

**Budget 2020/21: Equality Impact Assessments – Service-Users and Staff**

The council is legally required by the Equality Act 2010 to evidence how it has rigorously considered its equality duties in the budget-setting process. To achieve this, Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) have been completed on all budget proposals with a potential impact on service-users and staff, related to their legally protected characteristics.

EIAs assess how proposals may impact on specific groups differently (and whether/how negative impacts can be reduced or avoided) so that these consequences are explicitly considered. Further assessment will be made through the budget consideration process and in relation to implementation, if budget proposals are accepted. An assessment of the cumulative impacts across proposals will also be available with the budget papers for full council in February. Impacts on staff are assessed separately.

Members are referred to the full text of s149 of the Equality Act 2010 – included at the end of this document – which must be considered when making decisions on budget proposals.

<b>Equality Impact Assessments describing impacts on Service-Users</b>		
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>EIA number</b>
<b>Families, Children &amp; Learning</b>	<b>Health, SEN &amp; Disability; Children’s Disability Service: Residential, respite and short breaks</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Adult Learning Disability Assessment: Learning Disabilities Community Care Budget</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>Early Years and Childcare</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>Supported Employment Team, Youth Employability Service and Able and Willing</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Children’s Safeguarding &amp; Care - Children’s Placements</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Safeguarding &amp; Care: Partners in Change Hub</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Health &amp; Adult Social Care</b>	<b>There are no service-user EIAs required for proposals in these services</b>	<b>-</b>

<b>Economy, Environment, and Culture</b>	<b>City Transport / Parking Services Group – Concessionary bus passes</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>City Transport / Parking Services Group – Parking Fees and Charges</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities</b>	<b>Communities, Equality &amp; Third Sector: Communities Fund</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Finance &amp; Resources</b>	<b>There are no service-user EIAs required for proposals in these services</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Strategy, Legal &amp; Governance</b>	<b>Democratic Services - Civic Office</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Equality Impact Assessments describing impacts on Staff</b>		
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>EIA number</b>
<b>Families, Children &amp; Learning</b>	<b>Skills and Employment</b>	<b>S1</b>
<b>Health &amp; Adult Social Care</b>	<b>There are no service-user EIAs required for proposals in these services</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Economy, Environment, and Culture</b>	<b>Property &amp; Design: Asset Management</b>	<b>S2</b>
<b>Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities</b>	<b>Communities, Equality &amp; Third Sector Team</b>	<b>S3</b>
	<b>Safer Communities</b>	<b>S4</b>
<b>Finance &amp; Resources</b>	<b>There are no service-user EIAs required for proposals in these services</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Strategy, Legal &amp; Governance</b>	<b>Democratic Services &amp; Civic Offices</b>	<b>S5</b>
	<b>Performance, Improvement &amp; Programmes</b>	<b>S6</b>

The text of s149 of the Equality Act 2010 is at the end of this document.

# Families, Children & Learning

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2020/21 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Families, Children & Learning: Health, SEN & Disability - Children's Disability Service	2. EIA No. 1
3. Head of Service	Carl Campbell, Head of Service 0-25	
4. Budget Proposal	What is the proposal?	
	<p>Residential, respite and short breaks - £20,000 in 2020/21 (current budget - £1,253,000)</p> <p>These savings will be made by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of in-house provision and service users care packages to ensure that the correct young people are being offered a service in the most efficient way</li> <li>• Use of the Extended Day offer by the Education Hubs once this is established</li> <li>• Review of contracts and offer by providers in the Community and Voluntary Sector</li> </ul>	
5. Summary of impacts	Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups	
	<p>Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Age (young people)</p> <p>Although changes will be made there will be no reduction in residential, short breaks and respite care packages</p>	
6. Assess level of impact (1= low; 5= high)	1	
7. Key actions to reduce negative	What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?	

<b>impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working towards in-house residential, short breaks and respite providers being at normal capacity (not over capacity)</li> <li>• Care planning meetings involving managers from assessor and provider services (including Assistant Director) arranged to review in-house residential, short breaks and respite care packages</li> <li>• Alternative/replacement support options to be available for some young people eg. Direct Payments and Extended Day</li> <li>• Close liaison with parent/carers groups such as PaCC and Amaze in order to improve communication and the co-production of information</li> </ul>
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	Full EIA not required.
<b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<p><b>How will you monitor the impact of this proposal and the success of your mitigating actions on these groups over the coming year (or more)?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon service users will be monitored via Strengthening Families Assessments, Social Care Reviews and EHCP Annual Reviews</li> <li>• Use of data and performance reports to monitor the progress of service users</li> <li>• There will be a particular focus upon the impact on service users who are in care or subject to Child Protection Plans</li> <li>• Head of Service and other managers will monitor the impact upon decision making and care planning for service users</li> </ul>
<b>10. Cumulative impacts</b>	<p><b>Might related proposals from other service areas (or other changes) worsen or mitigate impacts from your proposal? Please explain these impacts.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional support may not be available to families if there is an inadequate offer by providers in the Community and Voluntary Sector</li> <li>• Changes to in-house residential, short breaks and respite providers are delayed if there is the need to accommodate additional young people on an emergency basis</li> </ul>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2020/21 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Families, Children and Learning: Adult Learning Disability Assessment	2. EIA No. 2
3. Head of Service	Georgina Clarke-Green, Assistant Director, Health, SEN & Disability	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <hr/> <p>The Financial Recovery Plan proposes a saving of £1,470,000 by reducing the cost of Learning Disabilities Community Care services through a number of targeted strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 'Move On' project has been very successful in supporting adults with LD to move on from high cost placements into new living arrangements which have enabled them to experience greater independence and control over their lives. It is anticipated that a further saving could be achieved using this strategy whilst maintaining positive outcomes for service users.</li> <li>• Review of the funding source of transport arrangements for clients aged between 18 to 25 attending education provision</li> <li>• Seek appropriate funding for clients from external agencies such as Health, particularly through CHC funding.</li> <li>• Review of existing block contracts for recently outsourced services, in particular through a review of client needs where over provision currently exists, and better utilisation of voids.</li> <li>• Better planning of arrangements for new service users, in particular clients transitioning from Children's social care. The recently established 14-25 social work pod within the service will seek to provide a greater focus on this high cost area.</li> <li>• Use of internal dedicated resource to re-assess direct payment levels.</li> <li>• Utilisation of voids in external contracts.</li> </ul> <p>It should be noted that the Learning Disability budget will be supported by additional investment of nearly £2m to cover transitions and growth, which together with inflationary provision will see the overall budget increase by over £1m.</p>	

**5. Summary of impacts**

**Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups**

**Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Disability (Learning Disabilities), Ethnicity, Gender Reassignment, Sexual Orientation**

Vulnerable people in the City are assessed in accordance with the Care Act 2014 to see if their eligible needs need to be met with care and support.

