 • A town that continues to transform | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>All except one of the proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate, the exception being the proposal to remove bus subsidies on a number of services. The Stage One impact assessment identified that it was possible that a lack of access to the town centre and other shopping/leisure facilities as well as places of work could have a negative impact on the local economy. The bus surveys undertaken highlighted that 30.4% of respondents used the services to travel to work. 15.4% of respondents also highlighted that they use the services for 'Shopping, hairdressers, bank'. This suggests an impact on the local economy would be likely.</p> <p>There are alternative services however these would involve significant de tours or walking distances. It is hoped the Bike to Work scheme will partially mitigate this impact along with negotiations with the bus companies to encourage them to maintain these routes, however it is not possible to mitigate this impact fully.</p> <p>The proposal is justified on the grounds that the Council needs to ensure value for money and research indicates that a number of routes are likely to be viable for the bus companies to continue in the long run.</p> |
| 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"/> | <p>All except the proposals either had no impact on this group, contained measures to fully mitigate the impact of proposals on this group or had an impact that was assessed as being proportionate.</p> |
| 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 / transformation | | | | | | |
| Partnership working | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>A number of the proposals relate to partnership working. Some of the proposals would result in the Council seeking alternative providers for services, seeking a fairer contribution to the cost of a service from a partner in line with their statutory duties and responsibilities or cessation of a partnership. There are no concerns expressed within this process that this could result in an unfair impact on partners.</p> |
| Employees | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>A number of proposals identify that there could be a possible impact on staff as a result of the proposals. Each individual Impact Assessment sets out how this impact will be mitigated as far as is possible. In the main mitigation will be undertaken by deleting vacant posts and accepting ERVR requests to reduce the number of compulsory redundancies required. A number of proposals may have an impact on staff when they are brought forward for decision in year. Impact assessments will be undertaken as appropriate. To date the overall impact of redundancies has been broadly in line with the overall gender composition of the workforce. It is not considered that there could be an overall disproportionate adverse impact on groups or individuals as a result of their holding a protected characteristic.</p> |

| Assessment issue | Impacts identified | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence | |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | | Uncertain |
| | | | Justified | Mitigated | | |
| Accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | A number of the proposals will result in reductions in the amount of accommodation required by the Council. These proposals form part of the Council's overarching strategic approach to the management of its property. The proposals within the budget will have a positive effect on this area, streamlining council accommodation. |
| ICT | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Some proposals will require ICT investment to realise savings as a result of automation of processes, implementation of new / alternative ICT solutions etc. These investments will be reflected within the Council's ICT work programme. |

| Further actions | | Lead | Deadline |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Mitigating actions | Mitigating actions identified within the Impact Assessment process are sets out within the individual impact assessments. | Individual IA leads | Various |
| Promotion | Promotion of the changes where there is an impact on service delivery will be undertaken. | Individual IA leads | Various |
| Monitoring and evaluation | Overall monitoring of the impact will be embedded within performance management arrangements for 2015/16 | Paul Stephens | May 2015 |
| Assessment completed by: | Ann-Marie Johnstone | Head of Service: | Paul Slocombe |
| Date: | 21 January 2015 | Date: | 21 January 2015 |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Subject of assessment: | Use of public health funding | | | |
| Coverage: | Remove core Council funding for services costing £1m per annum to deliver and utilise other funding sources available to the Council. | | | |
| 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: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key aims, objectives and activities To release £1m from the core Public Health budget to reinvest in Council public health services in-line with the Revenue Account return to the Department of Health. Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Department of Health Revenue Account return Differences from any previous approach Previously Public Health spend was an NHS responsibility, during the transition year of Public Health into Local Authorities a number of reviews have been undertaken on existing services to explore better alignment of Public Health investment with Local Authority Public Health priorities. The outcome of these reviews is that £1m of public health budgets will be invested into Council public health services and non-public health budgets of up to £1m will be released to support other Council priorities. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) The services being impacted on by the above changes have been informed by a number of pieces of commissioned insight work, i.e. school nursing review and weight management review. Intended outcomes. The proposal will ensure a number of key services delivered to all residents are maintained at their current level by redesigning services. | | | |
| Live date: | 1 April 2015 | | | |
| Lifespan: | 1 year | | | |
| Date of next review: | Autumn 2015 spending review | | | |

| 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 indirectly supports the following Human Rights in a positive way, by support schemes that contribute to their achievement: Right to life, Respect for your private and family life, home and correspondence and Right to education |
| Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?* | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>Equality and diversity issues are considered within the evidence base utilised within the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA). The proposed areas of spend have been aligned with the priorities for improvement that have been identified by the JSNA which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People • Vulnerable People • Wider Determinants • Behaviour and Lifestyles • Illness and Death <p>Given the nature of the priorities these proposals are relevant to all equalities protected characteristics. In particular they are relevant to the following protected characteristics: Age, Disability, Gender and Pregnancy and Maternity, through services such as Teenage Pregnancy, 0-19 Service, Transitions Team and Staying Put Agency. There are no concerns that the proposals could have an adverse impact on these characteristics. The purpose of the proposals is to continue to fund services which are working to address inequalities in outcomes that are experienced by individuals within these groups.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the JSNA, engagement with residents, key partners, stakeholders and through adhering to national guidance</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>Community cohesion</p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion. The JSNA is designed to identify where outcomes vary for different groups so that resources can be focussed on those with poorer outcomes. This will include neighbourhood specific work in some instances which will have a direct positive impact on community cohesion For example through the proposal the Neighbourhood Management team will be continue to operate at current levels to strengthen social relationships and opportunities for community connection and to build and enable social support, networks and capital within and between communities.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the JSNA, engagement with residents, key partners, stakeholders and through adhering to national guidance</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 proposal aligns with the 2020 vision. It will ensure that the Council continues to deliver services that work to improve health outcomes in Middlesbrough which supports the aim that Middlesbrough is a town which is clean, safe and healthy.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the JSNA, engagement with residents, key partners, stakeholders and through adhering to national guidance</p> |
| <p>Organisational management / Change Programme</p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council’s services as set out in its Change Programme?*</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The proposal with contribute to delivering the Change Programme by providing financial resource to support services through organisational change.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the JSNA, engagement with residents, key partners, stakeholders and through adhering to national guidance</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: | Louise Antill | Head of Service: | Edward Kununga |
| Date: | 6/1/15 | Date: | 6/1/15 |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Subject of assessment: | Proposal to enter into a partnership with Askham Bryan College | | | |
| 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 <p>To assess proposals to enter into a partnership with Askham Bryan College.</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 Transport Act 2000, Road Traffic Act 1988, Highways Act 1980, Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, New Roads and Street Works Act 1991</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differences from any previous approach <p>Newham Grange was at risk of closure as it was subsidised by the Council. Under the proposal Askham Bryan have leased Newham Grange for 10 years, with a three year break clause. As part of the partnership, Askham Bryan College will open a land based education centre and occupy buildings and land at Stewart Park with a transfer of assets, maintenance and staffing responsibilities leading to a saving of up to £220,000 pa (this includes costs associated with Newham Grange too) The public park would remain under the Council's management. More of the park would be open to the public than at present. The Visitors Centre, café animal enclosures would remain open to the public and additional attractions including a more diverse animal offer, college open days and education classes would be offered. Askham Bryan will also take occupation of the Central Lodge in Stewart Park and have submitted a HLF bid for £2.5m to enhance the offer at the Park for students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) <p>Council employees, Trade union representatives, NGLF and Park users., Trustees of Stewart Park, Charity Commission, Residents living in close proximity, Friends Groups, Heritage Lottery Fund, Askham Bryan College, its staff and students, Schools and Colleges, local employers. , funding bodies, customers, staff and trades union representatives, Askham Bryan college, its staff and students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intended outcomes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the Park user offer at Stewart Park and Newham Grange introducing such facilities as exotic animal enclosures, equestrian events (limited to appropriate space) and more access to land previously not for public access. To provide a new land based education package in the Tees Valley for 18-24 students, apprentices and some adult training. To provide increased chances of employability for young people through improved skills and learning. And also help reduce the skills shortage in rural industries. To enhance the existing facilities through investment and funding opportunities. Levering capital investment in Middlesbrough from the College and External agencies. Reduce the costs of parks services to the Council, protecting jobs and addressing specific risks around Newham Grange | | | |
| Live date: | 1 September 2014 onwards | | | |
| Lifespan: | 1 September 2014 onwards | | | |
| Date of next review: | 1 September 2017 (Newham Grange) or if a review clause is triggered. | | | |

| 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 will be particularly relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics because of the nature of the proposed decision.</p> <p>Age - it is anticipated that the proposal will have a positive impact on users of these facilities by maintaining and improving access to current facilities and providing new services including increased educational opportunities for the town’s residents. In addition to further education opportunities there will also be educational opportunities for adults.</p> <p>Disability – Askham Bryan provides opportunities for learners of all abilities and as part of the new provision, learners with additional needs will be supported at both the Stewart Park and Newham Grange campus. Access to buildings at Stewart Park will be improved as part of a joint investment. This will include bringing buildings back into use that have been closed because of the backlog of repairs required and improving access and standards in other buildings.</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 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>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 building standards data.</p> <p>As a result of the above there are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on individuals or groups 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"/> | It is not anticipated that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community relations as enhanced services and customer offer will continue to be provided and improved. |
| 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 priorities that Middlesbrough should be a town where streets and open spaces are well maintained, families are supported to succeed, more people are working – especially young people, children and adults have the skills they need. The proposal should have a positive impact on these priorities. |
| 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 transfer is a good example of modernising the way Council services are delivered and therefore follows closely the outcomes of the Change Programme. Activities once managed by the Council will be delivered by a well-resourced and highly skilled organisation that have expertise and experience in this service area. |
| 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: | Gamini Wijesinghe | Head of Service: | Tom Punton |
| Date: | 12 th January 2015 | Date: | 13 January 2015 |

