

## 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, 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 and impacts on staff are available in Appendix 6.

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 – Direct Payments</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Health, SEN &amp; Disability: Services for children with disabilities</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>Health, SEN &amp; Disability: Learning Disabilities Community Care</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>Standards and Achievements</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Children’s Centres</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Early Years and Childcare</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Social work and legal: s.17 expenditure</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>Safeguarding and Care: Children’s Agency Placements</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Community Care (Physical Support and Sensory Support / Memory &amp; Cognition / Mental Health Support)</b>	<b>9</b>

<b>Health &amp; Adult Social Care</b>	<b>Assessment and Provider Services</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>Commissioning</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Economy, Environment, and Culture</b>	<b>City Transport - Traffic Management Group</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>Parking Services Group</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>City Environment – City Parks</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities</b>	<b>Libraries</b>	<b>15</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>Life Events</b>	<b>16</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>There are no service-user EIAs required for proposals in these services</b>	<b>-</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: Premises Concierge Services</b>	<b>S1</b>
	<b>Property: Premises and Facilities Management</b>	<b>S2</b>
	<b>Property: Premises Helpdesk and Business Services</b>	<b>S3</b>

<b>Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities</b>	<b>Communities, Equality &amp; Third Sector</b>	<b>S4</b>
<b>Finance &amp; Resources</b>	<b>Revenues &amp; Benefits</b>	<b>S5</b>
<b>Strategy, Legal &amp; Governance</b>	<b>Communications</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 2021/22 – 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?	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct payments saving = £40,000 (total budget £573,000)</li> </ul> Direct Payments saving achieved by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correctly allocating costs for clients' post-18 which have already been captured in pressures calculation in adult's community care budget.</li> </ul>	
5. Summary of impacts	Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups	
	Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Age (young people) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is uncertainty about the ongoing and future impact of Covid-19 and the levels of support required by families particularly if Drove Road and Tudor House are at full capacity. Therefore, if demand rises and cannot be accommodated within current resources the reduction in budget may mean that children and young people (CYP) will not be able to access out of school activities, placing more pressure on the home and parents' ability to cope.</li> <li>• Reduction in the amount of funding to provide CYP with SEND access to out of school activities risks family breakdown and therefore an increase in the use of respite provision and possible agency placement.</li> </ul>	
6. Assess level of impact (1 = low, 5 = high)	3	

<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>• Alternative/replacement support options to be available for some young people through the Extended Day.</li> <li>• Additional use of community groups and other funding streams.</li> <li>• Close liaison with parent/carers groups such as PaCC and Amaze in order to improve communication and the co-production of information for alternative support options.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	<p>Full EIA not required as risks are known where there is ongoing PaCC and Amaze engagement in relation to this.</p>
<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> <hr/> <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>• Monitor the outcomes of the resource panel through Social Care review process.</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> </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> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional support may not be available to families if there are funding challenges for providers in the Community and Voluntary Sector.</li> </ul>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Families, Children & Learning: Health, SEN & Disability; Children’s Disability Service	2. EIA No. 2
3. Head of Service	Carl Campbell, Head of Service 0-25	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <hr/> <p><u>Savings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services for children with disabilities: £70,000</li> </ul> <p>For services for children with disabilities these savings will be made by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment of a Commissioning Team for the HSEND branch to review the value for money of current contracts and high cost placements.</li> <li>Progress the recommendations of the Peopletoo review for children’s in-house respite provision.</li> <li>Expansion of the Extended Day through a range of invest to save initiatives</li> <li>Development of complex needs foster care service to prevent the need to make high cost agency placements</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: Age (young people)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible re-location of children and young people (CYP) from high cost agency placements through returning to the city. Wrap around planning will be required to ensure this is experienced as a positive experience by service users.</li> </ul>	
6. Assess level of impact (1 = low, 5 = high)	<b>3</b>	
	<b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b>	

<b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand the Extended Day through invest to save initiatives thereby reducing the pressure on respite provision.</li> <li>• Savings achieved through the new HSEND Commissioning Team by re-negotiation / re-tendering / bringing in-house Children's Disability Service contracts. Calculated at 10% of current contract value.</li> <li>• Consideration of the provision of full time in house residential provision for CYP with complex needs that reduces pressure both on respite provision and agency placements.</li> <li>• Through developing a complex needs foster care service prevent the need for CYP to be placed in high cost agency placements.</li> <li>• Review those CYP currently in high cost agency placements and plan a return to the city through the further development of the local offer.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	<p>Full EIA not required at this stage. However, a further EIA may be necessary regarding the impact of re-locating young people.</p>
<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 are funding challenges for providers in the Community and Voluntary Sector whilst the Commissioning Team are reviewing contracts and considering what provision and services will be required to future proof the city for CYP with SEND.</li> <li>• The further development of a foster care service, in-house residential, short breaks and respite providers will be delayed if Covid 19 continues to impact upon service development because of staff capacity and absence.</li> </ul>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Families, Children & Learning: Health, SEN & Disability - Adult Learning Disability Assessment	2. EIA No. 3
3. Head of Service	Cameron Brown, Head of Service 25+	
4. Budget Proposal	What is the proposal?	
	The saving of £950,000 will be achieved by reducing the spend on the Learning Disabilities Community Care Budget.	
5. Summary of impacts	Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups	
	<p><b>Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Disability (learning disabilities and autistic spectrum conditions), Carers, Ethnicity, Gender Reassignment, Sexual Orientation</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Approximately 800 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.</p> <p>Any reduction in the community care budget will have a direct effect on the amount or the way support and care is offered.</p> <p>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/carers.</p> <p><b>Disability:</b> 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.</p>	



	<p><b>Ethnicity:</b> People from BME groups may continue to face disproportionate impacts, for example reduction in budgets for translators or for more in-depth work.</p> <p><b>Gender reassignment:</b> As we are trying to increase engagement with trans people, 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.</p> <p><b>Sexual orientation:</b> 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> <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 funding restrictions could have a direct effect on carers to continue in their caring role.</p>
<p><b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)</p>	<p><b>2:</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 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 required, 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</p>

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.

