

## Phase 1 equality impact assessment of electoral services budget savings proposals for 2011-2012

The savings proposals:

Area	Category	Heading	Brief Outline	Saving	Potential FTE Impact
Annual canvass	Efficiency		An optional third post-out of canvass forms scrapped	10,000	0.0
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>10,000</b>	<b>0.0</b>

The saving relates to an optional delivery mechanism for a statutory function and does not relate to direct service provision to Southwark residents.

## Assessment of budget savings proposals for 2013-2014

Further savings options have been put forward for future years based on the organisation as it exists now and the current savings requirements over 3 years. Both may be subject to review.

Area	Category	Heading	Brief Outline	Saving	Potential FTE Impact
Electoral registration	Efficiency		Confirmation of elector details	30,000	0.0

The introduction of individual electoral registration will result in changes in the way in which data is obtained and checked, and it may be the case that another efficiency saving will be identified and this process retained. An equalities impact assessment will need to be conducted as new procedures are introduced.

Fran Biggs  
January 2011

## Phase 1 equality impact assessment of democratic services budget savings proposals for 2011-2012

The savings proposals:

Area	Category	Heading	Brief Outline	Saving	Potential FTE Impact
Member Allowances	Efficiency	Reduced allowances	Members have reduced SRA, this will be reflected in the new base budget	77,000	0.0
Community Councils	Efficiency	Operational Efficiencies	Apply saving to departmental funding streams	8,000	0.0
Constitutional Support	Efficiency	Team Reconfiguration	Streamlining the discretionary decision making framework and non-statutory meeting structure	40,000	-1.0
Cross Service	Efficiency	Running Cost Efficiencies	Reduce recruitment advertising budget	9,000	0.0
Member Support	Efficiency	Reduce member support team	Reduce member support team to reflect new arrangements agreed with leaders	51,000	-2.0

Mayoral Services	Efficiency	Delete chauffeur post	To reflect changing service delivery	11,000	-0.5
Member Support	Efficiency	Delete service manager post	Implement a phased retirement by transferring manager to a part time post	21,000	-0.4
Head of Service	Efficiency	Delete HoS post	To reconfigure service delivery to enable the deletion of a post	86,000	-1.0
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>303,000</b>	<b>-4.9</b>

All of the savings relate to non-statutory functions and none relate to direct service provision to Southwark residents.

The SRA reductions have already been implemented as a result of a Council Assembly decision. This saving reconciles the budget with that decision and there are no further implications.

The chauffeur post deletion represents a formalisation of an earlier decision to outsource the service. The previous post holder retired and the post remained on the establishment only to ensure sufficient funding for the new contract.

The loss of nearly 5 posts directly affects two permanent members of staff but both are subject to mutually agreed flexible retirement arrangements. The remaining posts are currently vacant (2.5) or covered by a fixed term contract (1.0). Overall the savings reflect losses across the full spectrum of grades in the division rather than just on the lower paid. The retention of posts within member support, currently vacant, provides a number of opportunities for redeployees.

Current or last filled profile of deleted posts (filled posts shown in bold)

	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Disability</b>
Constitutional team	1	F	B	No
Member support	2	M	W	No
		M	W	No
Chauffeur	0.5	M	W	Yes
MS manager	0.4	<b>F</b>	<b>W</b>	<b>No</b>
HoS	1	<b>M</b>	<b>W</b>	<b>No</b>

1.4 F (29%), 3.5 M (71%)  
3.9-4.9 W (80-100%), 0-1 B (0-20%)

The savings proposals appear to affect white males to a greater extent but the numbers are so small that it would be difficult to influence a more balanced outcome. In addition all of the vacant posts were last filled by white males so the realistic impact on existing staff is much more neutral when this group is excluded. There are no implications for existing staff recorded as subject to DDA.

## Assessment of budget savings proposals for 2013-2014

Further savings options have been put forward for future years based on the organisation as it exists now and the current savings requirements over 3 years. Both may be subject to review.

Area	Category	Heading	Brief Outline	Saving	Potential FTE Impact
Cross Service	Service reduction	Reduced service provision	No support for non-statutory bodies, basic back office support for members ie no secretarial service	150,000	-3.0

Backbench councillors will be more adversely affected by the deletion of two posts in member support and this in turn may affect those constituents who seek their help. It is anticipated that members would make more use of systems such as i-casework and become more self-sufficient in their use of IT. Support for surgeries will continue.