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Subject of assessment: | Senior Management review outcome 7 | | | |
| Coverage: | To review the council's service structure | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service | <input type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input checked="" 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: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key aims, objectives and activities To review existing management structures within outcome 7 to ensure they are better placed to achieve the Mayor's vision and are fit for purpose to enable them to drive the transformational change required to deliver the Vision and Change Programme simultaneously. Statutory drivers Services within outcome 7 deliver a range of statutory and non-statutory services. There are a number of statutory drivers that are relevant to this restructure, including Local Government Acts and statutory guidance which set out the Statutory roles undertaken by some senior managers within the Council's structure. These statutory duties have been considered when designing the proposed approach and will be properly reflected within the proposed structure. Differences from any previous approach The proposal would reduce the number of senior manager posts within outcome 7 from 19 to 13 in line with the overall percentage reductions identified for statutory, non-statutory and support services as part of the Change Programme process. It is unlikely that this review will be completed without job losses either through voluntary or compulsory redundancies. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Service users, all local residents, Council staff, trades unions, partner agencies, voluntary and community sector and local businesses. Intended outcomes. That a structure is put in place so that continues to implement the Change Programme principles to ensure the services within outcome 7 are strategically focused on the transformation of Council services to achieve the following aim: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing, managing, maintaining and enhancing highways, streets, parks, open spaces, leisure facilities, public buildings and commercial properties such that the quality of place supports the needs of residents, visitors and business. | | | |
| Live date: | Depends on the outcome of consultation which will close on 23/10/14. | | | |
| Lifespan: | The implemented changes will apply until there is a further requirement to review structures within the scope of this review. | | | |
| Date of next review: | There will be an initial desk top review within six months of the full implementation date to ensure there no unintended disproportional negative outcomes have occurred or there are any unresolved or unexpected issues and that the revised structure is able to deliver the Change Programme and the vision for the town. This will be formalised if there are any concerns. | | | |

| 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 restructure will not impact on service delivery and will therefore have no impact on human rights. As set out in the preamble, it will enable delivery of the Mayor's vision for the town and in particular delivery of outcome 7. |
| Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>Because the review will significantly senior management budgets it is inevitable that it will have an impact on staff as staff capacity will need to be reduced to achieve savings targets in the vast majority of the directorates. The principles of the review and the proposed savings targets are in line with the Change Programme principles and its savings profile which has been previously impact assessed. The proposal for outcome 7 is that staffing will reduce from 16 to 15. Analysis of proposals indicates that there is a risk of one redundancy.</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.</p> <p>Documents used to support this process will include redeployment policy and redundancy policy. Based on the evidence available, there are no concerns that the review will disproportionately affect any person because they hold a protected characteristic. HR policies have been separately impact assessed. Consultation will be undertaken on proposals with staff and relevant partners as part of the review.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Analysis of equality information held on staff o Consultation feedback from staff within the proposed structure. |

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>Not directly relevant to decision. Staff within the scope of the review do not provide front-line services. The review has been designed to ensure that the Council is able to continue to meet all of its statutory duties of which community cohesion is one. The savings targets for statutory services reflect this commitment and therefore there are no concerns that the proposal could have an impact on community relations.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of statutory duties and previous Change Programme documentation.</p> |
| <p>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? *</p> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>No. The structure is designed to enable achievement of the vision for the town and was proposed following adoption by Council of the outcome based organisation model.</p> |
| <p>Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council’s services as set out in its transformation programme? *</p> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>This review fits in with transformation agenda – and is being put in place to ensure that there is strategic focus and drive to the Change Programme/transformation agenda.</p> |
| <p>Next steps:</p> <p>➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.</p> <p>➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.</p> <p>This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.</p> | | | | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|-----|
| Assessment completed by: | Tom Punton | Head of Service: Tom Punton | n/a |
| Date: | 01/09/14 | Date: 01/09/14 | n/a |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Subject of assessment: | Re-negotiate arrangements for Trade Union consultation and engagement that ensures more efficient use of the shop steward network | | | |
| Coverage: | Cross-cutting | | | |
| 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: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To assess the proposal re-negotiate arrangements for Trade Union consultation and engagement that ensures more efficient use of the shop steward network. • Statutory drivers Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 and ACAS Code of Practice - Time off for Trade Union duties and activities • Differences from any previous approach Under the proposals funding for trade union facility time would be reduced from £97,875 to £77,875. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Staff and their trade union representatives. • Intended outcomes. That the Council continues to have appropriate arrangements in place with reduced costs that are proportionate to the reduction in staff numbers. | | | |
| Live date: | April 2015 | | | |
| Lifespan: | Permanent Change | | | |
| Date of next review: | A review will be undertaken in the event of a significant change in trade union regulations or staffing numbers. | | | |

| 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> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Trade unions work to protect the rights of members. In some instances individual case work may be relevant to human rights legislation. There are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on this as the proposal is to reduce funding in line with the overall percentage reduction of Council staffing in the last three years.</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> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 is potentially relevant to the all the protected characteristics because of the nature of the services provided by trade unions. The proposal is to reduce facility time by 20%. In the last three years staffing numbers in the Council have been reduced by 19% and it is some years since trade union facility time was reduced. Given this is a proportionate reduction there are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate impact on individuals or groups because they hold a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of staffing numbers and feedback from trade unions to date.</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?* | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community cohesion. The proposed reduction is proportionate to the reduction in the number of staff employed by the Council. |
| Middlesbrough 2020 – Our Vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough?* | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | The proposal aligns with the 2020 vision. It will ensure that the Council continues to work with trade unions as part of steps taken to manage staff relations within a reduction that is proportionate to the Council's overall reduction in its workforce. |
| 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?* | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | The proposal aligns with the Change Programme. It will ensure that the Council continues to work with trade unions as part of steps taken to manage staff relations within a reduction that is proportionate to the Council's overall reduction in its workforce. |
| 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: | Pip Schofield | Head of Service: | Karen Whitmore |
| Date: | 18 December 2014 | Date: | 5 January 2015 |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Subject of assessment: | Reduction in use of External Barristers for child care matters | | | |
| 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Revision of an existing approach: | <input 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 proposal to change the way the Council is represented in child care proceedings. • Statutory drivers The Council has a number of statutory drivers relevant to this proposal including, but not exclusively Children's Act 1989, Children and Families Act 2014, Education Act 1996, . • Differences from any previous approach Currently barrister services are commissioned on an ad hoc basis. Under this proposal 2 members of staff would be recruited with the necessary skills to deliver this service in house. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Service users and their families / carers, partner agencies and schools. • Intended outcomes. That the Council continues to have appropriate arrangements in place for representation in child care matters, with reduced costs. | | | |
| Live date: | February 2015 | | | |
| Lifespan: | Permanent Change | | | |
| Date of next review: | A review will be undertaken in the event of a significant change in the volume of child care matters. | | | |

| Screening questions | Response | | | Evidence |
|---|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | No | Yes | Uncertain | |
| Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?* | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | There will be no alteration to the service provided; however, that service will be provided by internal staff rather than external barristers. |
| 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?* | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 is relevant to the age protected characteristic because of the nature of the service provided. Under the proposal it is anticipated that capacity in the service will be greater than the capacity currently provided through these ad hoc arrangements, while at the same time, reducing the cost of the services to the Council. The recruitment process to be undertaken will ensure that those appointed have the necessary skills to be able to deliver the post.</p> <p>Given the above there are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on this group. In fact it is anticipated that the proposal will have a positive impact. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - current costs - time spent on cases by Barristers who's services are currently procured - skills analysis and integration of those skills within the person specification of the proposed posts. |