We aim to carry this out by:

- Providing individuals living with families support to manage and sustain their care arrangements for as 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.

A new reviewing framework across Adult Social Care of our Independent Sector Providers, which includes integrating a digital platform for Performance, Activity and Quality information, will invite our partners to join us in ensuring we only gather and report on information that is needed in a timely way, and help us to ensure support is outcome focused, and resources are directed to those that are most in need.

An enhanced crisis provision service within Children's 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.

	<p>The Service will comply with the new Accessible Information Standards (S.250) of the Health and Social Care Act 2012.</p> <p>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.</p>
<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>• 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>	<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> <p>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.</p> <p>Public Health as a partner is key in promoting wellbeing and healthy lives: this is critical to stem any future and immediate demand.</p> <p>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 reduction in funding from the CCG would have a direct effect on the community care budget.</p>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Families, Children & Learning: Standards & Achievement	2. Proposal No. 4
3. Head of Service	Mark Storey (Head of Education Standards and Achievement)	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <hr/> <p>Standards &amp; Achievement - Non DSG is a budget of £329,000 in 2020/21. The budget is for core school intervention team, commissioned school partnership advisers, used to fund all school improvement activity and a range of school support. This work covers a range of statutory functions including school improvement, intervening if a school is failing or at risk of failure, assessment, RE, Equalities and anti-bullying and PSHCE and addressing disadvantaged outcomes.</p> <p>Key focus promoting high standards (particularly for disadvantaged pupils), includes facilitating and leading the education partnership; supporting Head appointments, liaison with Ofsted and working with partnerships and individual schools to maintain and improve standards. In particular the team intervenes when schools are at risk of failure (schools causing concern). A significant part of this budget is used to fund school improvement work and interventions for Schools causing concern.</p> <p>The proposal is for a cost saving of £25,000.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 40%; margin-top: 10px;"></div>	
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: Age (younger), Ethnicity, Child Poverty</b></p> <p>There is a clear link between school improvement work and outcomes for disadvantaged pupils and families. This money is likely to have been spent on school improvement and interventions that support schools in areas of high deprivation eg: St Mark's (Whitehawk), Moulsecoomb, Homewood. Removing funding therefore could impact on educational attainment and quality of school provision for disadvantaged groups and families.</p>	

	<p>As some of the school improvement work supports disadvantage and this work gets reduced slightly then there could be a link between cutting this budget and support for English as an Additional Language (EAL) and BAME pupils. There is a disproportionately high number of disadvantaged pupils who are EAL and BME.</p> <p>The funding cut will not directly affect any statutory RE support but it does come from same budget. SACRE funding will be ring-fenced.</p>
<b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)	<b>3</b>
<b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b>	<b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We monitor standards and school improvement work that is taking place via standards report.</li> <li>• We look to partnerships more for schools to provide support for each other.</li> <li>• We look for more opportunities for funding via Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) when available.</li> <li>• As we reduce support in certain schools we can look to any alternative methods of funding such as directly from DfE. We cannot predict however if any such schemes will exist.</li> <li>• We develop an anti-racist strategy to benefit BME and EAL groups.</li> <li>• Specifically ringfence SACRE money within budget</li> </ul>
<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>
	GCSE and primary outcomes of disadvantaged pupils. This is done within the annual standards report
<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>
	Development of anti-racist strategy, if funded, could mitigate some of the impact on BAME families.

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

<b>1. Service Area</b>	<b>Families, Children &amp; Learning: Children’s Centres</b>	<b>2. EIA No. 5</b>
<b>3. Head of Service</b>	<b>Caroline Parker</b>	
<b>4. Budget Proposal</b>	<b>What is the proposal?</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fund the contribution to Turnerland Nursery from the early years block of the Dedicated Schools Grant. Note: this is just a change of funding stream so will not impact the service. (£55,000)</li> <li>• Charge for accommodation of health visitors in Children's Centres: this will be funded by Public Health so there is no service impact (£33,000)</li> <li>• Not to fill Children’s Centre vacancies (£50,000). The total Children’s Centre budget is £1.553 million so this is 3% of the total budget. The reduction will have a small impact on reception work and support for universal groups.</li> </ul>	
<b>5. Summary of impacts</b>	<b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b>	
	<p><b>Potential disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Age (younger) and Sex (women)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts will be small because of the small size of the reduction: 3.2%</li> <li>• Children’s Centres are mainly used by children under 5 and women so any impact will have a disproportionate impact on these groups.</li> <li>• No impact is identified relating to ethnicity as attendance at children’s centre groups by children from different ethnicity and race is similar to the citywide population. However, equalities monitoring of the use of the children’s centre food bank during Covid-19 has shown that proportion of families using the service from BAME groups has been higher than the citywide average.</li> </ul>	
<b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)	<b>1</b>	

<b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b>	<b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any negative impacts will be small. Children’s Centres will continue to give priority to groups and home / virtual visits for families facing disadvantage. This includes disabled children and children who are identified as at risk of not achieving a good level of development, living in low-income families, or lacking a stimulating home learning environment.</li> <li>• Continue to target services on BAME families facing multiple disadvantages including those supported by the Food Bank</li> <li>• To continue partnership working with other agencies in the city who support families living in poverty to ensure these families can access services. To consider the learning from Covid-19 to look at whether continuing to provide virtual group and 1-1 support can be effective for some families.</li> </ul>
<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>
	To monitor the protected characteristics of families accessing services to ensure disadvantaged families access services.
<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>
	None identified.