Current or last filled profile of deleted posts (filled posts shown in bold)

	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Disability</b>
Constitutional team	1	<b>F</b>	<b>TBA (one of two contracts)</b>	<b>No</b>
Member support	2	M <b>F</b>	B <b>W (secondment)</b>	No <b>Yes</b>

2 F (66%), 1 M (33%)

1-2 W (33-66%), 1-2 B (33-66%)

Again due to the small numbers involved there is no particular imbalance between ethnic and gender groups. There are no implications for existing permanent staff recorded as subject to DDA. Although this saving proposal does impact on one employee recorded as disabled there are no divisional opportunities to offset this. Overall the saving does not disproportionately affect disabled staff.

Graham P Love

December 2010

## Phase 1 equality impact assessment of community engagement budget savings proposals for 2011-2012

1	Basic information
<p><b>What is being assessed?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Organisation?</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Department?</b></li> <li>○ Is it a new/existing service</li> <li>○ Is this a statutory or discretionary service?</li> <li>▪ <b>Service area/function?</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Budget proposal?</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Engagement Division, Communities, Law &amp; Governance Department, Southwark Council.</li> <li>• Existing Service</li> <li>• All savings proposals relate to discretionary services – the division as a whole is largely discretionary although makes a contribution to the council's duty to involve and has a role together with the Corporate Strategy in meeting equalities and human rights duties.</li> <li>• Deletion of Quality &amp; Performance Team, removal of one post in the Commissioning Team and reductions achieved through renegotiation of the legal advice contract.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aim, objectives and users of service/function</b></p>	<p>The community engagement division works to bring the council's services closer to the people it serves and to put local people at the heart of everything the council does.</p> <p>We provide professional expertise, guidance and support to all services across the Council, and to partner agencies in the statutory, voluntary and business sectors.</p> <p>Our key service users include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local residents</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members</li> <li>• Wide range of external partners through Southwark Alliance and its associated partnerships and forums</li> <li>• Internal partners</li> <li>• Voluntary and community sector forums, networks and organisations</li> </ul> <p>To meet these different customer needs, the Division:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides mechanisms to ensure the needs and views of residents and in particular excluded groups impact on policy development and implementation</li> <li>• Supports the work of Cabinet members and other council members to assist the Cabinet and others in their policy-making and executive functions</li> <li>• Works in conjunction with other council departments and services to secure a joined up approach within the Council by providing leadership and guidance to Council departments</li> <li>• Works in conjunction with other departments to enhance locality focused multi-agency working across the system</li> </ul>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**2 | Budget option detail**

<b>What is the proposed funding reduction?</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Heading</b>	<b>Brief Outline</b>	<b>Saving</b>	<b>Potential FTE Impact</b>
	Quality & Performance Team	Efficiency	Reallocate Q&P team duties	Reallocate team duties to existing areas of CE	170,000	-4.0
	Legal Advice Contract	Efficiency	Retendering of Legal Advice contract	Apply built in savings from recent retendering process	113,000	0.0
	Commissioning Team	Service Reduction	Delete Europe and Funding Officer Post	Delete a post within the VSC team	45,000	-1.0
					<b>328,000</b>	<b>-5.0</b>