* 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?* | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Under the proposal it is anticipated that capacity in the service will be greater than the capacity currently provided through these ad hoc arrangements, while at the same time, reducing the cost of the services to the Council. As a result there are no anticipated impacts on community cohesion. |
| Middlesbrough 2020 – Our Vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough?* | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Under the proposal it is anticipated that capacity in the service will be greater than the capacity currently provided through these ad hoc arrangements, while at the same time, reducing the cost of the services to the Council. The proposal is in line with the vision and links to the aim that ‘children and vulnerable adults are safeguarded. |
| 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?* | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Under the proposal it is anticipated that capacity in the service will be greater than the capacity currently provided through these ad hoc arrangements, while at the same time, reducing the cost of the services to the Council. The proposal forms part of the Change Programme, it sits within the Legal services savings target for 2015/16. |
| 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: | Bryn Roberts | Head of Service: | Karen Whitmore |
| Date: | 3 December 2014 | Date: | 7 January 2015 |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Subject of assessment: | Reduce costs with regard to the Sheltered Housing Scheme Warden Services by re-negotiating service costs, which will save £125,000. | | | |
| Coverage: | Service-specific. | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> Service | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure | <input type="checkbox"/> Programme | <input type="checkbox"/> Project | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state) | | |
| It is a: | New approach: | <input type="checkbox"/> | Revision of an existing approach: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| It is driven by: | Legislation: | <input type="checkbox"/> | Local or corporate requirements: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Description: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To review the current contract for the provision of the Sheltered Housing Scheme Warden service. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) The Sheltered Housing Scheme Warden service is delivered from former Supporting People funds; this funding is no longer ring-fenced as such but continues to be used in support of former commitments. • Differences from any previous approach The commissioning section has identified economies that can be obtained by review of this contract while still maintaining the current level of service. Under the proposal current levels of services will be maintained, however the provider may change as a result of a procurement exercise. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Service users in sheltered housing, Council staff, trades unions, partner agencies, voluntary and community sector and local businesses. • Intended outcomes To more efficiently and cost effectively deliver the existing level of service. | | | |
| Live date: | June 2015 | | | |
| Lifespan: | The service will continue in its new form until the contract is due for renewal or conditions are met such that an unscheduled review of contract is required. | | | |
| Date of next review: | This will be determined following review of the service to implement the new provider. | | | |

| Screening questions | Response | | | Evidence |
|--|----------|-----|-----------|--|
| | No | Yes | Uncertain | |
| <p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*</p> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>The future configuration will be monitored by the Local Authority Contracts and Commissioning department in same way as they are now and the agency appointed will have to be able to demonstrate that Human Rights duties are met.</p> <p>There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on human rights duties.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes the policies and processes to be employed by our Contracts and Commissioning team in monitoring the contract.</p> |
| <p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*</p> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>Under the proposal services would continue to be delivered to the same standard and the same level of access would be maintained regardless of the reconfiguration. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the measure would have an impact on service users. This will be monitored through Contracts and commission and legislation.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes the policies and processes to be employed by our Contracts and Commissioning team in monitoring the contract.</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 proposal does not impact on this as the service is planned to continue to be delivered with no diminution in the amount of provision. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the documentation relating to the existing use of the Sheltered Housing Warden Service. |
| 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 does contribute to the theme of “A town that is clean, safe and healthy” in that it supports people to live longer, healthier lives and supports us in ensuring that vulnerable adults are safeguarded. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes The Middlesbrough 2020 vision document and Contracts and Commissioning procedures. |
| 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 measure contributes to efficiency savings identified as part of on-going Change Programme work. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes Change Programme documentation and documentation relating to the existing contract. |
| 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: | Erik Scollay | Head of Service: | Erik Scollay |
| Date: | 05/01/2015 | Date: | 05/01/2015 |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Subject of assessment: | Reconfigure the Reablement Service, so it concentrates solely on complex, high-risk discharge from hospital and intermediate care, which will save £27,000 with approximately one job loss. | | | |
| Coverage: | Service-specific. | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Description: | <p><u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u> To reconfigure the services so that the current reablement team is revised to focus on complex, high risk discharges from hospital and the remainder of the current service is provided in partnership with the independent sector.</p> <p><u>Statutory Drivers</u> There is no statutory duty to provide this service. However decisions around the future of the service would be relevant to the Disability Discrimination Act the Equality Act 2010. The Public Sector Equality Duty requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regards to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act. • Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it. • Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who not share it. <p>In having due regards to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic • Taking steps to meet the needs of person who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| | <p>The Act that the needs of people with a disability are considered and that steps should be taken to take these into account. As this proposal relates to a service whose primary focus is on service users who are older people, then this provision is particularly relevant to this proposal.</p> <p><u>Differences from any previous approach</u></p> <p>The reablement service is part of the Middlesbrough Intermediate care service, which facilitates hospital discharges; prevent unnecessary admissions to hospital or residential care. The reablement services also maximises an individual’s independence and rebuilds their self-confidence to enable them to remain in their own home with or without support. The service can be delivered for a limited period and is nil charge to the individual. The service is also registered with Care Quality Commission and the service is currently provided in-house through the Department of Wellbeing Care and Learning. Under the revised approach the service will be split into two, with the complex, high risk discharges from hospital continuing to be serviced by the reablement team while remaining clients will be serviced by the Independent sector. There will be no gap in service provision. Eligibility criteria for accessing these services will not change and there will be no reduction in service standards.</p> <p><u>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past service users, current Service users – April 2013 until March 2014 and potential future service users • Ten staff members are directly affected by the proposal • Health – Health professionals work alongside the reablement team <p><u>Intended outcomes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increased use of reablement services to ensure that people remain as independent as possible and to avoid referrals to ongoing provider services wherever this can be achieved. • To enable a smaller reablement team to focus on discharges from residential rehab and stroke who have complex needs. <p>Reduction in cost of the service by £27,000 per annum.</p> |
| Live date: | November 2014 |
| Lifespan: | N/A |
| Date of next review: | It is envisaged that a review will take place within six months of the reconfiguration |

| 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 contract that will be implemented will be with an independent provider. This service will be monitored by the Local Authority Contracts and Commissioning department and current legislation. The same way as they are now and the agency appointed will have to be able to demonstrate that Human Rights are respected and the services they provide do not impact on the way that reablement is delivered.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>As set out previously, the Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal in line with the Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>Service users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 2012 until March 2013 – 148 commenced service • April 2013 until March 2014 – 186 commenced service • <p>The majority of the service users were female and over 65 years of age, therefore this proposal is more relevant to the age and gender protected characteristics.</p> <p>Under the proposal services would continue to be delivered to the same standard and the same level of access would be maintained – regardless of the outsourcing, and the reconfiguration. Therefore it is not anticipated that outsourcing would have an impact on service users. This will be monitored through Contracts and commission and legislation.</p> <p>Assessment includes feedback from the consultation process, analysis of the equality data on service where available, analysis for the complaints data,, value for money assessments</p> <p>Staff: - Ten staff work in the reablement team. Discussions will be held with the staff concerned and the review process will be supported by a range of HR policies, primarily ER/VR, to ensure there is no disproportional adverse impact on staff. No redundancies are anticipated as a result of this proposal. Savings will be achieved from deletion of vacant posts.</p> <p>Documents used to support this process include service review guidance, redeployment policy, redundancy policy and TUPE. These documents have been separately impact assessed.</p> <p>Evidence used to support this assessment includes analysis of current service user needs, service user levels and predicted future demand.</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 proposal does not impact on this as the service is planned to continue to be delivered with no diminution in the amount of reablement provided. |
| 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 does contribute to the Theme of Adult Health and Wellbeing/Tackling Exclusion and Promoting equality. The decision will have a positive impact on this theme as the level of service provided will be increased enabling more people to access the service |
| 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 aim of the review is to ensure that the service can maintain and improve the delivery of its key 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: | June Hunt | Head of Service: | Erik Scollay |
| Date: | 3 rd August 2014 | Date: | 05/01/2015 |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Subject of assessment: | Reduce costs in relation to exhibition and subsidised events, as well as the number of staff within the Cultural Services department, which will save £60,000, which will result in one job loss. | | | |
| Coverage: | Service-specific. | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> Service | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure | <input type="checkbox"/> Programme | <input type="checkbox"/> Project | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state) | | |
| It is a: | New approach: | <input type="checkbox"/> | Revision of an existing approach: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| It is driven by: | Legislation: | <input type="checkbox"/> | Local or corporate requirements: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Description: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To assess the impact of the proposal to reduce costs in relation to exhibition and subsidised events, as well as the number of staff within the Cultural Services department, which will save £60,000. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Services provided within this proposal are non-statutory. • Differences from any previous approach Under the proposal income targets for the service would be raised and savings from previous decisions to reduce staffing would be realised. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Customers, Council staff, visitors to the town and local businesses. • Intended outcomes To more efficiently and cost effectively deliver the existing level of service by improving commercial income. | | | |
| Live date: | April 2015 | | | |
| Lifespan: | ongoing. | | | |
| Date of next review: | Triggered when further budget savings are required | | | |