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

<b>1. Service Area</b>	<b>Families, Children &amp; Learning: Early years and childcare</b>	<b>2. EIA No. 6</b>
<b>3. Head of Service</b>	<b>Caroline Parker</b>	
<b>4. Budget Proposal</b>	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <hr/> <p>Move more training for early years providers to a virtual offer and a small reduction in business and childcare development support: saving of £20,000</p> <p>During Covid-19 most of the early years training programme has moved on-line. The intention is to continue with more on-line courses which are easy for childcare staff to access and to save some venue and organisation costs. Most of the training programme is paid for by fees from childcare providers. There will be a 10% reduction in support for business and development support for childcare providers in the city.</p>	
<b>5. Summary of impacts</b>	<p><b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Age (younger), Sex (women)</b></p> <p>The change in training and reduced support may lead to a small reduction in the quality and sustainability of childcare in the city. Childcare is used by children under five and women who tend to rely on childcare the most. Women also make up the majority of the childcare workforce.</p> <p>No changes to the support or training for children with SEND are planned. Children with SEND will continue to be supported by additional support funding and training for staff provided by B&amp;H Inclusion Support Service.</p>	
<b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)	<b>1</b>	



<b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b>	<b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To ensure that support is targeted on settings which most need support based on Ofsted inspections and the number of disadvantaged children attending.</li> <li>• The training programme will include anti-racist training. The Ethnic Minority Achievement Service (EMAS) also provide support and training to settings with children with English as an additional language.</li> </ul>
<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>• Through management scrutiny of effectiveness of support to early years settings</li> <li>• Monitoring access to training by all settings in the city</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>
	None

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Families, Children & Learning: Safeguarding & Care	2. EIA No. 7
3. Head of Service	Anna Gianfrancesco, Interim Assistant Director	
4. Budget Proposal	What is the proposal?	
	A reduction of the budget for section 17 by £75,000.	
5. Summary of impacts	<b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b>	
	<p><b>Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Age (younger)</b></p> <p>Section 17 of the Children Act 1989 states that it is the general duty of every local authority to safeguard and promote the welfare of children within their area who are in need; and so far as it is consistent with that duty, to promote the upbringing of such children by their families.</p> <p>Financial assistance in terms of goods or services, or in exceptional circumstances cash, can be provided to a child, parent or carer under <a href="#">Section 17(6)</a> Children Act 1989 to address identified needs to safeguard and promote a child's welfare where there is no other legitimate source of financial assistance.</p> <p>The payment must be to support and promote the welfare of the child.</p> <p>A reduction in the monies available under s.17 will have a direct impact on the vulnerable children and young people in the city as the money is directly used to support their needs and welfare.</p> <p>While services have in previous years worked to reduce the spend under s.17, through greater use of alternative funding streams via charities, grants etc as a result of Covid-19 we have seen an increase in spend and support given to families through s.17. If there continues to be a rise in the number of families experiencing financial hardship and requiring s.17 support we will struggle to meet the needs of all the families.</p>	

<b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)	3
<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>• We will continue to seek alternative funding streams.</li> <li>• To work with social workers to consider how best to support families who are experiencing financial hardship or requiring support via s.17.</li> <li>• Ensure those families who require s.17 financial support have robust plans in place that is working to address the children's needs, while ensuring the financial support within the plan and the family are able to address ongoing need.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	No
<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> <hr/> <p>Through the monitoring of the budget: S.17 has been devolved to teams and we are able to monitor at an operational level and if needed undertake an audit of team's spend.</p>
<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> <hr/> <p>The impact of Covid-19 and possible impact of Brexit (job losses and reduced income) is likely to lead to an increase in families needing support under s.17.</p>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Families, Children & Learning: Children’s Safeguarding & Care - Children’s Agency Placements	2. EIA No. 8
3. Head of Service	Anna Gianfrancesco, Interim Assistant Director	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <p>A £283,000 saving on the cost of agency placements for children in the care of Brighton &amp; Hove City Council.</p> <p>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% until March 2020. While we have seen a slight rise in the number of children in care during the Covid-19 period, this is in part due to a delay in court proceedings with children waiting to be put on a Special Guardianship Order and placed with family and friends. This would allow numbers to drop back to a pre-Covid-19 level. We envisage then continuing to build on the reductions in care that have been made.</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>• Developing a framework for care leavers.</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> </ul>	
	<b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b>	

<b>5. Summary of impacts</b>	<p><b>Disproportionate impacts identified on the following characteristics: Age (younger)</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 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.</p>
<b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)	<p><b>1</b></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/> <p>Continuing the actions defined in the model of practice, which are proving effective:</p> <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> <li>• Continuing use of placement review board to have oversight of placements within the independent sector.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	<p>Not needed</p>
<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> <hr/> <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> <li>• Placement review board will continue to have oversight of placements made in the independent sector</li> </ul>