<b>What will be the impact of the proposed funding reductions on (complete as applicable):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing council funded service.</li> <li>• All savings proposals relate to discretionary services. The division as a whole is largely discretionary although makes a contribution to the council's duty to involve and has a role together with the Corporate Strategy in meeting equalities and human rights duties.</li> <li>• As well as providing direct services to residents in terms of undertaking consultation and community engagement activities and in relation to grants and contracts to voluntary and community sector providers the division provides support to all council departments on community engagement.</li> <li>• The Quality &amp; Performance team and Commissioning team proposals do not relate to staff responsible for direct service provision to Southwark residents. The legal advice contract does relate to direct service provision to some of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged residents in the borough who access advice on a range of issues such as debt and housing. This saving has however been achieved with no reduction in level of service to residents the providers having made efficiencies in their back office functions.</li> <li>• The loss of posts directly affects three permanent members of staff. The</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Organisation?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is it wholly dependent on Council funding?</li> <li>○ What reserves does it have? (March 2010)</li> <li>○ Other funding known to be at risk?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Department?</b></li> <li>○ Is it a new/existing service</li> <li>○ Is this a statutory or discretionary service?</li> <li>▪ <b>Service area/function?</b></li> <li>○ Are there other internal services /external organisations offering a similar service/function ?</li> <li>▪ <b>Service users?</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Other services or departments in the Council that are considering budget reduction options?</b></li> </ul>	<p>remaining two posts that are proposed for deletion are currently vacant. Baseline assessment of the staffing proposal is attached as Appendix 1 and shows no significant impact in terms of ethnicity, disability or gender in relation to the proportions in the whole division. The proposals do appear to affect staff at lower grades to a greater extent but the numbers involved are so small that it would be difficult to influence a more balanced outcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Savings proposals compounded by loss of ABG/WNF funding of £1,401,000 as follows:</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="502 421 1560 1749"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Area</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Revenue Savings £</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Implications</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>South Bermondsey Partnership</td> <td style="text-align: right;">-362,000</td> <td>Will close the neighbourhood management partnership and cease all activity. Partnership was time limited (has had 7 years funding) and exit strategy has been produced. Big Lottery is putting investment into the area. Potential redundancy of 2 members of staff. Other staff were on short term contracts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Partnership Working support to CAS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">-42,000</td> <td>Removes support for CAS forums which provide mechanism for voluntary and community sector engaging with statutory agencies and working together.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capacity Building Consortium</td> <td style="text-align: right;">-280,000</td> <td>Removes funding for 4.5 voluntary sector posts at Cambridge House, CAS, PVSF, Blackfriars Settlement and Time &amp; Talents - the posts provide community capacity building/partnership support to small community organisations.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cease Support to External Forums</td> <td style="text-align: right;">-86,000</td> <td>Removes council support for Southwark Travellers Action Group and Refugee Communities Organisation. Could mean loss of 2 external posts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Removal of Neighbourhoods Team ABG</td> <td style="text-align: right;">-263,000</td> <td>Deletion of 3 posts in the neighbourhoods team (from a total of 9 FTE) and 50% reductions in budgets for promoting greater participation in community councils. Impact on delivery of Community Councils. Will involve redundancy costs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cease Support to Active Citizens Hub/Volunteer Centre Southwark</td> <td style="text-align: right;">-153,000</td> <td>The hub empowers people, to get involved in decision making and active in the community and encourages people to volunteer. Likely redundancy of at least 1 member of staff at Volunteer centre Southwark.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total ABG/WNF Reduction</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>-1,401,000</b></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Area	Revenue Savings £	Implications	South Bermondsey Partnership	-362,000	Will close the neighbourhood management partnership and cease all activity. Partnership was time limited (has had 7 years funding) and exit strategy has been produced. Big Lottery is putting investment into the area. Potential redundancy of 2 members of staff. Other staff were on short term contracts.	Partnership Working support to CAS	-42,000	Removes support for CAS forums which provide mechanism for voluntary and community sector engaging with statutory agencies and working together.	Capacity Building Consortium	-280,000	Removes funding for 4.5 voluntary sector posts at Cambridge House, CAS, PVSF, Blackfriars Settlement and Time & Talents - the posts provide community capacity building/partnership support to small community organisations.	Cease Support to External Forums	-86,000	Removes council support for Southwark Travellers Action Group and Refugee Communities Organisation. Could mean loss of 2 external posts.	Removal of Neighbourhoods Team ABG	-263,000	Deletion of 3 posts in the neighbourhoods team (from a total of 9 FTE) and 50% reductions in budgets for promoting greater participation in community councils. Impact on delivery of Community Councils. Will involve redundancy costs.	Cease Support to Active Citizens Hub/Volunteer Centre Southwark	-153,000	The hub empowers people, to get involved in decision making and active in the community and encourages people to volunteer. Likely redundancy of at least 1 member of staff at Volunteer centre Southwark.	<b>Total ABG/WNF Reduction</b>	<b>-1,401,000</b>	
Area	Revenue Savings £	Implications																							
South Bermondsey Partnership	-362,000	Will close the neighbourhood management partnership and cease all activity. Partnership was time limited (has had 7 years funding) and exit strategy has been produced. Big Lottery is putting investment into the area. Potential redundancy of 2 members of staff. Other staff were on short term contracts.																							
Partnership Working support to CAS	-42,000	Removes support for CAS forums which provide mechanism for voluntary and community sector engaging with statutory agencies and working together.																							
Capacity Building Consortium	-280,000	Removes funding for 4.5 voluntary sector posts at Cambridge House, CAS, PVSF, Blackfriars Settlement and Time & Talents - the posts provide community capacity building/partnership support to small community organisations.																							
Cease Support to External Forums	-86,000	Removes council support for Southwark Travellers Action Group and Refugee Communities Organisation. Could mean loss of 2 external posts.																							
Removal of Neighbourhoods Team ABG	-263,000	Deletion of 3 posts in the neighbourhoods team (from a total of 9 FTE) and 50% reductions in budgets for promoting greater participation in community councils. Impact on delivery of Community Councils. Will involve redundancy costs.																							
Cease Support to Active Citizens Hub/Volunteer Centre Southwark	-153,000	The hub empowers people, to get involved in decision making and active in the community and encourages people to volunteer. Likely redundancy of at least 1 member of staff at Volunteer centre Southwark.																							
<b>Total ABG/WNF Reduction</b>	<b>-1,401,000</b>																								