| 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>There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on human rights duties.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of income from previous years and analysis of mainstream event subsidies v impacts.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>Under the proposal services would continue to be delivered to the same standard and the same level of access would be maintained, there would be a very small reduction in the total number of commercial events delivered, for example the theatre would see a reduction of around 5 events from a programme of 200 events. The service's commitment to provision of events which are designed to engage communities and individuals that are less likely to attend cultural events, delivered mainly through grant funding. Savings will be achieved by raising income targets on chargeable events, reducing the extent to which individual events are subsidised and realising savings from previous decisions to reduce staffing.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that the measure would have a disproportionate adverse impact on customers or staff.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of income from previous years and analysis of mainstream event subsidies versus impacts achieved.</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>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 proposal does not impact on this as the service is planned to continue to be delivered with no anticipated impact on those targeted events that support community cohesion. Savings will be achieved by raising income targets on chargeable events, reducing the extent to which individual events are subsidised and realising savings from previous decisions to reduce staffing.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of income from previous years and analysis of mainstream event subsidies versus impacts achieved.</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 service provides a cross-cutting contribution towards achievement of the Mayor’s vision. There are no concerns that the proposal could adversely impact on the vision.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of income from previous years and analysis of mainstream event subsidies versus impacts achieved.</p> |
| <p>Organisational management / Change Programme</p> <p>Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council’s services as set out in its Change Programme?*</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>This measure contributes to efficiency savings identified as part of on-going Change Programme work.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of income from previous years and analysis of mainstream event subsidies versus impacts achieved.</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: | Anne Besford | Head of Service: | Sharon Thomas |
| Date: | 05/01/2015 | Date: | 05/01/2015 |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Subject of assessment: | Withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services 12, 28, 29A, 39, 603/604, 605/606/607. | | | |
| Coverage: | Service Specific | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service | <input type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure | <input type="checkbox"/> Programme | <input type="checkbox"/> Project | <input 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>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key aims, objectives and activities <p>The aim of the assessment is to assess the potential impact of the proposal to withdraw the subsidy to the 12, 28, 29A, 39, 603/604 and 605/606/607 bus services. This is linked to the prioritisation of transport funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) <p>The Transport Act requires that a Local Authority to secure the provision of such passenger transport services as the Council considers appropriate to meet any public transport requirements which would not otherwise be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differences from any previous approach <p>Proposal to withdraw the subsidies to the 12, 28, 29A, 39, 603/604 and 605/606/607 bus services which have until now been provided by the council.</p> <p><u>Services:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service 12: 0910 & 0940 (Sun) Middlesbrough – Parkway Centre via Acklam & Hemlington Service 28: 0700 (Mon-Fri) & 0705 (Sat) Middlesbrough – Lingdale via JCH & Nunthorpe, 0605 (M-S) & 0635 (Mon-Fri) Guisbrough - Middlesbrough via Nunthorpe & JCH, 0652 (Sat) Swans Corner - Middlesbrough via Nunthorpe & JCH, 0712 (Sat) Lingdale - Middlesbrough via Nunthorpe & JCH Service 29A: Eagle Park diversion on all journeys - Middlesbrough – Stokesley via JCH, Matron & Eagle Park Service 39: 0602 & 0632 (Mon-Sat) Middlesbrough – Park End, 0703 (Sat) Middlesbrough – Park End, 0515 & 0545 & 0615 (Mon-Sat) Park End – Middlesbrough, 0645 (Sat) Park End – Middlesbrough Service 603/604: All journeys: Middlesbrough – Middlesbrough via JCH, Coulby Newham, Hemlington & Acklam Service 605/606/607: All journeys: Middlesbrough – Middlesbrough via JCH, Coulby Newham, Hemlington & Acklam <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) <p>Members of the public, Bus companies and Local employers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intended outcomes. <p>This assessment is intended to assess the impact of removing the subsidies to these bus services in order to better inform the final proposal for these services.</p> | | | |
| Live date: | April 2015 | | | |
| Lifespan: | April 2015 onwards | | | |
| Date of next review: | 3 months to assess the impact any withdrawal may have had. | | | |

| 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. |

* 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 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 proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>In particular due regard was given to the need to the second part of the duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) “remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. <p>The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons’ disabilities.”</p> <p>The proposal is most relevant to the disability, age and religion or belief protected characteristics because of the nature of the service. For example, those of older age and those with disabilities may be less able to walk further to find alternative transportation. This issue was considered as part of the development of the proposed reduction and informed the proposal to ensure due regard was given to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>Alternative services and other solutions will be available such as bike-to-work and walking initiatives however, such alternatives may not be viable for some individuals with protected characteristics such as those with disabilities or the elderly.</p> <p>Past bus surveys have been carried out which provide information about the users of the services, which are proposed to be withdrawn. This data was used to inform the proposal along with analysis of bus usage on these routes.</p> <p>DfT data shows 41% of bus fares are from those who held a concessionary pass either because they were aged 60 or because of a disability.</p> |