<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>
	<p>Increasing social work demand due to unforeseen social, policy or demographic changes could increase the impact of these proposals.</p>
	<p>The impact of growing levels of inequality and results of Brexit and Covid-19, within Brighton &amp; Hove, alongside decreasing access to services to mitigate levels of inequality, could lead to greater levels of demand upon social work services.</p> <p>The increasing number of children in care nationally is putting pressure on the availability of placements, this along with increasing costs care providers have incurred due to Covid-19 has led to an increase in placement costs. If these costs continue to increase this will put significant pressure on the budget, even with falling numbers in care.</p>

# Health and Adult Social Care

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Health and Adult Social Care: Physical Support and Sensory Support / Memory & Cognition / Mental Health Support	2. EIA No. 9
3. Head of Service	Grace Hanley	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <p>The overall net budget for this service area is £36,982,000 and the proposed saving is £3,780,000.</p> <p>This is proposed to be done by continuing with the agreed direction of travel for Adult Social Care focusing upon reducing demand through a number of approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increasing the reablement offer to those who require it</li> <li>• managing the care market through a hospital discharge and Discharge-to-Assess bed project</li> <li>• negotiating costs to the Local Authority with care providers</li> <li>• reviewing service agreements and improving care system controls</li> <li>• recommissioning of extra care block contracts</li> <li>• redevelopment of a social care building to provide services in City</li> <li>• reduction of long-term care placements through improved care pathways.</li> <li>• negotiate the existing Community Equipment Services contract.</li> </ul>	
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: Age (older), Disability (mental health, physical and sensory impairments)</b></p> <p>Community Care budget funds packages of care to meet statutory responsibilities across adult care groups apart from Learning Disability and Mental Health. Services include community support, home care, supported accommodation, residential and nursing care. The proposals could impact on all these service user groups.</p>	

	<p>Increasing the opportunity for reablement thus reducing the need for long term care will positively impact in that it will enable people to be more independent, requiring less ongoing care and the ability to stay living in their own home for longer. However, reablement is a short-term intervention, and if some long-term care is required after reablement this may require a change of service provider, which some people and families may find unsettling.</p> <p>Increasing the Discharge to Assess options enables quicker discharge from hospital when medically fit to do so, and improved reablement and assessment for the person, supporting people to get the right care following hospital admission. Again, this may require a change of ongoing care provider if long term care is required after this period of reablement and assessment, which some people and families may find unsettling.</p> <p>Redevelopment of a social care building will provide additional care within the City, reducing the need for people to go out of City to receive required care. A full EIA will be developed on this proposal.</p> <p>Reviewing service agreements and improving care system controls has no impact on service provision.</p> <p>The proposed negotiated contract costs to the Local Authority has no impact on service provision.</p>
<p><b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)</p>	<p><b>2:</b> The Community Care budget is used to purchase services for a range of vulnerable people and their carers and proposals will impact on older people, people with mental health issues, a physical disability, long term conditions, sensory impairment and those with substance misuse problems</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessments undertaken to establish care needs will be person centred and take into account individual needs and requirements</li> <li>• Those in a caring role will be offered a Carer's Assessment and a person budget, in line with the requirements of the Care Act, to enable them to maintain their caring role and the right care is available</li> <li>• The provision of a direct payment will be made where appropriate to enable choice and control of care provision</li> <li>• Quality of commissioned care and reablement outcomes will be monitored</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Full EIA?</b></p>	<p>A full EIA will be developed as part of the proposal of redeveloping a social care building.</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><b>9. Monitoring and Evaluation</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Annual User Survey will monitor effectiveness and any negative impacts.</li> <li>• Customer Feedback monitors specific user experience.</li> <li>• The statutory review process will also monitor impact.</li> <li>• Quality Monitoring arrangements will monitor quality of care, linking with Care Quality Commission outcomes.</li> </ul>
<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>Any changes in Health Service provision in the city can impact particularly on those people the Community Care budget supports. This will be closely monitored through the integrated health agenda and other joint planning mechanisms.</p>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Health and Adult Social Care: Assessment and Provider Services	2. EIA No. 10
3. Head of Service	Michelle Jenkins	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <p>The budget for this area is £15,496,000 and the proposed saving is £425,000 proportionally from across all service areas.</p> <p>This is proposed to be achieved through redesign of the service offer and service pathways to enhance cost effectiveness. This will be enhanced by redesign of internal digital systems to create improved workflow and streamlined pathways for customers, reducing duplication across the service.</p> <p>A range of options are being considered focussed on management and running costs, including a review of costs. Impact on front line service provision will be minimal.</p>	
5. Summary of impacts	<p><b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b></p> <p>No disproportionate negative impacts on service-users sharing protected characteristics are identified.</p>	
6. Assess level of impact (1 = low, 5 = high)	1	
7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts	<p><b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b></p> <p>None required</p>	