820 adults with a learning disability and / or autism have eligible needs and are currently receiving a service paid for via the Community Care budget. Services being provided are: Residential Care, Supported Living, Community Support and Day Options.

Any reduction in the community care budget will have a direct effect on the amount or the way support and care is offered.

Care costs are steadily increasing and there is an increasing level of complex needs being identified resulting in higher care costs. This is a trend reflected nationally as well as locally. For people and their families there could be a perceived reduction in the level of service they receive or potentially a change in provider and approach, which can be unsettling for users and families.

Specific impacts identified:

**Disability:** managing these conversations will require staff to manage any changes in expectations carefully and skilfully. Direct payments must continue to be promoted (Care Act 2014) as a way to deliver more creative and sustainable modes of support and care, which will also be more person centred.

**Ethnicity:** People from minority ethnic groups may continue to face disproportionate impacts, for example reduction in budgets for translators or for more in-depth work.

**Gender reassignment:** As we are trying to increase engagement with this group, and recent research shows that despite the city being 'trans-friendly, discrimination, abuse and isolation are still a problem, any reduction in funding may impact negatively on any extra initiatives in this area.

**Sexual orientation:** Some LGB people still remain silent or hidden. At a time of resource realignment there is a risk that these groups become more distant or marginalised.

	<p><b>Other groups:</b> People with Learning Disabilities who are in transition from Children’s to Adults’ services at this time of resource realignment may be adversely affected, as transition can take longer if not managed creatively and resources are not targeted effectively. This can mean young people with Learning Disabilities could experience a delay in accessing services they are entitled to when reaching 18, such as extra benefits.</p> <p>The Care Act 2014 places a requirement on Local Authorities to assess Carers. Work provided by carers in the city is of huge value, representing a huge saving. Any threat including any funding restrictions could have a direct effect on carers to continue in their caring role.</p>
<p><b>6. Assess level of impact (1= low; 5= high)</b></p>	<p><b>3</b>          There is an obligation to meet statutory need and there is a clear plan to implement a method of operating using the wellbeing and prevention approach as well as an asset based approach to our support and care offer: see below.</p>
<p><b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b></p>	<p><b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b></p> <hr/> <p>The Care Act asks for more than just Adult Social Care to look to offer support to people, instead recognising that in a city-wide approach must be embraced, encompassing all services from housing through to leisure, to enhance the lives of vulnerable people.</p> <p>Therefore, a new asset based approach is needed, a fundamental and radical rethink to help develop a new conversation with the public about how people, friends and families as well as communities can help people to remain independent.</p> <p>The integration agenda with health gives opportunities to reduce duplication and work in a more joined-up way to proactively identify those people who may be at risk of going into hospital or residential care and thus manage risk, help people to live life and have a good death. Together we will ensure improvements in consistency particularly around the giving of information and advice to service users in how to access information, and get support to manage their own care needs.</p> <p>We aim to carry this out by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing individuals living with families support to manage and sustain their care arrangements for as</li> </ul>

long as possible.

- Ensuring the right level of support takes place in the most appropriate setting; maximising independence, health and wellbeing.
- Continuing to offer personal budgets to clients to meet support needs in cost effective way, and promoting direct payments as a means of stimulating more creativity and choice about how people can meet their eligible needs.

Technology must be available for people to be supported remotely and in a modern way from telecare through to telehealth and other technologies and a raft of equipment which can help people remain independent.

A new reviewing framework will invite our partners to join us in reviewing people in a timely way and is intended to release care capacity and target those most in need. Reviews will also include a focus on readiness to move on to more independence, and therefore release some resources for those who need more support.

New and VFM commissioning of appropriate supported living and accommodation services for people with Learning Disabilities will add to the savings in the long term and increase the quality of life for a small but significant cohort of people.

An enhanced crisis provision service within the Community Learning Disability Team will provide targeted prevention work to the highest need service users in the city, working to prevent hospital admissions and placement breakdowns, which can result in higher cost placements being required in the future.

The Service will comply with the new Accessible Information Standards (S.250) of the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

Commissioners across Children's and Adults' services will work together with providers to prioritise assignment of resources, and ensure that the additional focus on all protected groups can continue.

The recent redesign, integrating Children with Disabilities and Adult Learning Disability services, will create greater focus and efficiencies for young people as they prepare for adulthood.

Feedback from service users and carers about ongoing changes following the model described above has been and continue to be positive overall. The changes that have been made have not so far impacted on meeting



	eligible statutory need.
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	Not needed
<b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>How will you monitor the impact of this proposal and the success of your mitigating actions on these groups over the coming year (or more)?</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service users will have their statutory individual Care Reviews</li> <li>• Contracts will be monitored via the Commissioning and Performance Team</li> </ul>
<b>10. Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Might related proposals from other service areas (or other changes) worsen or mitigate impacts from your proposal? Please explain these impacts.</b>
	Housing is a key player to deliver good support and care. Any significant reduction in access to suitable housing will have a direct effect on the Community Care Budget.
	Public health as a partner is key in promoting wellbeing and healthy lives: this is critical to stem any future and immediate demand.  The CCG are a key partner and currently there are some joint funding arrangements in place to share some community care costs for people being discharged from specialist LD hospitals. Any further reduction in funding from the CCG would have a direct effect on the community care budget.

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2020/21 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Families Children & Learning: Early Years and Childcare	2. EIA No. 3
3. Head of Service	Caroline Parker	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <p>Proposal is to save £32,400</p> <p><b>Year 1 (2020-21)</b>            To introduce <b>charging for Quality improvement in Learning &amp; Teaching (QUILT) programme for early years providers which are rated good/outstanding by Ofsted and do not have high numbers of disadvantaged children (£5,000)</b>. The risks are that providers will not complete QUILT modules and will consequently offer provision which is less high quality. The most popular module is equal opportunities and so providers not completing this may result in poorer quality for children in this area</p> <p>To start <b>charging childcare providers for statutory courses</b> including safeguarding training (<b>£7,400</b>). This risk is that fewer providers will attend training and knowledge of safeguarding will reduce. All other courses are already charged for.</p> <p>To <b>increase funding by (£20,000)</b> for supporting early years providers from the centrally retained element of the Early Years Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant. This will mean that there is £20,000 less to pass through to early years and childcare providers. This sum amounts to 0.15% of the early years block allocation for three and four year olds.</p> <p><b>Years 2-4 (2021-24)</b>            To review and <b>reduce training and support</b> for early years childcare providers. The risk is that childcare providers will become poorer quality</p>	
5. Summary of	Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups	