<b>3</b>	<b>Previous equalities impact assessment (EqIA)</b>
<b>Has this service/function previously been impact assessed?</b>	Yes in 2002, 2005 and then 2009.

<p><b>If yes, please summarise the findings/action plan of your current EqlA in relation to this service/function.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Did it identify any barriers preventing certain groups from benefiting fully from your service/function?</li> </ul>	<p>Demonstrated positive impacts but because of the dynamic nature of Southwark's population the need to work with new and emerging communities. Capacity to do this was addressed in the Community Engagement reorganisation at the end of 2009. All actions complete – these proposals will not impact on the agreed action plans with the exception of the potential impact of the reduction in ABG funding on broadening participation in Community Councils (in particular by young people, older people and ethnic minority communities).</p>
<p><b>If no, what other evidence is there regarding the impact (positive/negative) of the service on equality groups?</b></p>	

4	<b>Establishing Relevance</b>
---	-------------------------------

Indicate on the following grid whether the proposed funding reduction will have an adverse impact on communities related to each of the equality areas listed below. Where possible, address each equality strand in turn.

Will it contribute to inequality or have a negative impact on:

- **equal opportunities** i.e. will it benefit or disadvantage certain groups on the basis of the grounds listed below?<sup>1</sup>
- **the elimination of discrimination** i.e. will it have a disproportionate impact on any of the groups listed below?
- **promoting good relations** i.e. is there are risk that it will lead to worsening relations between members of different groups or exacerbate tensions between communities?

Indicate on the following grid whether the proposed funding reduction will have an adverse impact on communities related to each of the equality areas listed below. Where possible, address each equality strand in turn.

Will it contribute to inequality or have a negative impact on:

- **equal opportunities** i.e. will it benefit or disadvantage certain groups on the basis of the grounds listed below?<sup>2</sup>
- **the elimination of discrimination** i.e. will it have a disproportionate impact on any of the groups listed below?
- **promoting good relations** i.e. is there are risk that it will lead to worsening relations between members of different groups or exacerbate tensions between communities?

EQUALITY STRAND	MIGHT THERE BE AN ADVERSE IMPACT? Briefly explain why
<b>Race</b>	No. Please see Appendix 1 in relation to impact of staffing reductions.
<b>Gender</b>	No. Please see Appendix 1 in relation to impact of staffing

<sup>1</sup> Special consideration is also to be given to Gypsies and Travellers, refugees and asylum seekers and people living on low incomes.

<sup>2</sup> Special consideration is also to be given to Gypsies and Travellers, refugees and asylum seekers and people living on low incomes.

	reductions.
<b>Disability</b>	No. Please see Appendix 1 in relation to impact of staffing reductions.
<b>Religion/belief</b>	No
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No
<b>Age</b>	No
<b>Human Rights<sup>3</sup></b>	No
<b>Gender re-assignment<sup>4</sup></b>	No
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity<sup>5</sup></b>	No
<b>Gypsies and Travellers, refugees and asylum seekers</b>	<p>The guidance in the council's Equalities and Human Rights scheme (2008-2011), highlights the need to give special consideration to Gypsy and Traveller communities and refugees and asylum seekers.</p> <p>Previous EqlAs which have been conducted within the Community Engagement division have highlighted the need for us to work with new and emerging communities. We will continue to support and engage with these groups and endeavour to ensure they have an effective voice in policy making and service delivery in Southwark.</p> <p>However, due to the savings proposals concerning external forums – namely the Southwark Travellers Action Group (STAG) and the Refugee Forum – which have been necessitated by the withdrawal of WNF/ABG funding by central government, it has been identified that there may be a potential disproportionate impact on these groups. Both groups have been aware that the WNF support would cease at the end of this financial year for some time.</p> <p><b>STAG</b> The STAG provides essential social support to the Gypsy and Traveller community in Southwark around housing, access to education and other services. It also currently receives substantial financial support from the Irish government which may also be under threat due to austerity measures there.</p>