<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	<p>If the plans develop require changes to service delivery such as building use, a full EIA will be required, though this is not anticipated.</p>
<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> <hr/> <p>Standard monitoring practices such as Customer Feedback, Service Monitoring will be in place</p>
<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> <hr/> <p>None</p>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Health and Adult Social Care: Commissioning	2. EIA No. 11
3. Head of Service	Andrew Witham	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <p>The budget for this area is £10,200,000 and the savings proposal is £310,000.</p> <p>The directorate has reviewed the overall provision of Supported Accommodation services which has a substantial budget. Savings have been enabled by recommissioning contracts, using alternative provision and identifying some process and staffing efficiencies (vacancy management). £0.040m of this saving is also identified through reviewing the Home Care system contract and delivering the service via an in-house option.</p> <p>The savings proposals in detail are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tenancy access service being funded through alternative funding not impacting on HASC budget</li> <li>• A vacant link project post not being replaced within 2021/22.</li> <li>• A volunteer arrangement for short stay for homeless adults to be discontinued.</li> <li>• A proposal for arrangements for accommodation during the pandemic not to be actioned.</li> <li>• Creation of an in-house software option, removing the need for contracted service provision.</li> </ul>	
5. Summary of impacts	<p><b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b></p> <p><b>No disproportionate negative impacts on service-users sharing protected characteristics are identified.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The savings proposals are not impacting the volume of supported accommodation available.</li> <li>• The link project post was in place to develop and create links to community and voluntary groups. These links are now in place and there are alternative arrangements to sustain this work.</li> <li>• Tenancy access scheme has increased and is continuing but with an alternative funding arrangement.</li> <li>• The volunteer short stay arrangement for homeless adults was not being utilised for the cohort it was funded for, and no rough sleeping clients have been accommodated through this scheme in the year.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed pandemic arrangements were requested via the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). However, the MHCLG has now confirmed it will not be progressing with these proposals, so funding for this has been released with no impact on existing services.</li> <li>Creating an inhouse software option for home care does not impact on service provision.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)	<b>1</b>
<b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b>	<b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b>
	None needed
<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>
	Monitored through the Homeless Reduction Board
<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>
	None identified

# Economy, Environment and Culture

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Economy, Environment and Culture: City Transport - Traffic Management Group	2. EIA No: 12
3. Head of Service	Andrew Westwood	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Highway Fees</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing licence fees for skips, scaffolds, hoardings, materials and A-Boards (highway licences) by a maximum of 5%</li> <li>Increasing application fees for dropped kerbs and crossovers for vehicle access to a property by 20%</li> </ul> <p>The increases amount to approximately £32,000 per annum which will enable the Council to continue recovering the cost of administering these services.</p>	
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: Age (older people), Disability</b></p> <p>Increasing the fee for a vehicle crossover application may discourage people from applying and have a greater impact on those who are more reliant on a car to travel; particularly older and/or disabled people.</p> <p>Increasing licence fees for skips, scaffolds, hoardings, materials and A-Boards may have a detrimental impact on the recovery of the local economy, depending on the buoyancy of the construction industry and retail sector, and if future restrictions are placed on businesses and movement as a result of the pandemic.</p> <p>Increasing fees may result in increased avoidance leading to extra costs for monitoring and enforcement.</p>	

<b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)	<b>2</b>
<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/> <p>No specific mitigating actions are planned, but the proportion of Blue Badge holders applying for cross overs will be monitored during the year to establish if the increased fee could be having a greater impact on disabled car users.</p>
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	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> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of highway licences and crossover applications made will be monitored throughout the year and compared with previous levels of demand, to ascertain whether there has been a drop in demand or people are trying to avoid the fee.</li> <li>• Highway enforcement officers will continue to monitor the impact of the proposals on the ground, as part of their regular inspection regime.</li> <li>• The proportion of Blue Badge holders applying for crossovers will also be monitored.</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?</b></p> <hr/> <p>The concessionary travel scheme for disabled passes has been expanded to 24-hour use. This may mitigate some of the potentially disproportionate impacts of increasing vehicle crossover application fees on disabled people by providing improved access to public transport as an alternative mode of transport to the car. This will depend on the location of the crossover in relation to bus routes.</p>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Economy, Environment and Culture: Parking Services Group	2. EIA No: 13
3. Head of Service	Charles Field	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Parking Fees &amp; Charges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raising price of resident permits – Freezing quarterly and half yearly prices to reduce costs to those who find the upfront annual costs more difficult. The price of instalments through the year will now be the same as the annual fee.</li> <li>• Increasing on-street tariffs across the city by 9.5%</li> <li>• Transition of some free limited waiting bays in parking zones to paid parking.</li> <li>• Increases to Business permits.</li> <li>• Increasing tariffs in four off-street car parks (Trafalgar Street, The Lanes, Regency Square and London Road) by 15% and other off street car parks by 10%.</li> <li>• Increasing the hours of the King Alfred and Black Rock Car parks from finishing at 6pm to 8pm.</li> </ul> <p>The increases 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>Under section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the defined ‘Parking Surplus’ arising from on-street parking permits, tariffs and penalty charge notices must be used for transport and highways related projects and expenditure such as supported bus services, concessionary fares, financing costs of transport and parking related capital investments and environmental improvements. Where the council already provides funding for transport and highways related budgets from its General Fund budget, increases to the Parking Surplus can be lawfully applied to fund these budgets, which can thereby release equivalent General Fund resources. The council may use the released resources for any purpose within its duties and powers, including releasing resources for savings. In this way, these measures will release £1.562m budget savings.</p>	
	<b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b>	