<b>impacts</b>	<p><b>Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Age (younger people), Sex (women), Child Poverty</b></p> <p>337 delegates attended free safeguarding training in 2018/19 with another 45 attending online training. Thirteen early years settings and six childminders have undertaken QUILT modules since the beginning of 2018, the most popular module being equal opportunities.</p> <p><b>Charging for QUILT programme</b> Most likely to impact smaller childcare providers as they may be unable to pay for quality assurance.</p> <p><b>Charging for statutory courses</b> Greatest impact on smaller childcare providers with fewer resources to pay for training. Impact on children as providers not accessing training will be less skilled in safeguarding.</p> <p><b>Contribution from the early years block</b> This will mean that there is less money to pass through to early years providers. Providers in Brighton &amp; Hove already have one of the lowest funding rates for three and four year olds in the south east and this ongoing difficulty threatens the sustainability of provision, particularly amongst small voluntary sector providers who have no opportunity to increase income through charges to parents.</p> <p><b>Reducing training and support</b> Poorer quality in sector, more closures, less choice for parents.</p>
<b>6. Assess level of impact (1= low; 5= high)</b>	<p>3</p>
<b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b>	<p><b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b></p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support women who lose jobs in childcare as a result of closures to find employment elsewhere in the sector through our job vacancy service</li> <li>• Refer women to Family Information Service if they need to make new childcare arrangements because of closures</li> <li>• Continue to target training and quality support to settings with most disadvantaged children</li> </ul>

<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	No further assessment needed.
<b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<p data-bbox="456 233 2000 304"><b>How will you monitor the impact of this proposal and the success of your mitigating actions on these groups over the coming year (or more)?</b></p> <hr/> <ul data-bbox="456 363 1319 475" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring access to training by all settings in the city</li> <li>• Monitoring impact on safeguarding at early years settings</li> <li>• Monitoring quality of settings throughout the city</li> </ul>
<b>10. Cumulative impacts</b>	<p data-bbox="456 533 1995 604"><b>Might related proposals from other service areas (or other changes) worsen or mitigate impacts from your proposal? Please explain these impacts.</b></p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="456 647 674 679">None identified</p>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2020/21 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Families, Children and Learning: Employment and Skills	2. EIA No. 4
3. Head of Service	Carla Butler (Acting Head of Service)	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b> Use the savings proposal wording and more detail if needed</p> <hr/> <p>A saving of £102,000 across the Supported Employment Team, Youth Employability Service and Able and Willing Placement Scheme. The total current budget for this service is £828,000.</p> <p>The Youth Employability Service (YES) has been very successful in ensuring that the number of young people not in education, employment and training in Brighton &amp; Hove is relatively low. This means that young people have a good start on their employment journey. In January 2019, The Children and Young People and Skills Committee agreed that the future delivery model of Able &amp; Willing be changed to a rolling work placement programme matching suitable placements within council services for candidates who are disabled.</p> <p>The council's Supported Employment Team (SET) work with local people who have disabilities, including learning disabilities, helping them seek and maintain employment. Although there is no statutory requirement to deliver the SET services, there is an ongoing administration commitment to support those furthest from the labour market into work. At budget council in February 2018 an additional pot of funding was allocated to support those aged 18-24 into work.</p> <p>The team provides support to the employee, the employer and work colleagues through training, job coaching and advice. The SET work much closer with the YES to deliver the council's objective to target young people with SEND, in order to increase the percentage who are able to access sustainable employment. It is proposed that savings will be identified through a redesign of these services.</p>	
5. Summary of	Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups	

<p><b>impacts</b></p>	<p><b>Disproportionate impact on Age (Young People), Disability and Carers, Children in Care and Care Leavers</b></p> <p>The Youth Employability Service works with people aged 16 to 24. The Supported Employment Team works specifically with people of all ages who have Special Educational Needs and Disabilities. Carers also access the service on behalf of a young person or adult. There is also potential for impact in the Virtual School support.</p> <p>Details of the service redesign are not certain at this stage: a full EIA will be completed to inform this.</p>
<p><b>6. Assess level of impact</b></p>	<p>3</p>
<p><b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b></p>	<p><b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b></p> <hr/> <p>The service redesign will aim to minimise impacts on service-users, by reviewing management structures, systems and infrastructure, to identify opportunities for closer alignment of these services and reduce any duplication.</p> <p>There are other organisations in the city working with these cohorts, so if capacity to support individuals were reduced the service would refer to other suitable providers, appropriately.</p> <p>Priority will be given to protect services for Children in Care, Care Leavers and young people with SEND.</p>
<p><b>8. Full EIA?</b></p>	<p>A full EIA will be completed to inform the service-redesign</p>
<p><b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>How will you monitor the impact of this proposal and the success of your mitigating actions on these groups over the coming year (or more)?</b></p>

	<p>Record data of clients supported and destinations in relation to moving away from being NEET. There is a KPI in the team measuring people who are Not in Education Employment and Training and adults with Learning Disability in employment.</p> <p>Continue to monitor statutory returns which oversee outcomes for these cohorts.</p>
<p><b>10. Cumulative impacts</b></p>	<p><b>Might related proposals from other service areas (or other changes) worsen or mitigate impacts from your proposal?</b> Please explain these impacts.</p> <hr/> <p>None identified.</p>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2020/21 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Early Years and Childcare: Children’s Safeguarding & Care - Children’s Placements	2. EIA No. 5
3. Head of Service	Deb Austin, Assistant Director	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <hr/> <p>A £907,000 saving on the cost of placements for children in the care of Brighton &amp; Hove City Council. This will be achieved by via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further embedding on the model of social work practice, in particular Lead Practitioners within the Partners in Change Hub, to enable more children to be safely supported within their families resulting in a further decrease in the number of Children in Care. Since October 2015 CIC numbers have reduced by 19% and this reduction continues.</li> <li>• Further increasing the number of in-house foster placements and reducing reliance on more expensive independent provider provision.</li> <li>• Provision of high quality, value for money provision through contracted services with external providers supported by the children's services framework contract arrangements and preferred provider guidelines.</li> <li>• Relationship based social work practice and the specialist adolescence service to continue to divert children from the care system.</li> <li>• For those already in care, a stepping down to in house and/or less expensive placements.</li> <li>• Continued scrutiny of placement costs contributing to a reduction in unit costs.</li> <li>• Review of SGO allowances and reducing child benefit amounts to bring payments in line with East &amp; West Sussex.</li> </ul>	
5. Summary of impacts	<p><b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics:</b></p> <p>Brighton &amp; Hove City Council has a statutory duty to provide alternative care for children who otherwise would suffer significant harm if left in the care of their family. These proposals would not impact upon the threshold for children to come into the care system. The savings are primarily related to reducing the cost of placements by</p>	