| Screening questions | Response | Evidence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------|-------|--------|---------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|----|----|-----|----|---------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|------|-------------------|------|-------|------|------|-------|--|---------------|------|------|------|--|-------|-------|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|--|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|----------------------------|------|------|-------|--|-------|--|---------------------|---|---|------|--|--|--|-----------------------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|--|--|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|----|----|-----|----|---------|-------------|--------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|------------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-----|------------------------|-------|-------|------|-------|--------|-------|--------------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|------------------|------|------|-------|------|--------|---|---------------|------|--|------|------|------|-------|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | | <p>For:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service 12 the surveys showed that 25% of respondents held a concessionary pass for being 'aged 60 years or over' and 3.6% held a concessionary pass for having a 'disability'. • Service 28 the surveys showed that 35.1% of respondents held a concessionary pass for being 'aged 60 years or over' and 1.3% held a concessionary pass for having a 'disability'. • Service 29A the surveys showed that 46% of respondents held a concessionary pass for being 'aged 60 years or over' and 5% held a concessionary pass for having a 'disability'. • Service 39 the surveys showed that 10.1% of respondents held a concessionary pass for being 'aged 60 years or over' and 2.5% held a concessionary pass for having a 'disability'. • Service 603/604 the surveys showed that 23.9% of respondents held a concessionary pass for being 'aged 60 years or over' and 1.05% held a concessionary pass for having a 'disability'. • Service 605/606/607 the surveys showed that 19.4% of respondents held a concessionary pass for being 'aged 60 years or over' and 2.75% held a concessionary pass for having a 'disability'. <p>The surveys provided information on the reasons for bus usage.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 683 1791 964"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2"></th> <th colspan="6">Routes</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2"></th> <th>12</th> <th>28</th> <th>29A</th> <th>39</th> <th>603/604</th> <th>605/606/607</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="9">Reason for travel</td> <td>Travel to work</td> <td>39.1%</td> <td>36.4%</td> <td>14.7%</td> <td>79.7%</td> <td>73.05%</td> <td>81.55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shopping, hairdressers, bank</td> <td>23.2%</td> <td>22.1%</td> <td>31.7%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>School or college</td> <td>8.9%</td> <td>18.2%</td> <td>6.8%</td> <td>3.8%</td> <td>1.05%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Visit friends</td> <td>5.4%</td> <td>3.9%</td> <td>8.7%</td> <td></td> <td>1.05%</td> <td>4.05%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Attend place of worship</td> <td>3.6%</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>0.6%</td> <td>2.5%</td> <td>5.55%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provide care for family /friend</td> <td>3.6%</td> <td>7.8%</td> <td>5.0%</td> <td>2.5%</td> <td>3.15%</td> <td>0.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leisure or social purposes</td> <td>1.8%</td> <td>3.9%</td> <td>11.8%</td> <td></td> <td>1.05%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health appointments</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>1.9%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multi-purpose journey</td> <td>8.9%</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>14.9%</td> <td>5.1%</td> <td>5.55%</td> <td>0.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Similarly, the surveys provided information regarding alternatives.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 1008 1791 1362"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2"></th> <th colspan="6">Routes</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2"></th> <th>12</th> <th>28</th> <th>29A</th> <th>39</th> <th>603/604</th> <th>605/606/607</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="8">Alternatives</td> <td>would still travel by bus 'at a different time'</td> <td>26.8%</td> <td>16.9%</td> <td>15.5%</td> <td>11.4%</td> <td>7.6%</td> <td>8.05%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>'to a different destination'</td> <td>16.1%</td> <td>7.8%</td> <td>14.3%</td> <td>7.6%</td> <td>11.1%</td> <td>5.45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>would 'walk'</td> <td>17.9%</td> <td>22.1%</td> <td>13.0%</td> <td>11.4%</td> <td>22.85%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>would 'travel by taxi'</td> <td>17.9%</td> <td>13.0%</td> <td>5.6%</td> <td>22.8%</td> <td>17.65%</td> <td>11.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>would 'travel by car as a passenger'</td> <td>5.4%</td> <td>7.8%</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td>11.4%</td> <td>3.15%</td> <td>1.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>or as a 'driver'</td> <td>3.6%</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>11.8%</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>1.15%,</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>would 'cycle'</td> <td>1.8%</td> <td></td> <td>2.5%</td> <td>3.8%</td> <td>6.2%</td> <td>7.15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>would 'give up the activity'</td> <td>3.6%</td> <td>5.2%</td> <td>8.7%</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>5.15%</td> <td>4.95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>stated they either 'don't know' or have 'no alternative'</td> <td>16.1%</td> <td>32.5%</td> <td>21.1%</td> <td>29.1%</td> <td>24.55%</td> <td>39.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | Routes | | | | | | | | 12 | 28 | 29A | 39 | 603/604 | 605/606/607 | Reason for travel | Travel to work | 39.1% | 36.4% | 14.7% | 79.7% | 73.05% | 81.55% | Shopping, hairdressers, bank | 23.2% | 22.1% | 31.7% | | | 0.9% | School or college | 8.9% | 18.2% | 6.8% | 3.8% | 1.05% | | Visit friends | 5.4% | 3.9% | 8.7% | | 1.05% | 4.05% | Attend place of worship | 3.6% | 1.3% | 0.6% | 2.5% | 5.55% | | Provide care for family /friend | 3.6% | 7.8% | 5.0% | 2.5% | 3.15% | 0.9% | Leisure or social purposes | 1.8% | 3.9% | 11.8% | | 1.05% | | Health appointments | - | - | 1.9% | | | | Multi-purpose journey | 8.9% | 1.3% | 14.9% | 5.1% | 5.55% | 0.9% | | | Routes | | | | | | | | 12 | 28 | 29A | 39 | 603/604 | 605/606/607 | Alternatives | would still travel by bus 'at a different time' | 26.8% | 16.9% | 15.5% | 11.4% | 7.6% | 8.05% | 'to a different destination' | 16.1% | 7.8% | 14.3% | 7.6% | 11.1% | 5.45% | would 'walk' | 17.9% | 22.1% | 13.0% | 11.4% | 22.85% | 10% | would 'travel by taxi' | 17.9% | 13.0% | 5.6% | 22.8% | 17.65% | 11.7% | would 'travel by car as a passenger' | 5.4% | 7.8% | 10.6% | 11.4% | 3.15% | 1.8% | or as a 'driver' | 3.6% | 1.3% | 11.8% | 1.3% | 1.15%, | - | would 'cycle' | 1.8% | | 2.5% | 3.8% | 6.2% | 7.15% | would 'give up the activity' | 3.6% | 5.2% | 8.7% | 1.3% | 5.15% | 4.95% | stated they either 'don't know' or have 'no alternative' | 16.1% | 32.5% | 21.1% | 29.1% | 24.55% | 39.3% |
| | | Routes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 12 | 28 | 29A | 39 | 603/604 | 605/606/607 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reason for travel | Travel to work | 39.1% | 36.4% | 14.7% | 79.7% | 73.05% | 81.55% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Shopping, hairdressers, bank | 23.2% | 22.1% | 31.7% | | | 0.9% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | School or college | 8.9% | 18.2% | 6.8% | 3.8% | 1.05% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Visit friends | 5.4% | 3.9% | 8.7% | | 1.05% | 4.05% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Attend place of worship | 3.6% | 1.3% | 0.6% | 2.5% | 5.55% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Provide care for family /friend | 3.6% | 7.8% | 5.0% | 2.5% | 3.15% | 0.9% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Leisure or social purposes | 1.8% | 3.9% | 11.8% | | 1.05% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Health appointments | - | - | 1.9% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Multi-purpose journey | 8.9% | 1.3% | 14.9% | 5.1% | 5.55% | 0.9% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Routes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 12 | 28 | 29A | 39 | 603/604 | 605/606/607 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternatives | would still travel by bus 'at a different time' | 26.8% | 16.9% | 15.5% | 11.4% | 7.6% | 8.05% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 'to a different destination' | 16.1% | 7.8% | 14.3% | 7.6% | 11.1% | 5.45% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | would 'walk' | 17.9% | 22.1% | 13.0% | 11.4% | 22.85% | 10% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | would 'travel by taxi' | 17.9% | 13.0% | 5.6% | 22.8% | 17.65% | 11.7% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | would 'travel by car as a passenger' | 5.4% | 7.8% | 10.6% | 11.4% | 3.15% | 1.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | or as a 'driver' | 3.6% | 1.3% | 11.8% | 1.3% | 1.15%, | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | would 'cycle' | 1.8% | | 2.5% | 3.8% | 6.2% | 7.15% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | would 'give up the activity' | 3.6% | 5.2% | 8.7% | 1.3% | 5.15% | 4.95% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| stated they either 'don't know' or have 'no alternative' | 16.1% | 32.5% | 21.1% | 29.1% | 24.55% | 39.3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Screening questions | Response | Evidence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|-----------|--|-----------|--|------------|--|-----------|---|----------------|---|--------------------|--|
| | | <p>Alternative buses</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="632 337 1997 578"> <tr> <td data-bbox="638 337 793 391">12</td> <td data-bbox="798 337 1990 391">There are no alternatives for the early morning journeys however passengers for later journeys can board the 10:10 Stagecoach commercial service '12', beginning in Middlesbrough.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="638 394 793 415">28</td> <td data-bbox="798 394 1990 415">No alternative bus service for these early morning services serving Nunthorpe & Marton</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="638 418 793 472">29A</td> <td data-bbox="798 418 1990 472">No alternative service for Eagle Park, to access regular frequency services operated by Arriva or Leven Valley, passengers have to walk up to a maximum of 1 km to the Southern Cross or Marton Moor Corner.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="638 475 793 529">39</td> <td data-bbox="798 475 1990 529">There are no alternatives for the very early morning bus services serving Park End. The first commercial service does not commence until 1 hour 16mins later.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="638 532 793 553">603/604</td> <td data-bbox="798 532 1990 553">No other services are provided into the village on a Sunday if the proposals are enacted.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="638 557 793 578">605/606/607</td> <td data-bbox="798 557 1990 578">No alternative bus services for these very early morning bus services serving Coulby Newham & Acklam</td> </tr> </table> <p>Impact on Age and Disability</p> <p>Bus usage on the subsidised routes has been compared to Department of transport data on the percentage of overall bus journeys undertaken by concessionary fares (41%). Only 29A has higher than average percentage of concessionary fare users. Analysis shows that if the bus company decides not to continue this route without subsidy, individuals will have to travel 1km from the farthest point in Marton Manor to a bus stop on Dixons Bank. This would be an adverse impact on those who are less able to walk this far, <u>therefore this proposal is potentially a disproportionate adverse impact on age and disability because of this particular impact.</u></p> <p>If the proposal results in a change of circumstances for those with a care package because of disability or age, those packages would be reassessed as part of the Council's standard approach to social care provision. Every individual is entitled to apply to be assessed against the Fair Access to Care criteria. This will mitigate the impact of this proposal on those with a disability or the elderly who qualify for additional social care support, this includes mobility needs. Care packages support those with a disability, by providing additional support to enable them to achieve equal outcomes. Since the last survey the number of buses being provided by local colleges has increased, further reducing the proportion of young people using the services to travel to college. There are also reasonable alternatives for some of the routes. Where the proposal would impact on a child accessing a school that impact will be mitigated by the Council's home to school transport policies. As a result there are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on young people attending schools and colleges.</p> <p>Impact on Religion or Belief</p> <p>A small number of those surveyed (19 people of the 1166 surveyed) identified that they use the bus routes to attend a place of worship. Analysis of alternatives for each route and places of worship alternatives including analysis of service timings. It is identified that there are alternatives in most cases to enable attendance at places of worship on the bus routes listed with the exception of access to Stainton Village Parish Church on a Sunday. In this instance there are alternative places of worship in the town serviced by a bus route however there will be an adverse impact on those surveyed who use the 603/604. <u>Therefore this proposal may have an adverse impact on religion or belief if those accessing places of worship have no alternative transport options.</u></p> <p>While the majority of the content of this proposal's impact will have a proportionate impact on protected characteristics, in two particular areas, underlined above, there is the potential that the proposal could have disproportionate adverse impacts.</p> <p>In line with the Council's Public Sector Equality Duty, work will be undertaken to assess whether this impact can be avoided and if it cannot, whether it can be mitigated. A stage 2 impact assessment will then be undertaken.</p> | 12 | There are no alternatives for the early morning journeys however passengers for later journeys can board the 10:10 Stagecoach commercial service '12', beginning in Middlesbrough. | 28 | No alternative bus service for these early morning services serving Nunthorpe & Marton | 29A | No alternative service for Eagle Park, to access regular frequency services operated by Arriva or Leven Valley, passengers have to walk up to a maximum of 1 km to the Southern Cross or Marton Moor Corner. | 39 | There are no alternatives for the very early morning bus services serving Park End. The first commercial service does not commence until 1 hour 16mins later. | 603/604 | No other services are provided into the village on a Sunday if the proposals are enacted. | 605/606/607 | No alternative bus services for these very early morning bus services serving Coulby Newham & Acklam |
| 12 | There are no alternatives for the early morning journeys however passengers for later journeys can board the 10:10 Stagecoach commercial service '12', beginning in Middlesbrough. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | No alternative bus service for these early morning services serving Nunthorpe & Marton | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29A | No alternative service for Eagle Park, to access regular frequency services operated by Arriva or Leven Valley, passengers have to walk up to a maximum of 1 km to the Southern Cross or Marton Moor Corner. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | There are no alternatives for the very early morning bus services serving Park End. The first commercial service does not commence until 1 hour 16mins later. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 603/604 | No other services are provided into the village on a Sunday if the proposals are enacted. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 605/606/607 | No alternative bus services for these very early morning bus services serving Coulby Newham & Acklam | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 proposed reductions would have some impact on those who travel to take part in community activities. Surveys have identified that a small proportion travel to attend places of worship or for leisure or social purposes. Analysis of alternative bus provision above identified that there are alternatives in place for some (see above). Overall it is not considered that the proposal could have an adverse impact on relations between communities / groups of interest if implemented. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of reasons for travel and alternative provision available. |
| Middlesbrough 2020 – Our Vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough? * | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | The proposal relates to the provision that a town is clean, safe and healthy. The surveys above indicate that a significant proportion of users for the 603/604 and 605/606/607 routes use the services to access employment (73% (56 people) and 82% (60 people) respectively. 24.55 and 39.3% of all users of this service identified that they did not know how they would travel without the provision. |
| 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 that there would be any knock on effect on organisational management as staff should not be affected. |