<p><b>5. Summary of impacts</b></p>	<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. This may create additional barriers and disadvantage for some older and disabled people.</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. Although it is appreciated that not all disabled people can use public transport.</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 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</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)</p>	<p><b>2</b></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> <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. The price of instalments for resident permits is now the same price as paying annually.</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.</p> <p>Any surplus parking income is mainly spent on providing free concessionary bus passes for elderly and disabled people to encourage alternative sustainable transport choices.</p>
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	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>• Regular review meetings are held to review on-street and off-street parking usage.</li> <li>• Parking Services have applied for and been awarded People's Parking accreditation. This scheme was set up to provide independent feedback about the facilities and public car park experience from a disabled user perspective, with regular monitoring and reviews.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</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?</b></p> <p>We have expanded Concessionary travel scheme for disabled passes for 24 hour use which will mitigate some of the impacts from increases to fees &amp; charges by encouraging / improving access to public transport use.</p>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	City Environment: City Parks	2. EIA No. 14
3. Head of Service	Rachel Chasseaud, Assistant Director	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <p><b>Self-management of sports facilities. This will save £50,000.</b></p> <p>Work has already started to enable more sports users to run their own facilities within parks by transferring management to sports clubs and community interest companies. This budget proposal will extend this work. Council is currently working with the governing bodies of Football, Tennis, Rugby and Cricket.</p> <p>Experience indicates that under self-management, facility managers have a far greater understanding of who is using their facilities, than the council does. This, coupled with the drive of the various sports governing bodies to meet their own equalities targets, means that the self-managed facilities with a strong governing body involvement, work hard to deliver on equalities. Examples of this include Brighton &amp; Hove Cricket Club and Hove Rugby Club – sports that are traditionally male dominated - both now having well developed women’s teams.</p> <p>Where we have council-run facilities and strong governing bodies exist, they are involved in assessing the suitability of any self-management proposals put forward, governing bodies are, generally, key to future funding opportunities so there is a strong incentive for self-managed facilities to meet their equalities responsibilities on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Through the budget proposals, the council will have less influence on the fees charged. However, evidence to date indicates that self- managed facilities have generally demonstrated better control of charging, rather than charging more than the fees originally set by the council.</p> <p>Less evasion of fees, coupled with external funding drawn in by self-managed clubs, has enabled facility improvements on most self-managed sites. Self-managed facilities often offer free taster sessions, and some operate bursaries for less well-off players, but they do not offer free facilities.</p> <p>In general, under council control, free facilities were often the result of the difficulty of collecting fees due rather than a decision not to charge.</p>	

	<p>There are people who currently pay nothing for sports facilities who will have to pay going forward some of whom will inevitably be financially disadvantaged.</p> <p>The knowledge and control of self-managed facilities also means that the safeguarding of users is more effective with practices such as coaching regulated and standards set and observed.</p>
<b>5. Summary of impacts</b>	<b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b>
	<p><b>No disproportionate negative impacts on service-users sharing protected characteristics are identified.</b></p> <p>There are people who currently pay nothing for sports facilities who will have to pay going forward some of whom will inevitably be financially disadvantaged. However, there is no specific impact identified on people sharing protected characteristics. Evidence to date indicates that self- managed facilities have generally demonstrated better control of charging</p>
<b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)	<b>1</b>
<b>7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts</b>	<b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b>
	No mitigations are needed.
<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>
	Monitoring will be completed by clubs rather than by the council.
<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>
	None

# Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Libraries & Information Services	2. EIA No. 15
3. Head of Service	Sally McMahon / Kate Rouse	
4. Budget Proposal	<p><b>What is the proposal?</b></p> <p>The proposal is to modify library operations to reduce costs and to take advantage of automation to reduce the administrative costs of the Bibliographic Service saving £98,000.</p>	
5. Summary of impacts	<p><b>Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups</b></p> <p>None identified</p>	
6. Assess level of impact (1 = low, 5 = high)	1	
7. Key actions to reduce negative impacts	<p><b>What actions are planned to reduce/avoid negative impacts and increase positive impacts?</b></p> <p>No impacts anticipated for customers as any staffing time is being removed from non-customer facing time.</p>	
8. Full EIA?	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>
	Libraries already collect substantial amounts of data about usage and this would be used to continue to monitor the impact of any changes.
<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>
	None identified

## **Finance & Resources**

**There are no service-user EIAs required for proposals in these services.**

## Strategy, Governance & Law

### Budget Equality Impact Assessment Template 2021/22 – Service-Users

1. Service Area	Strategy, Governance & Law: Life Events	2. EIA No. 16
3. Head of Service	Paul Holloway	
4. Budget Proposal	What is the proposal?	
	Service Redesign proposals in Bereavement Services, Registration Services and Electoral Services along with introduction of new software at Woodvale will drive efficiency and modernisation across Life Events over the three year period. Saving £35,000 per year.	
5. Summary of impacts	Highlight the most significant disproportionate impacts on groups	
	<p><b>No disproportionate negative impacts on service-users sharing protected characteristics are identified.</b></p> <p>It is not anticipated that any of the proposals have adverse impact on customers sharing protected characteristics as the savings relate to changes to more flexible staff structures. Changes to software systems will impact positively for customers at Bereavement Services. Consideration of fees and charges changes will not adversely affect any protected groups. Any increases to fees and charges will all groups equally. Cremations and burials for children under 17 years old remain free.</p> <p>A report relating to funeral poverty has been produced by the Competitions and Marketing Authority and Any proposals to increase fees and charges for Bereavement Services would be based on the findings of the report.</p>	