	providing in-house alternatives rather than more expensive agency placements and by supporting families, in the wider sense, to provide safe and effective care so their children can remain in their care.
<b>6. Assess level of impact (1= low; 5= high)</b>	1
<b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b>	<b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b>
	Continuing the actions defined in the new model of practice, which are proving effective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued embedding of relationship-based practice with a focus on a proportionate, strengths-based approach, monitored via Quality Assurance activity and scrutinised via FCL Performance Board.</li> <li>Continuation of Entry to Care Panel chaired by Assistant Director to ensure that those children who need to be in the care of the Local Authority receive a timely and effective response</li> </ul>
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	No
<b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>How will you monitor the impact of this proposal and the success of your mitigating actions on these groups over the coming year (or more)?</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An ongoing evaluation of the model of practice is in place, which oversees the quality of services provided to children in need.</li> <li>Regular quality assurance activity takes place which is overseen by FCL Performance Board, chaired by Executive Director for FCL</li> <li>Entry to Care Panel, chaired by Assistant Director Children's Safeguarding &amp; Care, will continue to ensure that children who need to be placed in LA care receive a timely and effective service.</li> </ul>
<b>10. Cumulative</b>	<b>Might related proposals from other service areas (or other changes) worsen or mitigate impacts from your proposal? Please explain these impacts.</b>

**impacts**

Increasing social work demand due to unforeseen social, policy or demographic changes could increase the impact of these proposals.

The impact of growing levels of inequality, including changes to benefits, within Brighton & Hove alongside decreasing access to services to mitigate levels of inequality, could lead to greater levels of demand upon social work services.

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2020/21 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Families, Children & Learning: Safeguarding & Care	2. EIA No. 6
3. Head of Service	Tom Stibbs	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <p>Savings from re-commissioning the budget for the Partners in Change Hub of £75,000.</p> <p>This is made up of £25,000 from ending the payment to Oasis for a secondment for a substance misuse worker to support the Looking Forward project. The Looking Forward project was set up to support vulnerable adults whose children had been placed in permanent alternative care with the aim that they would not go on to have further children placed in care. This project will not continue in its current form next year.</p> <p>It is proposed that the funding for the Chance 2 Change programme, which is a group programme for domestic abuse perpetrators, is reduced by £50,000 in 2020/21. This is approximately a reduction in the budget for 2019/20 by a third. In the year 2018/19 around 25 people were in the programme. As part of this proposal we will consider providing more individual support for perpetrators in the place of group work.</p>	
5. Summary of impacts	<p><b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b></p> <p><b>Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Sex (women)</b></p> <p>The Looking Forward project has mainly supported women and so the loss of this service will have a greater impact on women.</p> <p>The loss or reduction of a domestic violence and abuse perpetrator programme will have a specific impact on men in terms of reduced opportunities to hold perpetrators accountable and provide effective interventions to change their behaviour and for women and girls in terms of the disproportionate risk to them as victims of domestic violence and abuse.</p>	

<p><b>6. Assess level of impact (1= low; 5= high)</b></p>	<p>2</p>
<p><b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b></p>	<p><b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b></p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To work with commissioners and other agencies in the city to consider how support is provided to vulnerable adults with multiple needs. To make sure that the Partners in Change Hub works with social workers to help vulnerable adults who are no longer caring for their children to accept help.</li> <li>• To make sure that the Partners in Change Hub provides support to social workers to work with perpetrators of domestic abuse in a flexible way that engages them and allows their violent behaviour to be addressed in a safe way. This may also enable opportunities for interventions that can support perpetrators who share different protected characteristics.</li> <li>• To continue to work with commissioners and providers across Sussex to develop aligned programmes and 1:1 work that engage more men more flexibly and that include engagement with men who have been sentenced, those who have substance misuse issues, fathers and with different forms of domestic violence and abuse. As part of this to make sure that protective partners and the victims of domestic abuse are provided with support to prioritise victim safety.</li> <li>• To work with commissioners and other agencies in the city to consider how support is provided to vulnerable adults with multiple needs. To make sure that the Partners in Change Hub works with social workers to help vulnerable adults who are no longer caring for their children to accept help.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Full EIA?</b></p>	<p>Not needed</p>
<p><b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>How will you monitor the impact of this proposal and the success of your mitigating actions on these groups over the coming year (or more)?</b></p> <hr/> <p>The changes to the Chance 2 Change programme will be monitored and the individual work that is being proposed, 'Safer Relationships', is part of an independent evaluation by the University of Sussex.</p>
<p><b>10. Cumulative</b></p>	<p><b>Might related proposals from other service areas (or other changes) worsen or mitigate impacts from your proposal? Please explain these impacts.</b></p>

**impacts**

Services to support the victims of domestic abuse across Sussex are being re-commissioned for 2020 and it is possible that changes to these services could impact on the changes in this proposal as could changes to other programmes that support domestic abuse perpetrators in the city.

The Principal Social Worker will be a member of the group overseeing the new commissioning process.

## **Health and Adult Social Care**

**No service-user EIAs are required for proposals from these services.**

# Economy, Environment and Culture

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2020/21 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Economy, Environment and Culture: City Transport / Parking Services Group – Concessionary Travel	2. EIA No. 7
3. Head of Service	Charles Field	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <p><b>Renewal of Concessionary Travel deal from April 2020 for a three year period.</b></p> <p>BHCC has a statutory obligation to provide disabled and older persons (above state pension age of a woman) concessionary travel passes to those eligible<sup>1</sup> and reimburse operators for journeys taken by pass holders.</p> <p>The current 3 year fixed deal runs out on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020 and we are working on a new fixed deal with Brighton &amp; Hove Bus Company (who have the vast majority of bus trips within Brighton &amp; Hove) The proposed fixed deal, whilst expanding the scheme for disabled pass holders, will save £500,000 per annum from the 2020/21 Parking Services budget. The potential saving on a fixed deal is £300,000 saving per annum for 3 years and £200,000 each year from not requiring 2% inflationary increase due to fixed deal.</p> <p>If we cannot make an agreement with the Brighton &amp; Hove Bus &amp; Coach Company (BHBCC) then we would need to go down the route of reimbursement through the DfT calculator. However, this would put £200,000 of the £500,000 of the required savings at risk as we would be required to keep the 2% inflationary increase for the reimbursement based on actual journeys.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Those eligible include anyone who is resident in the city over the pensionable age of a woman and those disabled people who fit the following criteria. Blind or partially sighted, severely or profoundly deaf, without speech or have a disability or have suffered an injury which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on the ability to walk. Or the applicant is in receipt of the Higher Rate Mobility Component of Disability Living Allowance or 8-12 points in the 'Moving Around' descriptor of Personal Independence Payment (PIP), been awarded a blue badge or war pensioners allowance, a lump sum benefit under the Armed Forces and Reserve Forces (Compensation) Scheme