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: | Lesley Jackson /Claire Henderson | Head of Service: | Derek Gittins |
| Date: | 14.01.2015 | Date: | 14.01.2015 |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 2: Full impact assessment

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Subject of assessment: | Withdrawal of Subsidised Bus Services | | | |
| Coverage: | Economic Development | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service | <input type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure | <input type="checkbox"/> Programme | <input type="checkbox"/> Project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state) | | |
| It is a: | New approach: | <input type="checkbox"/> | Revision of an existing approach: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| It is driven by: | Legislation: | <input type="checkbox"/> | Local or corporate requirements: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Description:</p> | <p>Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities <p>The aim of the assessment is to assess the potential impact of the mayor's proposal to withdraw subsidised bus services. This is linked to the prioritisation of transport funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) <p>The Transport Act requires places a duty on the Local Authority to secure the provision of such passenger transport services as the Council considers appropriate to meet any public transport requirements which would not otherwise be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences from any previous approach <p>Proposal to withdraw subsidised bus services which have until now been provided by the council.</p> <p><u>Services:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service 12: 0910 & 0940 (Sun) Middlesbrough – Parkway Centre via Acklam & Hemlington • Service 28: 0700 (Mon-Fri) & 0705 (Sat) Middlesbrough – Lingdale via JCH & Nunthorpe, 0605 (M-S) & 0635 (Mon-Fri) Guisbrough - Middlesbrough via Nunthorpe & JCH, 0652 (Sat) Swans Corner - Middlesbrough via Nunthorpe & JCH, 0712 (Sat) Lingdale - Middlesbrough via Nunthorpe & JCH • Service 29A: Eagle Park diversion on all journeys - Middlesbrough – Stokesley via JCH, Marton & Eagle Park • Service 39: 0602 & 0632 (Mon-Sat) Middlesbrough – Park End, 0703 (Sat) Middlesbrough – Park End, 0515 & 0545 & 0615 (Mon-Sat) Park End – Middlesbrough, 0645 (Sat) Park End – Middlesbrough • Service 603/604: All journeys: Middlesbrough – Middlesbrough via JCH, Coulby Newham, Hemlington & Acklam • Service 605/606/607: All journeys: Middlesbrough – Middlesbrough via JCH, Coulby Newham, Hemlington & Acklam <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external) <p>Members of the public, Bus companies and Local employers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended outcomes. <p>This assessment is intended to assess the impact of removing subsidised bus services in order to better inform the final proposal for the services.</p> |
| <p>Live date:</p> | <p>April 2015</p> |
| <p>Lifespan:</p> | <p>April 2015 onwards</p> |
| <p>Date of next review:</p> | <p>3 months to assess the impact any withdrawal may have had.</p> |

| 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 1 of the Impact Assessment Policy). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 | | | | | | |
| Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | The Stage 1 impact assessment highlighted that there was a potential disproportionate adverse impact on the age and disability protected characteristics, specifically those using concessionary bus passes either because they were over the age of 60 or because of a disability, as a result of one element of the proposal: |
| Age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29A - The Stage 1 impact assessment highlighted that the only service that would disproportionately impact older people would be the 29A. The average proportion of bus users across all services in the Middlesbrough area is 41% for concessionary pass holders, the 29A is the only service where the proportion using a concessionary fare pass exceeds this percentage. <p>In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) work was undertaken to assess whether this impact could be avoided and if it could not be avoided, whether it could be mitigated. Work has been undertaken to attempt to identify whether the bus company would be willing to continue to deliver the route without the subsidy. The survey and research indicates that overall the route may be profitable and it is likely that the company may continue to operate it. However this could not be verified at the point of completion of this impact assessment therefore it cannot be taken into account as a method of mitigating the impact.</p> <p>As it was not possible to mitigate the impact of the proposal, consideration was given to whether the impact was justified. It is therefore judged that the impact of this proposal is justified as the purpose of the subsidy is to support services that would not otherwise be delivered because they are unprofitable and data available indicates this service has become more popular so is less reliant on the subsidy.</p> |
| Sex | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | The impact upon these groups has been considered and there is nothing in the proposal that should have a disproportionate adverse negatively on an individual or group because they hold one of these this protected characteristic. There is no evidence to suggest that this would disproportionately impact on this section of the population. |
| Gender reassignment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Pregnancy / maternity | <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"/> | |

| Assessment issue | Impacts identified | | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | Uncertain | |
| | | | Justified | Mitigated | | |
| Sexual Orientation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Religion or belief | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The Stage 1 impact assessment highlighted that there was a potential disproportionate adverse impact on this as a result of one element of the proposal which could not be mitigated by a suitable alternative bus transport provision.</p> <p>A small number of those surveyed (19 people of the 1166 surveyed) identified that they use the bus routes to attend a place of worship. An analysis of alternatives for each route and places of worship including analysis of service timings was completed. It is identified that there are alternatives in most cases to enable attendance at places of worship on the bus routes listed with the one exception:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 603/604 - analysis identified one place of worship where access would be affected. Two people surveyed indicated that they used this service to access a place of worship (place not identified). Access to Stainton Village Parish Church on a Sunday would be affected by the proposal. <p>Again, consideration was given to whether this impact could be avoided and if not avoided whether it could be mitigated. In this instance, although access to this site would be affected, there are alternative places of worship in the town serviced by a bus route however there will be an adverse impact on those surveyed who use the 603/604 but this is partially mitigated by the availability of access to alternative places of worship and alternatives religious service times, although it may increase journey times.</p> <p>Given the very small number of users, the alternatives available and the need to ensure value for money is achieved, it is judged that the impact of this proposal is justified</p> |
| Marriage / civil partnership** | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | The impact of the proposal on those who are married or are involved in a civil partnership has been considered and there is nothing in the proposal that should affect residents differentially depending upon this characteristic. |
| Dependants / caring responsibilities** | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>A small proportion of people indicated that services were used to travel to provide care to family or friends. National statistics indicate that 10% of the population are carers. Survey data did not identify any services which would have an above average adverse impact on carers.</p> <p>Given the above, the impact of the proposal on those who have dependants or caring responsibilities has been considered and it is judged that there is nothing in the proposal that should have a greater or lesser impact on residents depending upon whether they have dependants or are carers.</p> |
| Criminal record / offending past** | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | The impact upon those who have a criminal record or offending past has been considered and there is nothing in the proposal that should disproportionately impact upon this section of the population. |
| Community cohesion | | | | | | |