<b>6. Assess level of impact</b> (1 = low, 5 = high)	<b>1</b> - Any agreed fees and charges increases will impact across all customers in both Registration and Bereavement. Proposals are based on the current pandemic situation with minimal increases proposed, due to the current restrictions of numbers for both Registration ceremonies, and funeral services at Woodvale
<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/> <p>Service redesigns will create more flexibility to provide services to our customers, maintaining the quality of services regularly fed back to the service by the Customer Insight work undertaken. A new software system at Bereavement Services will provide efficiencies over the 3 year period, with processes improved through streamlining.</p>
<b>8. Full EIA?</b>	<p>Not required</p>
<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> <hr/> <p>Income will be monitored through TBM monthly reporting. Redesigns will provide small savings and lead to some efficiencies over the 3 year period.</p>
<b>10. Cumulative impacts</b>	<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</p>

## Equality Impact Assessments describing impacts on Staff

EIA No. S1	EIA Proposal	
	<p><b>Economy, Environment &amp; Culture: Property &amp; Design – Premises Concierge Services</b></p> <p>£40,000 saving anticipated from staffing due to the reduction in face to face customer service and channel shift during the Covid 19 pandemic. There is a planned review of the corporate main council accessibility line/switchboard that will be undertaken by the Customer Experience team in Performance Improvement Programmes later in the year. If there are any staffing impacts arising from the review, staff and unions will be consulted on any proposed changes.</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 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, and BME profile very close to reaching 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 2021-22: Equality Impact Assessments – Staff

EIA No. S2	EIA Proposal	
	<p><b>Economy, Environment &amp; Culture: Property &amp; Design – Premises and Facilities Management</b></p> <p>£30,000 saving identified from staffing as the Building Surveying administrative requirement can be reduced owing to the removal of duplication in schools liaison, which is carried out in the service directly with school management teams.</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 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, and BME profile very close to reaching 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 2021-22: Equality Impact Assessments – Staff

EIA No. S3	EIA Proposal	
	<p><b>Economy, Environment &amp; Culture: Property &amp; Design – Premises Helpdesk and Building Services</b></p> <p>£10,000 saving anticipated as a staffing reduction, due to implementation of a new Helpdesk data recording system that enables better reporting, early warning notification on Key Performance Indicators and intensive filtering applications. When the system has embedded, the impacts on staff will be reviewed later in the year, and staff and unions will be consulted on any proposed changes.</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 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, and BME profile very close to reaching 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 2021-22: Equality Impact Assessments – Staff

EIA No. S4	EIA Proposal	
	<p><b>Communities, Equality &amp; Third Sector</b>                      Small redesign and restructure of the service should be able to achieve a staffing efficiency of 1 FTE across the service by integrating workloads.</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 affected to preserve employee confidentiality, no employee equalities data has been gathered or analysed from the council's employee database. Comments below are based on evident information.</p>	<p>We know that the council as a whole and in the directorate that most protected characteristics are under-represented. In Housing, Neighbourhoods and Communities, this is the case for BME and White Other staff.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure staff support information is made clear in the staff consultation document.</li> <li>2. Ensure management, trade union and HR support is available for all staff.</li> <li>3. Ensure there are opportunities in the consultation process for staff to raise any issues in relation to protected characteristics.</li> <li>4. Ensure any reasonable adjustments are considered and implemented as appropriate</li> <li>5. Ensure that mental health support is highlighted to staff throughout the consultation in recognition that change management can impact adversely on mental health/stress/anxiety.</li> </ol>

## Budget 2021-22: Equality Impact Assessments – Staff

EIA No. S5	EIA Proposal	
	<p><b>Finance and Resources: Revenues and Benefits</b></p> <p>This service includes the administration of Housing Benefits, Council Tax, Council Tax Reduction awards and management of Welfare Support (Hardship) &amp; Rights services. In the Council's budget proposals for 2021/2022 it is proposed that savings will be identified through a redesign of the service, based on the continued downsizing of the Housing Benefit caseload element of Revenues and Benefits as cases move to Universal Credit managed by the Department for Work and Pensions.</p>	
Groups potentially impacted	Impacts identified	Specific Mitigating Actions (in addition to the generic actions identified above)
<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>• Disability</li> <li>• Ethnicity</li> <li>• Sexual Orientation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Age:</b> Council targets for age have not yet been established. The age distribution of staff in the service follows a similar pattern to the Council, although whereas the Council's highest proportion of staff are in the 50-54 age range, in Revenues and Benefits this is slightly younger at 45-49 years old. 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 however has exceeded the target and currently has 9.35% of staff who have declared they have a disability. The service area is higher than the Council and above the directorate average, at 11.11%. Disabled employees may be more likely to:</p>	<p><b>Age:</b> No further actions required beyond the generic ones that apply across the board.</p> <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>