	<p>Currently non- residents can travel between the statutory times of 9.30am- 11pm weekdays &amp; all day weekends and bank holidays. Brighton &amp; Hove residents are currently allowed to start their journey in the boundaries of Brighton &amp; Hove between 9.00am -3.59am weekdays and all day at weekends. The technology is already in place and working to differentiate between passes of residents and non-residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are proposing that negotiation with BHCC takes place to allow resident disabled card holders to travel for 24 hrs as part of the negotiations for a new deal. However, it is necessary for us to commit to continuing this for a further 3 years.</li> <li>• Disabled pass holder travel time for Brighton &amp; Hove residents is being proposed to extend to allow travel 24/7 (this would increase access between 4am-9am weekdays) from April 2020 for a minimum of 3 years.</li> <li>• This will put us in line with the times: West Sussex County Council are offering disabled card holders.</li> <li>• Older persons and non-resident Concessionary Travel conditions will remain the same</li> </ul> <p>Final approval at Policy &amp; Resources Committee is required before 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020.</p>
<p><b>5. Summary of impacts</b></p>	<p><b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Age (older people), Disability, Carers</b></p> <p>The benefits for our 6655 disabled pass holders outweigh the cost, this is demonstrated by how it will support many strategies including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The corporate vision; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A city working for all</li> <li>○ A stronger city</li> <li>○ A growing and learning city</li> <li>○ A sustainable city</li> <li>○ A healthy and caring city</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supports the Council’s Equalities and Inclusion Policy Statement and Strategy aims.</li> <li>• Our customers have told us that they are working part time in low paid jobs due to their disabilities and paying the additional bus fare to get to work first thing in the morning is a real barrier to them working.</li> <li>• It supports disabled parents who are taking their children to school by bus when they are unable to walk.</li> </ul>



<p><b>6. Assess level of impact (1= low; 5= high)</b></p>	<p>1</p>
<p><b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b></p>	<p><b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b></p> <hr/> <p>Independent Travel Trainer (Access Project) – helping children with disabilities achieve travel independence. The council are also subsidising a small amount of children with concessionary travel passes with extra commercial bus passes to get them to school. We can see from our journey analysis that children and young adults use their bus passes heavily at 3pm, but not in the mornings.</p> <p>Older people may apply for disabled cards to get this additional benefit we cannot stop them from doing this. In comparison to other West Sussex and looking at population vs how many disabled bus passes are already on issue to older people we predict the increased disabled cards on issue will be inconsequential.</p>
<p><b>8. Full EIA?</b></p>	<p>Not required. Work has already been completed with the Communities, Equality &amp; Third Sector Team to inform the development of this 24-hour disabled pass scheme.</p>
<p><b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>How will you monitor the impact of this proposal and the success of your mitigating actions on these groups over the coming year (or more)?</b></p> <hr/> <p>94% of all concessionary journeys are taken on Brighton &amp; Hove Bus and Coach Company who we are in a fixed deal with until April 2020. This fixed deal is based on a projection of 9,549,760 journeys taken by concessionary travel pass holders for the financial year.</p> <p>Our analysis indicates there will be 171,000 pa journeys taken between 4am-9am. These are not all additional generated journeys as it does not allow for people who have simply changed their travel time from after 9am to before 9am.</p> <p>We will make more of the data we have. We will analyse it so it informs service planning and delivery; helps us identify who is and is not accessing our services; and to identify who could be getting more from them.</p>

<b>10. Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Might related proposals from other service areas (or other changes) worsen or mitigate impacts from your proposal?</b>
	Increased parking fees & charges may encourage more bus use as a free travel alternative. Equally parking surplus from increased parking fees will pay for concessionary travel

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2020/21 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Economy, Environment and Culture: City Transport / Parking Services Group	2. EIA No. 8
3. Head of Service	Charles Field	
4. Budget Proposal	<p data-bbox="459 440 792 475"><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <hr data-bbox="459 494 2063 497"/> <p data-bbox="459 534 1279 569"><b>Parking Fees &amp; Charges (Raising by an average 5.4%)</b></p> <ul data-bbox="472 619 2033 1310" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raising price of first resident permits – Not raising quarterly prices to reduce costs to those who find the upfront annual costs more difficult.</li> <li>• Raising price of 2nd / Additional resident permits by means of an additional surcharge.</li> <li>• Increasing selected tariffs on seafront tariffs.</li> <li>• Increasing price of Traders Permits and including monthly, weekly and daily (removing waiver) options</li> <li>• Raising price of Doctors permit but allow them to use parking bays with same rule as business permit as well as doctors bays.</li> <li>• Increases to Business permits.</li> <li>• Increase price of resident visitor permits in Zone B &amp; D (event day schemes) alongside setting £50 charge for Guest permits.</li> <li>• Increase price of car club permits (any vehicle).</li> <li>• Increasing selected tariffs in off street car parks by 2.6% to 25%. (Trafalgar Street and London Road would remain same prices as underachieving slightly currently) Black Rock, King Alfred, Norton Road, Regency Square and other off street Car Parks.</li> <li>• Increasing hours of King Alfred and Black Rock Car parks from finishing at 6pm to 8pm.</li> <li>• Increase allocation of business permits.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="459 1390 2063 1489">The increases amount to approximately £1,480,000 per annum and will meet traffic management objectives, including improving air quality, reducing demand and congestion as well as achieving a higher turnover of spaces and supporting economic growth in the city.</p>	

<p><b>5. Summary of impacts</b></p>	<p><b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Age (older people), Disability, Carers</b></p> <p>Any increase in price for fees and charges allows for a decrease in demand from users. Members of the public may choose not to pay to park on or off street due to price increases.</p> <p>This could lead to inclusion issue with impacts on lower income residents as the amount they pay to park on and off street would increase. However, these proposals are in line with transport objectives of supporting sustainable transport options and reducing vehicles.</p> <p>This may mean carers have to pay more if they live in a different parking zone to the person they visit although there are carers' permit or visitor permits available.</p> <p>The proposed increases in visitor permits is more reflective of high demand for parking on event days near the AMEX Stadium and will reduce demand of on-street parking. The visitor permit remains good value to park within the restricted hours.</p> <p>The increase in hours of the King Alfred and Black Rock Car parks may have an impact on all users to local facilities as they would need to pay to park between 6pm and 8pm.</p>
<p><b>6. Assess level of impact (1= low; 5= high)</b></p>	<p>2</p>
<p><b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b></p>	<p><b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b></p> <hr/> <p>Officers will work to ensure any increase in fees will avoid negative impacts as much as possible. Fee increases are targeted at areas where parking is at capacity to help provide drivers with better access to currently congested areas.</p> <p>In terms of resident permits the proposals keep quarterly prices the same where possible to reduce costs to those who find the upfront annual costs more difficult.</p>