** 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 | | |
| Individual communities / neighbourhoods | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>There was no evidence to suggest that there would be a negative impact on community cohesion if subsidised services were withdrawn. However, the stage one impact assessment identified that it was possible that a lack of access to employment opportunities and transport could have a negative effect on community cohesion. The bus surveys undertaken found that 30.4 % of respondents used the services to travel to work. A significant percentage also used it for social reasons: 'Leisure/Social' 14.7%, 'Visit friends' 8.1%, 'To attend school/college' 5.3%, 'Provide care for family/friend' 3.5%, 'Attend church/worship' 1.6%, 'Health appointments' 0.9%. So the combined impact may have an impact on community cohesion.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that when asked about alternatives if the services were to be withdrawn, 21.2% would walk. When considering attending of places of worship and health appointments, many communities have these within close reach. Many of the journeys undertaken for social reasons could be within the more confined area of the community rather than wider reaching travel. Although 22.8% of respondents chose 'No alternative/Don't know' only 8.2% stated that they would 'Give up the activity' suggesting that there are alternatives available.</p> |
| Relations between communities / neighbourhoods | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Middlesbrough 2020 | | | | | | |
| Theme 1 • Town that is clean, safe and healthy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The proposal will not impact on the Council's endeavours to ensure a clean, safe and healthy town. The removal of services would be expected to increase healthy, sustainable travel such as walking and cycling as alternatives to using the subsidised services.</p> |
| Theme 2 • A learning town, in which families and communities thrive | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The stage one impact assessment identified that the elements of the proposal would have a significant impact on those travelling on the subsidised services to access employment, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of those surveyed on the 603/604 and 605/606/607 routes, 73% (56 people) and 82% (60 people) respectively, of those travelling used the services to access employment. 24.55 and 39.3% of all users surveyed for these services identified that they did not know how they would travel without the provision. • Of those surveyed for the service 39 (previously known as the 537) 79.7% (63 people) of users used the service to access employment. <p>This could have an adverse impact on the Mayor's vision, in particular the aim that more people are working – especially young people. There are alternative bus routes for the 39 at a later time and there are other routes that could be accessed but there would be an increase in the walking distance in some cases.</p> <p>If the 603/604 route was removed there would be alternative routes at some points, however there would be no bus access to Stainton village on a Sunday. If the 605/606/607 routes were removed there would be alternative routes at some points, however there would be no early morning bus access to Stainton village on a Monday to Saturday.</p> <p>There are alternative services however these would involve significant de tours or walking distances. It is hoped the Bike to Work scheme will partially mitigate this impact along with negotiations with the bus companies to encourage them to maintain these routes, however it is not possible to mitigate this impact fully.</p> <p>The proposal is justified on the grounds that the Council needs to ensure value for money and research indicates that a number of routes are likely to be profitable for the bus companies to continue in the long run.</p> |

| Assessment issue | Impacts identified | | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | Uncertain | |
| | | | Justified | Mitigated | | |
| Theme 3 • A town that continues to transform | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>There was no evidence to suggest that there would be a negative impact on the local economy if subsidised services were withdrawn. However, the Stage One impact assessment identified that it was possible that a lack of access to the town centre and other shopping/leisure facilities as well as places of work could have a negative impact on the local economy. The bus surveys undertaken to address this suggested that it would have an impact on the local economy.</p> <p>The surveys highlighted that 30.4% of respondents used the services to travel to work. 15.4% of respondents also highlighted that they use the services for 'Shopping, hairdressers, bank'. This suggests an impact on the local economy would be likely.</p> <p>There are alternative services however these would involve significant de tours or walking distances. It is hoped the Bike to Work scheme will partially mitigate this impact along with negotiations with the bus companies to encourage them to maintain these routes, however it is not possible to mitigate this impact fully.</p> <p>The proposal is justified on the grounds that the Council needs to ensure value for money and research indicates that a number of routes are likely to be viable for the bus companies to continue in the long run.</p> |
| Sustainability • One Planet Living principles • Climate Change risk assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>There was no evidence to suggest that there would be a negative impact on the One Planet Living principles if subsidised services were withdrawn. However, the Stage One impact assessment identified that it was possible that a reduced public transport provision could impact on the principles of zero carbons, sustainable transport and the local economy.</p> <p><u>Zero Carbon and Sustainable Transport</u></p> <p>The bus surveys undertaken to address this showed that whilst some residents would react by using cars for their journeys (excluding taxi's) this is significantly lower than the number who would walk instead. So the increase in car journeys would be offset by an increase in the use of sustainable modes of transport.</p> |
| Organisational management / transformation | | | | | | |
| Partnership working | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | If the services were withdrawn it should not affect the partnership arrangements the Council has in place. The decision is not required in order to fulfil a statutory duty to cooperate. |
| Employees | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | If the services were withdrawn it would not affect Middlesbrough Council employees. No employees would be made redundant or hours need to be reduced. |
| Accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | If the services were withdrawn there would be no impact on accommodation. The services are subsidised by Middlesbrough Council but no equipment or staff are housed internally so there would be no effect on the Accommodation Strategy. |
| ICT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | There will be no ICT implications if the proposal were to go ahead. No equipment, software or training requirements would result from the withdrawal of the services. |

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 | | Lead | Deadline |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------|----------------------------|
| Mitigating actions | The Bike-to-Work scheme is hoped to encourage people to embrace alternative modes of transport, which could reduce carbon output. Ongoing negotiations with Bus operators to encourage them to maintain current services. | Lesley Jackson | 30 th June 2016 |
| Promotion | The proposals were publicised in the Mayor's budget cut proposals which were subsequently advertised on the Council's website (service numbers included). | Lesley Jackson | December 2014 |
| Monitoring and evaluation | The proposal would be reviewed after 3 months if implemented. | Lesley Jackson | 30 th June 2015 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| Assessment completed by: | Claire Henderson/Lesley Jackson | Head of Service: | Sharon Thomas |
| Date: | 20/01/15 | Date: | 20/01/2015 |

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Subject of assessment: | Senior Management review outcome 1 | | | |
| Coverage: | To review the council's service structure | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service | <input type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input checked="" 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: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key aims, objectives and activities To review existing management structures within outcome 1 to ensure they are better placed to achieve the Mayor's vision and are fit for purpose to enable them to drive the transformational change required to deliver the Vision and Change Programme simultaneously. Statutory drivers Services within outcome 1 deliver a range of statutory and non-statutory services. There are a number of statutory drivers that are relevant to this restructure, including Local Government Acts and statutory guidance which set out the Statutory roles undertaken by some senior managers within the Council's structure. These statutory duties have been considered when designing the proposed approach and will be properly reflected within the proposed structure. Differences from any previous approach The proposal would reduce the number of senior manager posts in line with the overall percentage reductions identified for statutory, non-statutory and support services as part of the Change Programme process. There are currently 11 FTEs for 10 posts and there is also one new post, therefore it is possible that this review will be completed with job losses either through voluntary or compulsory redundancies. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Service users, all local residents, Council staff, trades unions, partner agencies, voluntary and community sector and local businesses. Intended outcomes. That a structure is put in place so that continues to implement the Change Programme principles to ensure the services within outcome 1 are strategically focused on the transformation of Council services to achieve the following aim: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> securing economic development, physical regeneration and transport to create jobs and housing such that the mix of jobs, skills and quality of housing in the town is complementary. | | | |
| Live date: | Will depend on the outcome of consultation. Consultation closes on 11/12/14 | | | |
| Lifespan: | The implemented changes will apply until there is a further requirement to review structures within the scope of this review. | | | |

| Date of next review: | There will be an initial desk top review within six months of the full implementation date to ensure there no unintended disproportional negative outcomes have occurred or there are any unresolved or unexpected issues and that the revised structure is able to deliver the Change Programme and the vision for the town. This will be formalised if there are any concerns. | | | |
|--|--|-----|-----------|---|
| Screening questions | Response | | | Evidence |
| | No | Yes | Uncertain | |
| Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? * | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | The proposed restructure will not impact on service delivery and will therefore have no impact on human rights. As set out in the preamble, it will enable delivery of the Mayor's vision for the town and in particular delivery of outcome 1. |

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

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <p>Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>Because the review will significantly senior management budgets it is inevitable that it will have an impact on staff as staff capacity will need to be reduced to achieve savings targets in the vast majority of the directorates. The principles of the review and the proposed savings targets are in line with the Change Programme principles and its savings profile which has been previously impact assessed. The proposal for outcome 1 is that the number of posts within the structure will remain at 11. 11 people will be considered for 10 posts. A further new post will be created which staff within the scope of the review will have first chance to apply for this post. If there are no applicants it will then be offered to staff within the wider management review to in line with the aim of mitigate the impact of reductions where possible.</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.</p> <p>Documents used to support this process will include redeployment policy and redundancy policy. Based on the evidence available, there are no concerns that the review will disproportionately affect any person because they hold a protected characteristic. HR policies have been separately impact assessed. Consultation will be undertaken on proposals with staff and relevant partners as part of the review.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Analysis of equality information held on staff o Consultation feedback from staff within the proposed structure to date. |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>Not directly relevant to decision. Staff within the scope of the review do not provide front-line services. The review has been designed to ensure that the Council is able to continue to meet all of its statutory duties of which community cohesion is one. The savings targets for statutory services reflect this commitment and therefore there are no concerns that the proposal could have an impact on community relations.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of statutory duties and previous Change Programme documentation.</p> |
| <p>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? *</p> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>No. The structure is designed to enable achievement of the vision for the town and was proposed following adoption by Council of the outcome based organisation model.</p> |
| <p>Organisational management / transformation Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council’s services as set out in its transformation programme? *</p> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>This review fits in with transformation agenda – and is being put in place to ensure that there is strategic focus and drive to the Change Programme/transformation agenda.</p> |
| <p>Next steps:</p> <p>➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.</p> <p>➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.</p> <p>This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.</p> | | | | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|-----|
| Assessment completed by: | Sharon Thomas | Head of Service: | n/a |
| Date: | 01/09/2014 | Date: | n/a |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Subject of assessment: | Merge management roles within the Business Support function of Adult Social Care, which will save £200,000. | | | |
| Coverage: | Service-specific. | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service | <input type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure | <input type="checkbox"/> Programme | <input type="checkbox"/> Project | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review |
| | <input 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>The measure reflects the merging of two Team Manager roles, the deletion of an Operations Manager post and the deletion following review of posts from the Aspire and Independence teams.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) <p>Both of the team manager roles relate to services that are statutorily required under current legislation and will continue to be so following the implementation of the Care Act 2014 when it goes live in in April 2015. There is no statutory duty to provide the other services referred to however decisions around the future of those services would be relevant to the Disability Discrimination Act the Equality Ace 2010. The Public Sector Equality Duty also applies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differences from any previous approach <p>The planned new approach follows from a review of the adult social care workforce and reflects a re-configuration of fieldwork teams and services rather than a reduction in provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) <p>Service users of the teams involved, Council staff, trades unions and partner agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intended outcomes <p>Intended outcomes relate to full implementation of the adult social care workforce review and service reviews of the Aspire and Independence teams.</p> | | | |
| Live date: | September 2015 | | | |
| Lifespan: | N/A | | | |
| Date of next review: | Desktop review is intended within six months of implementation. | | | |

| Screening questions | Response | | | Evidence |
|--|----------|-----|-----------|--|
| | No | Yes | Uncertain | |
| Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | The measure reflects a change in the structure of social care teams and in the delivery model for Aspire and the Independence team. Service provision for service users will not be directly affected. |