	<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 disability.</li> <li>• Experience barriers regarding technology and equipment required to perform their role.</li> <li>• People with mental health needs may be impacted by the stress/anxiety caused by the change process.</li> </ul> <p>Note: 13.47% of employee disability data is not known in the service area. The analysis above is based on declared data only.</p> <p><b>Ethnicity:</b> The council is below the BME target of 9% and the directorate is also below target at 7.37%. The council and the directorate are below the White Other group target. The Revenues and Benefits service area employs above the average BME employees compared to the council and the directorate as a whole and is above the target, with 10% staff identifying as BME. The number of White Other staff in the service however is below the Council and directorate average, at 6.51% and therefore proposals may further erode this group in the workforce. Employees from ethnic minority groups are more likely to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience language barriers.</li> </ul>	<p>5. Work with support services (such as IT&amp;D and HROD) to identify solutions to overcome barriers relating to technology and equipment.</p> <p>6. The council now offers an online training course on conducting virtual interviews, which covers barriers managers need to be aware of if interviewing virtually. Ensure managers have completed this training ahead of interviews taking place as part of restructure proposals.</p> <p>7. A range of support to be provided in the staffing communication and consultation process regarding mental health support including individual reasonable adjustments, staff wellbeing information, counselling services and occupational health/risk assessment support where required.</p> <p><b>Ethnicity:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Positive action to include training on interview skills, coaching and signposting to BME Workers' Forum.</li> <li>2. Review communications approach options (plain English etc) and monitor engagement.</li> <li>3. Ensure all staff and managers have attended the mandatory Fair and Inclusive briefings</li> </ol>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suffer from a possible lack of employer awareness and information regarding ethnicity.</li> </ul> <p>Note: 10.88% of staff are unknown. The analysis above is based on declared data only.</p> <p><b>Sex:</b> The council is below the male employee target but the directorate is very close to target. The profile of the staff in this service is similar to that of the directorate, with 51.3% of female staff and 48.7% of male staff.</p> <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 average. Note: 18% 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 above the LGB employee target, and the service area is significantly above target at 16.44%. LGBTQ employees groups may be more likely to suffer from a possible lack of employer awareness and information regarding LGB issues. Note: 13.47% of sexual orientation employee data is not known. The analysis above is based on declared data only.</p>	<p><b>Sex:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Positive action to include training on interview skills</li> <li>2. Support to part-time staff in identifying opportunities and consideration of other roles as job share roles.</li> </ol> <p><b>Religion &amp; Belief:</b> No further actions required beyond the generic ones that apply across the board.</p> <p><b>Sexual orientation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Positive action including skills interview training and internal coaching as well as signposting to LGBTQ Forum</li> <li>2. Providing skills interview training and internal coaching;</li> </ol>
--	---	--



## Budget 2021-22: Equality Impact Assessments – Staff

EIA No. S6	EIA Proposal	
	<p><b>Strategy Governance and Law: Communications</b></p> <p>The Communications Team provide advice to all councillors and staff on communications. From crafting engaging content, to project managing campaigns that help change behaviors, Brighton &amp; Hove City Council’s Communications Team provides a fully integrated service that covers marketing, public relations, film-making and copywriting; Internal communications; Media relations; Consultation and engagement, and Digital communications. The team are also responsible for emergency and crisis communications, supporting the council and the city in the immediate aftermath of a significant incident and in the recovery stages.</p> <p>In the Council’s budget proposals for 2021/2022 it is proposed that savings will be identified through a redesign of the service.</p>	
Groups potentially impacted	Impacts identified	Specific Mitigating Actions (in addition to the generic actions identified above)
<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>• Ethnicity</li> <li>• Sex</li> <li>• Sexual Orientation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Age:</b> Council targets for age have not yet been established. The age distribution of staff in the service follows a different pattern to the Council, where the Council’s highest proportion of staff are in the 50-54 age range. In the Communications team there is more of an even distribution across all age ranges, with 42% of staff aged under 45 years old.</p> <p><b>Disability:</b> The council and directorate are just below the disability target of 8%. The</p>	<p><b>Age:</b> No further actions required beyond the generic ones that apply across the board.</p> <p><b>Disability:</b> No further actions required beyond the generic ones that apply across the board.</p>

Communications service has no employees who have declared they have a disability. Disabled employees may be more likely to:

- Experience barriers to accessing information and getting their views heard.
- Suffer from a possible lack of employer awareness and information regarding disability.
- Experience barriers regarding technology and equipment required to perform their role.

Note: 16.67% of employee disability data is not known in the service. The analysis above is based on declared data only

**Ethnicity:**

The council is below the BME target of 9% and the directorate is just below target at 8.92%. The council and the directorate are below the White Other group target. The Communications service area employs below the average BME employees compared to the council and the directorate as a whole, with 4.55% staff identifying as BME, therefore proposals may further erode this group in the workforce. The service has no staff who identify as White Other 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.

**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.
3. Ensure all staff and managers have attended the mandatory Fair and Inclusive briefings

	<p>Note: 8.33% of the employee ethnicity data is not known in the service The analysis above is based on declared data only</p> <p><b>Sex:</b> The council and directorate are below the male employee target. The profile of male staff in this service is above that of the directorate but is still below target, with 39% of male staff, therefore proposals may further erode this group in the workforce.</p> <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 at 65%. Note: 20.83% of religion/belief employee data is not known in the service. Analysis above is based on declared data only</p> <p><b>Sexual orientation:</b> The council is above the LGBT employee target, whilst the directorate is just below target. The service area is also below target, with 9.52% of staff identifying as LGBT, therefore proposals may further erode this group in the workforce. LGBTQ employees may be more likely to suffer from a possible lack of employer awareness and information regarding LGBTQ issues. Note: 12.5% of employee sexual orientation data is not known in the service. Analysis above is based on declared data only.</p>	<p><b>Sex:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Providing managers with training on interview skills</li> </ol> <p><b>Religion &amp; Belief:</b> No further actions required beyond the generic ones that apply across the board.</p> <p><b>Sexual orientation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Providing skills interview training and internal coaching;</li> <li>2. Signposting staff to the LGBTQ Forum</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.