	<p>The ongoing work identifying Blue Badge fraud frees up parking spaces for eligible blue badge holders and we will continue with Blue Badge fraud investigation work to protect disabled bays from misuse.</p> <p>The cost of professional carers' permits and carers' permits remain unchanged to reflect the positive impact this brings to all members of society. We will be looking to see if this can be advertised through the new One Account IT system when operational and other options such as through the Carers' Centre.</p> <p>Any surplus parking income is mainly spent on providing free bus passes for older and disabled people to encourage alternative sustainable transport choices.</p>
<p><b>8. Full EIA?</b></p>	<p>Not required.</p>
<p><b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>How will you monitor the impact of this proposal and the success of your mitigating actions on these groups over the coming year (or more)?</b></p> <p>Regular review meetings are held to review on-street and off-street parking usage.</p> <p>Parking Services have applied for and been awarded People's Parking accreditation. This scheme was set up by Helen Dolphin MBE, a disability rights campaigner, to provide independent feedback about the facilities and public car park experience from a disabled user perspective, with regular monitoring and reviews.</p> <p>Parking Services have also received Park Mark accreditation from the police for our off-street car parks as safe car parks to use. It is nationally recognised and we receive significant feedback that we were chosen via the Park Mark website.</p> <p>Parking Services produce an annual Parking Annual Report providing transparency and meaningful insight into the overall service including how and where funding is raised and distributed. The Service has recently, for the fourth time, been awarded Parking Report of the Year for their work in this area.</p>
<p><b>10. Cumulative</b></p>	<p><b>Might related proposals from other service areas (or other changes) worsen or mitigate impacts from your proposal?</b></p>

**impacts**

The proposal to expand the scheme for disabled passes within the new concessionary travel will mitigate some of the impacts from increases to fees & charges by encouraging / improving access to public transport use.

# Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2020/21 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Neighbourhoods, Communities and Housing/Communities, Equality and Third Sector Team	2. EIA No. 9
3. Head of Service	Emma McDermott	
4. Budget Proposal	What is the proposal? Use the savings proposal wording and more detail if needed	
	Reduction in the Communities Fund by £10,000. The Communities Fund provides an annual fund for grassroots activity, growing third sector resilience, and pump priming collaborations to respond to gaps in and improve service provision.	
5. Summary of impacts	Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups	
	No specific disproportionate impact identified.  The Fund support projects that contribute to the following outcomes: promoting fairness, improving well-being and building cohesion. This is not specific to any one protected characteristic.	
6. Assess level of impact	1	
7. Key actions to reduce negative	What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?	

<b>impacts</b>	When applying the saving consideration will be given to trying to ensure that whilst all protected characteristic may be affected the reduction does not unfairly affect one protected characteristic more than another.
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	Not needed.
<b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<p data-bbox="456 488 2000 560"><b>How will you monitor the impact of this proposal and the success of your mitigating actions on these groups over the coming year (or more)?</b></p> <p data-bbox="456 616 1397 651">Through monitoring number and diversity of successful applicants.</p>
<b>10. Cumulative impacts</b>	<p data-bbox="456 711 1993 783"><b>Might related proposals from other service areas (or other changes) worsen or mitigate impacts from your proposal? Please explain these impacts.</b></p> <p data-bbox="456 826 685 861">None identified.</p>



## **Finance & Resources**

**No service-user EIAs are required for proposals from these services.**

# Strategy, Governance & Law

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2020/21 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Strategy Governance & Law: Democratic Services - Civic Office	2. EIA No. 10
3. Head of Service	Abraham Ghebre-Ghiorghis / Mark Wall	
4. Budget Proposal	What is the proposal?	
	A saving of £59,000 against an overall budget of £699,000 is proposed for 2020/21 from the Democratic Services and Civic Office teams.	
5. Summary of impacts	Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups	
	Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: none specifically identified	
	<p>From a review, a revised structure to reduce overall number of posts down to 8 in the Democratic Services Team. This will impact on the level of support to the committee process and require a change in working processes to ensure that all meetings can be effectively managed and statutory deadlines maintained. There will be a need for the use of electronic agendas to be fully embraced by elected Members and the adoption of the i-Casework system for councillors' casework.</p> <p>A reduction in staff will contribute the overall savings target to be met; but will impact on the level of support available to the civic office and the Mayor.</p> <p>There may be potential impacts on capacity to form working groups, which may mean that residents see a delay in Members' addressing case work or impact on Members' ability to consider and respond to city-wide issues.</p>	
6. Assess level of impact (1= low; 5= high)	2	

<p><b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b></p>	<p><b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b></p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Democratic Services Officers will work with Members to enable greater flexibility and use of their tablet devices for agendas and committee papers, and with officers to ensure that they are more self-confident in using the report management system on the wave.</li> <li>• A reduced number of hard copies of papers will be made available to those Members who require them, although it is hoped that as they become more adept at using their mobile devices in meetings, this need will decrease.</li> <li>• Continual training on the use of the ModGov app and i-Casework system will be offered to Members and Officers as well as refresher training to officers for the report management system.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Full EIA?</b></p>	<p>A review of the roll-out of mobile devices will take place early in the new year and additional support provided as needed.</p>
<p><b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>How will you monitor the impact of this proposal and the success of your mitigating actions on these groups over the coming year (or more)?</b></p> <hr/> <p>A review after each committee cycle will be undertaken to identify how many users are making use of the electronic agendas/papers and further training and help will be directed to those still taking hard copies.</p>
<p><b>10. Cumulative impacts</b></p>	<p><b>Might related proposals from other service areas (or other changes) worsen or mitigate impacts from your proposal? Please explain these impacts.</b></p> <hr/> <p>The use of mobile devices will depend on sufficient Wi-Fi connections being available in council buildings and alternative provision may need to be available if it was to fail.</p>

## Budget 2020-21: Equality Impact Assessments – Staff

	<b>EIA Proposal</b>	
<b>EIA S1</b>	<p><b>Families, Children &amp; Learning: Skills &amp; Employment</b></p> <p>The team provides support to the employee, the employer and work colleagues through training, job coaching and advice. The Supported Employment Team works with the Youth Employability Service to deliver the council's objective to target young people with SEND, in order to increase the percentage who are able to access sustainable employment. In the Council's budget proposals for 2020/2021 it is proposed that savings will be identified through a redesign of these services, including rationalising the management arrangements across the 2 services.</p>	
<b>Groups potentially impacted</b>	<b>Impacts identified</b>	<b>Specific Mitigating Actions (in addition to the generic actions identified above)</b>
<p>In broad terms the proposal to reduce staffing has the potential to have an impact on the following protected characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age</li> <li>• Disability</li> <li>• Ethnicity</li> <li>• Sex</li> <li>• Sexual Orientation</li> <li>• Religion/Belief</li> </ul>	<p><b>Age:</b> Council targets for age have not yet been established. The age distribution of staff in the service is broadly similar to the Council albeit with a greater proportion in the 45-54 age group. Any reduction in staff could affect the age distribution.</p> <p><b>Disability:</b> The council is just below the disability target of 8%; the directorate is materially below target at 6.43%. The service area is much higher than the Council or directorate average, at 11.11%. Therefore the proposals could have a disproportionate impact on disabled staff. Disabled employees may be more likely to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience barriers to accessing information and getting their views heard.</li> <li>• Suffer from a possible lack of employer</li> </ul>	<p><b>Age:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offer all employees job application and interview support.</li> <li>2. Consider the need for appropriate support and training to re-skill employees in new working methods.</li> </ol> <p><b>Disability:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure that all appropriate reasonable adjustments are made for disabled employees.</li> <li>2. Utilise the support of appropriate non-council agencies to support employees where appropriate and necessary.</li> <li>3. Positive action including skills interview training and internal coaching.</li> <li>4. Review communications approach options (plain English etc) and monitor engagement..</li> </ol>

awareness and information regarding disability.