* 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 proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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</p> <p>Under the proposal services would continue to be delivered to the same standard and the same level of access would be maintained regardless of the reconfiguration. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the measure would have an impact on service users. This will be monitored through Contracts and commission and legislation.</p> <p>Staff</p> <p>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> |
| <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>The proposal does not adversely impact on this as the service is planned to continue to be delivered with no diminution in the amount of provision.</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 service does contribute to the theme of “A town that is clean, safe and healthy” in that it supports people to live longer, healthier lives and supports us in ensuring that vulnerable adults are safeguarded. The proposal does not adversely impact on this as the service is planned to continue to be delivered with no diminution in the amount of provision. |
| 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 measure contributes to efficiency savings identified as part of on-going Change Programme work. |
| 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: | Erik Scollay | Head of Service: | Erik Scollay |
| Date: | 05/01/2015 | Date: | 05/01/2015 |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Subject of assessment: | Remove core Council funding for Telecare brokerage services and utilise health funding as an alternative. | | | |
| Coverage: | Service-specific. | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service | <input type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input checked="" 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: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities The measure reflects the utilisation of funding from the NHS rather than from the local authority; no change to the delivery of the service is anticipated. • Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) There is no statutory duty to provide the other services referred to however decisions around the future of those services would be relevant to the Disability Discrimination Act the Equality Act 2010. The Public Sector Equality Duty also applies. • Differences from any previous approach There will be no change to service delivery, only the funding source will change. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Service users, carers, staff members, partner agencies. • Intended outcomes The outcome will be a reduction in cost to the local authority of £33,000 per annum. | | | |
| Live date: | April 2015 | | | |
| Lifespan: | N/A | | | |
| Date of next review: | The measure will be reviewed as part of annual budget setting processes. | | | |

| 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 measure reflects a change in the funding source rather than any change to current service provision. As such there is no anticipated impact on service delivery or staff and therefore no impact on human rights. Telecare services indirectly support a |
| Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?* | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>Under the proposal services would continue to be delivered to the same standard and the same level of access would be maintained and would continue to be provided directly by the Council.</p> <p>The measure reflects a change in the funding source rather than any change to current service provision.</p> <p>As a result there is no anticipated adverse impact on either staff or service users.</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"/> | <p>The measure reflects a change in the funding source rather than any change to current service provision. Telecare will continue to provide services that enable people to live independently for longer, remaining in their local communities.</p> <p>There will be no adverse impact on service provision.</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 |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 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 measure reflects a change in the funding source rather than any change to current service provision. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on achievement of 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"/> | This measure contributes to efficiency savings identified as part of on-going Change Programme work. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on achievement of the vision. |
| 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: | Erik Scollay | Head of Service: | Erik Scollay |
| Date: | 05/01/2015 | Date: | 05/01/2015 |

Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Subject of assessment: | Proposal to remove Council funding in respect of communication support for children with complex needs and replace it with funding from the DfE High Needs budget, as permitted in school funding | | | |
| Coverage: | To review the council's service structure | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> Service | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input checked="" 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: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key aims, objectives and activities To assess the proposal to remove Council funding in respect of communication support for children with complex needs and replace it with funding from the DfE High Needs budget. Statutory drivers The Council has a number of statutory drivers relevant to this proposal including, but not exclusively Children's Act 1989, Children and Families Act 2014, Education Act 1996 and Equality Act 2010. Differences from any previous approach The proposal would remove Council funding in respect of communication support for children with complex needs and replace it with funding the DfE High Needs budget, as permitted in school funding. While Dedicated Schools Grant is ringfenced for education purposes, the Council has discretion within this to apply the grant as long as expenditure meets the definitions of items in the School Funding Regulations, which this does. This is purely a technical change which does not affect the provision of the service. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Service users and their families / carers, partner agencies and schools. Intended outcomes. That the identified communication needs of children with complex needs who qualify for this support continue to receive from an appropriate funding source. | | | |
| Live date: | April 2015 | | | |
| 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 proposed restructure will not impact on service delivery and will therefore have no impact on human rights. As set out in the preamble, it will enable continued delivery of the services that support the aims set out in the Mayor's vision for the town. |
| Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The proposal is relevant to the disability and age protected characteristic. Under the proposal the support will continue to be provided at current levels and there will be no impact on current or potential future users of the service. The proposal will achieve the saving by funding this service from a fund that has been earmarked for this purpose. As a result there are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact. <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o analysis of the proposed budget source o feedback from partners o analysis of the outcomes delivered by the funding. |
| 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 that the need of service users continue to be supported in relation to communications. This forms part of the overall support package that service users may receive (subject to qualification) to assist in day to day living, supporting people to be independent within their communities. Continuing to provide this funding will ensure that there is no negative impact on community cohesion. <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o analysis of the proposed budget source o feedback from partners o analysis of the outcomes delivered by the funding. |

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>2020 – the Mayor’s vision</p> <p>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? *</p> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>No. The structure is designed to enable achievement of the vision for the town and was proposed following adoption by Council of the outcome based organisation model.</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> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>This review fits in with transformation agenda – and is being put in place to ensure that there is strategic focus and drive to the Change Programme/transformation agenda.</p> |
| <p>Next steps:</p> <p>➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.</p> <p>➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.</p> <p>This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.</p> | | | | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----|
| Assessment completed by: | Julie Cordiner | Head of Service: | n/a |
| Date: | 18 November 2014 | Date: | n/a |

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Subject of assessment: | To assess the proposal to change South Tees Youth Offending Service (STYOS) Partnership the true cost of support services in relation to Middlesbrough assuming lead authority responsibility for the delivery of Youth Justice, saving in the region of £100,000 per annum. | | | |
| Coverage: | Service-specific. | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service | <input type="checkbox"/> Function |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure | <input type="checkbox"/> Programme | <input type="checkbox"/> Project | <input type="checkbox"/> Review |
| | <input 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: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key aims, objectives and activities To ensure MBC is properly remunerated for the provision of support services which enable the delivery of youth justice service through STYOS. • Differences from any previous approach Historically MBC has not charged for these services, given the financial position of the council it is no longer feasible to provide these services without a proportionate recharge for their costs. • Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) STYOS partnership, the children and families and communities of Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland who are the recipients of services and Redcar and Cleveland Council. • Intended outcomes To ensure a viable and fairly costed support structure for delivery of youth justice services via STYOS going forward. | | | |
| Live date | 1/4/15 | | | |
| Lifespan: | To continue whilst MBC is the led authority for STYOS | | | |
| 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"/> | As the management charge is within the current budget there will be no impact on service delivery and as such no impact on any service users or beneficiaries |
| Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>This duty has been considered as part of the development of this proposal.</p> <p>The proposal is relevant to the age protected characteristic because of the nature of the services being provided. Current levels of service are judged as meeting the needs of children in the area. Under the proposal, these levels of services would be maintained. The fee would be levied from money not currently being spent.</p> <p>The proposal will not result in a reduction in services, nor will it mean that there are unmet needs, as a result there are no concerns that this could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a group or individuals because they hold a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes:</p> <p>Analysis of current service provision and budgets, previous inspection report findings and initial discussions with partners.</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 STYOS provides services which support community cohesion. Those services will not be affected by 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 |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 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"/> | STYOS work contributes towards the 2020 vision outcome that crime and anti-social behaviour is reduced by providing services that reduce the risk of re-offending / increases in the severity of offences. Current will not be adversely impacted by these proposals. |
| 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 supports the themes of the Change programme, ensuring that the true costs of the service are shared fairly with partners. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on the Change Programme. |
| | | | | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Assessment completed by: | Alison Brown | Head of Service: | Neil Pocklington |
| Date: | 5 th December 2014 | Date: | 10 December 2014 |