Note: 18.18% of employee disability data is not known in the service area The analysis above is based on declared data only.

**Ethnicity:**

The council is below the BME target however the directorate is just above target. The council and the directorate are below the White Other group target. The service area employs significantly below the average BME employees compared to the council and the directorate as a whole and is therefore also below the target. The number of BME staff could be eroded further there are reductions in staff.

Employees from ethnic minority groups are more likely to:

- Experience language barriers.
- Suffer from a possible lack of employer awareness and information regarding ethnicity.

Note: 4.55% of staff are unknown. The analysis above is based on declared data only.

**Sex:**

The council and the directorate are below the male employee target with the directorate being significantly so. The profile of the staff in this service is similar with more emale staff than the directorate average. If male staff are either redeployed or made redundant this would further erode this under-represented group.

**Ethnicity:**

1. Positive action to include training on interview skills, coaching and signposting to BME Workers' Forum.
2. Review communications approach options (plain English etc) and monitor engagement.

**Sex:**

1. Positive action to include training on interview skills
2. Support to part-time staff in identifying opportunities and consideration of other roles as job share roles.

	<p><b>Religion &amp; Belief:</b> Council targets for religion/belief have not yet been established. Compared to the council and directorate the number of staff in the service declaring they have no religion is above average. Note: 9.09% of religion/belief employee data is not known in the service The analysis above is based on declared data only</p> <p><b>Sexual orientation:</b> The council and directorate are all below the LGB employee target, and the service area is significantly below target. If LGB staff are either redeployed or made redundant as this would further reduce this under-represented group. LGB employees groups may be more likely to suffer from a possible lack of employer awareness and information regarding LGB issues. Note: 13.64% of sexual orientation employee data is not known. The analysis above is based on declared data only.</p>	<p><b>Religion &amp; Belief:</b> 1. Positive action to include training on interview skills</p> <p><b>Sexual orientation:</b> 1. Positive action including skills interview training and internal coaching as well as signposting to LGBT Forum</p>
--	---	---

## Budget 2020-21: Equality Impact Assessments – Staff

	<b>EIA Proposal</b>	
<b>EIA S2</b>	<p><b>Economy, Environment &amp; Culture: Property &amp; Design – Asset Management</b></p> <p>£69,000 savings have been identified from staffing due to the restructure of Property &amp; Design services to form a combined strategic Estate &amp; Asset Management property team, transferring other asset management functions to the relevant property teams &amp; achieving operational benefits identified as part of the 2019 Property &amp; Design Service Review.</p>	
<b>Groups potentially impacted</b>	<b>Impacts identified</b>	<b>Specific Mitigating Actions (in addition to the generic actions identified above)</b>
<p>Note: As not more than 20 employees are affected, to preserve employee confidentiality, no employee equalities data has been gathered or analysed from the council's employee database. Comments are based on evident information.</p>	<p>We know in the council as a whole and in the EEC Directorate that a number of groups of people who share protected characteristics are under-represented. This is also the case in the Property &amp; Design team, with the exception of White Irish profile exceeding the council target.</p>	<p>No specific mitigation: Council policies and support processes to be equitably applied. Including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offer all employees job application, interview and other support as needed.</li> <li>2. Consider the need for appropriate support and training to re-skill employees in new working methods.</li> <li>3. Ensure that all appropriate reasonable adjustments are made for disabled employees as required during and after the restructure process.</li> <li>4. Sign posting staff to appropriate forums (BME, LGBT, women, disability and carers)</li> <li>5. Review communications approach options (plain English etc) and monitor understanding.</li> <li>6. Support to part-time staff in identifying opportunities and consideration of other roles as job share roles as needed.</li> </ol>

## Budget 2019-20: Equality Impact Assessments –Staff

	<b>EIA Proposal</b>	
<b>EIA S3</b>	<p><b>Housing, Neighbourhoods &amp; Communities: Communities, Equality &amp; Third Sector Team</b></p> <p>The service needs to make savings of £114,000. Part of these savings will be met by a service redesign and staff consultation across the Communities, Equalities and Third Sector structure will be carried out, with due regard to the council’s priorities for supporting a diverse and welcoming city, those most affected by austerity and community wealth building as well as ensuring the council meets its legal obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty.</p>	
<b>Groups potentially impacted</b>	<b>Impacts identified</b>	<b>Specific Mitigating Actions (in addition to the generic actions identified above)</b>
<p>Note: As not more than 20 employees are affected, to preserve employee confidentiality, no employee equalities data has been gathered or analysed from the council’s employee database. Comments are based on evident information.</p>	<p>We know in the council as a whole and in the directorate that a number of groups of people who share protected characteristics are under-represented. In Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities, this is the case for BME and White Other staff.</p>	<p>No specific mitigation: Council policies and support processes to be equitably applied. Including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offer all employees job application, interview and other support as needed.</li> <li>2. Consider the need for appropriate support and training to re-skill employees in new working methods.</li> <li>3. Ensure that all appropriate reasonable adjustments are made for disabled employees as required during and after the restructure process.</li> <li>4. Sign posting staff to appropriate forums (BME, LGBT, women, disability)</li> <li>5. Review communications approach options (plain English etc) and monitor understanding.</li> <li>6. Support to part-time staff in identifying opportunities and consideration of other roles as job share roles as needed.</li> </ol>



## Budget 2020-21: Equality Impact Assessments – Staff

	<b>EIA Proposal</b>	
<b>EIA S4</b>	<p><b>Housing, Neighbourhoods &amp; Communities: Safer Communities</b></p> <p>As part of the council’s budget strategy, Safer Communities have been asked to save £170,000. In order to achieve these savings, the service is deleting vacancies (savings £91,000) and is currently offering VS with proposals to delete vacancies and offer voluntary severance (£79,000).</p> <p>These proposals will ensure that savings are made with a minimal impact on staff.</p>	
<b>Groups potentially impacted</b>	<b>Impacts identified</b>	<b>Specific Mitigating Actions (in addition to the generic actions identified above)</b>
<p>In broad terms the proposal to reduce staffing has the potential to have an impact on the following protected characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age</li> <li>• Disability</li> <li>• Ethnicity</li> <li>• Sex</li> <li>• Sexual Orientation</li> <li>• Religion/Belief</li> </ul>	<p><b>Age:</b> Council targets for age have not yet been established. The age distribution of staff in the service is broadly similar to the Council albeit with a greater proportion in the 45-54 age group. Any reduction in staff could affect the age distribution.</p> <p><b>Disability:</b> The council is just below the disability target of 8%; the directorate is above target at 10.58%. The service area is higher than the Council or directorate average, at 10.61%. Therefore the proposals could have a disproportionate impact on disabled staff. Disabled employees may be more likely to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience barriers to accessing information and getting their views heard.</li> <li>• Suffer from a possible lack of employer awareness and information regarding</li> </ul>	<p><b>Age:</b> 1. Ensure there are opportunities in the consultation process for staff to raise any issues relating to age. 2. Consider the need for appropriate support and training to re-skill employees in new working methods.</p> <p><b>Disability:</b> 1. Ensure that all appropriate reasonable adjustments are made for disabled employees. 2. Ensure there are opportunities in the consultation process for staff to raise any issues relating to disability. 3. Review communications approach options (plain English etc) and monitor understanding.</p>

disability.

**Ethnicity:**

The council is below the BME target and the directorate is also below target. The service area employs roughly the same average BME employees as the council and the directorate as a whole and is therefore also below the target. The number of BME staff could be eroded further if there are reductions in staff. Employees from ethnic minority groups are more likely to:

- Experience language barriers.
- Suffer from a possible lack of employer awareness and information regarding ethnicity.

**Sex:**

The council and the directorate are below the male employee target. The profile of the staff in this service is similar with more female staff than the directorate average. As male staff are under-represented this could further widen the gap.

**Religion & Belief:**

Council targets for religion/belief have not yet been established. Compared to the council and directorate the number of staff in the service declaring they have no religion is above average.

**Sexual orientation:**

The council is below the LGB employee target, but the directorate and service area are significantly above. LGB employees

**Ethnicity:**

1. Ensure there are opportunities in the consultation process for staff to raise any issues relating to ethnicity.
2. Review communications approach options (plain English etc) and monitor engagement.

**Sex:**

1. Ensure there are opportunities in the consultation process for staff to raise any issues relating to gender.
2. Consider reasonable adjustments for caring responsibilities.

**Religion & Belief:**

1. Ensure there are opportunities in the consultation process for staff to raise any issues relating to religion and belief.

**Sexual orientation:**

1. Ensure there are opportunities in the consultation process for staff to raise any issues relating to sexual

	groups may be more likely to suffer from a possible lack of employer awareness and information regarding LGB issues. Any cut in staffing could affect the representation of LGB workers in this area	orientation
--	--	-------------

## Budget 2020-21: Equality Impact Assessments – Staff

	<b>EIA Proposal</b>	
<b>EIA S5</b>	<p><b>Strategy, Governance &amp; Law: Democratic Services and Civic Office</b></p> <p>Savings of £59,000 have been identified across the service. In order to achieve these savings a service redesign has taken place which will reduce the number of posts, requiring a change in working practices to ensure that all meetings can be effectively managed and statutory deadlines maintained.</p>	
<b>Groups potentially impacted</b>	<b>Impacts identified</b>	<b>Specific Mitigating Actions (in addition to the generic actions identified above)</b>
<p>Note: As not more than 20 employees are affected, to preserve employee confidentiality, no employee equalities data has been gathered or analysed from the council's employee database. Comments are based on evident information.</p>	<p>We know in the council as a whole and in the directorate that a number of groups of people who share protected characteristics are under-represented. This is also the case in the Strategy, Governance and Law Directorate</p>	<p>No specific mitigation: Council policies and support processes to be equitably applied. Including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offer all employees job application, interview and other support as needed.</li> <li>2. Consider the need for appropriate support and training to re-skill employees in new working methods.</li> <li>3. Ensure that all appropriate reasonable adjustments are made for disabled employees as required during and after the restructure process.</li> <li>4. Sign posting staff to appropriate forums (LGBT, women, disability/carers, BME)</li> <li>5. Review communications approach options (plain English etc) and monitor understanding.</li> <li>6. Support to part-time staff in identifying opportunities and consideration of other roles as job share roles as needed.</li> </ol>

## Budget 2020-21: Equality Impact Assessments – Staff

EIA Proposal		
<b>EIA S6</b>	<p><b>Strategy, Governance &amp; Law: Performance Improvement and Programmes</b></p> <p>As part of the budget proposals, savings of £49,000 are required from core funding, in addition, the amount given for the modernisation funding for the next four years starting from 2020/21 is reduced by £219,000. Proposals to reduce the number of Programme Manager and Performance Analyst posts across the service have been put forward.</p>	
Groups potentially impacted	Impacts identified	Specific Mitigating Actions (in addition to the generic actions identified above)
<p>Note: As not more than 20 employees are affected, to preserve employee confidentiality, no employee equalities data has been gathered or analysed from the council's employee database. Comments are based on evident information.</p>	<p>We know the council as a whole and in the directorate that a number of groups of people who share protected characteristics are under-represented. This is also the case in the Strategy, Governance and Law Directorate</p>	<p>No specific mitigation: Council policies and support processes to be equitably applied. Including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offer all employees job application, interview and other support as needed.</li> <li>2. Consider the need for appropriate support and training to re-skill employees in new working methods.</li> <li>3. Ensure that all appropriate reasonable adjustments are made for disabled employees as required during and after the restructure process.</li> <li>4. Sign posting staff to appropriate forums (LGBT, women, disability/carers, BME)</li> <li>5. Review communications approach options (plain English etc) and monitor understanding.</li> <li>6. Support to part-time staff in identifying opportunities and consideration of other roles as job share roles as needed.</li> </ol>

## Equality Act 2010: section 149 Public Sector Equality Duty

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to—
- (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.
- (2) A person who is not a public authority but who exercises public functions must, in the exercise of those functions, have due regard to the matters mentioned in subsection (1).
- (3) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
- (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.
- (4) 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.
- (5) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
- (a) tackle prejudice, and
  - (b) promote understanding.
- (6) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.
- (7) The relevant protected characteristics are—
- age;
  - disability;
  - gender reassignment;
  - pregnancy and maternity;
  - race;
  - religion or belief;

- sex;
- sexual orientation.

(8) A reference to conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act includes a reference to—

- (a) a breach of an equality clause or rule;
  - (b) a breach of a non-discrimination rule.
- (9) Schedule 18 (exceptions) has effect.