<sup>3</sup> The following two links provide useful guidance on the relevance of human rights generally, and specifically within the public sector: [www.justice.gov.uk/guidance/docs/human-rights-making-sense-human-rights.pdf](http://www.justice.gov.uk/guidance/docs/human-rights-making-sense-human-rights.pdf), [www.justice.gov.uk/guidance/docs/human-rights-handbook-for-public-authorities.pdf](http://www.justice.gov.uk/guidance/docs/human-rights-handbook-for-public-authorities.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> This strand or 'protected characteristic' is part of the new 2010 Equality Act and requires consideration

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

	<p>In light of the potential significant impact of savings proposals on service delivery and representation of Gypsy and Traveller communities if the STAG fell into financial difficulties, we propose to hold further talks with their management committee to identify shared ways to mitigate the impact of the proposed savings. We will update this impact assessment as and when further information is available.</p> <p><b>Refugee Forum</b>  The Refugee Forum is unique in providing essential support to refugees and asylum seekers in Southwark. They are currently funded through the WNF and are also recipients of a grant from the council's Community Grants Scheme. They have applied for further funding from this grant scheme for 2011-12 and have also been proactive in seeking alternative sources of funding.</p> <p>Once again, in light of the potential negative impact of savings proposals on service delivery and representation of refugees and asylum seekers, particularly if alternative sources of funding are not found, we propose to hold further talks with the Refugee Forum management committee to identify shared ways to mitigate the impact of the proposed savings. We will update this impact assessment as and when further information is available.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>5 Conclusion of Stage One: Screening</b>
<b>Please attach this EqIA to your budget option/s for presentation to Cabinet member</b>

<b>Assessment completed by:</b>	
Name & Division	Stephen Douglass, Head of Community Engagement
Date	31/12/10

<b>Cabinet Member:</b>	
Name	Councillor Abdul Mohamed
Date	



## Appendix 1

### Initial Equalities Impact of Staffing Reductions:

All of the savings relate to non-statutory functions. The quality & Performance team and Commissioning team proposals do not relate to staff responsible for direct service provision to Southwark residents. The legal advice contract does relate to direct service provision to some of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged residents in the borough who access advice on a range of issues such as debt and housing. This saving has however been achieved with no reduction in level of service to residents the providers having made efficiencies in their back office functions.

The loss of posts directly affects three permanent members of staff. The remaining two posts that are proposed for deletion are currently vacant. Overall the savings reflect losses across a range of grades in the division rather than just on the lower paid. The retention of posts elsewhere in the Council, currently vacant, should provide a number of opportunities for redeployees.

### Current profile of proposed deleted posts

	FTE	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability
Quality & Performance Team	1	F	Black African	No
	1	F	Black Caribbean	No
	2	Vacant		
Commissioning Team	1	F	White British	Yes
South Bermondsey Partnership	1	M	Black British	No
	1	M	White Other	No
	2	Vacant		

The current profile of the whole division is as follows:

FTE	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Grade	% of total
1	F	Asian Bangladeshi	0	9	7
1	M		0	12	
1	M	Asian Indian	1 M	14	3
2	F	Black African	0	9, 14	13
2	M		0	9, 10	
3	F	Black British	1 F	11, 12, 14	19
3	M		0	9, 10, 12	
2	F	Black Caribbean	0	5, 9	7
1	F	Black Other	0	10	3
2	F	Other Any Group	0	9, 12	7
6	M	White British	1 F	9, 10, 10, 12, 12,	31
4	F		0	16 9,10, 11, 12	
1	F	White Irish	0	14	7
1	M		0	11	
1	M	White Other	0	11	3

Post implementation of these proposals the profile of the division will be as follows:

FTE	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Grade	% of total
1	F	Asian Bangladeshi	0	9	8
1	M		0	12	

1	M	Asian Indian	1 M	14	4
1	M	Black African	0	10	8
1	F		0	14	
3	F	Black British	1 F	11, 12, 14	19
2	M		0	10, 12	
1	F	Black Caribbean	0	9	4
1	F	Black Other	0	10	4
2	F	Other Any Group	0	9, 12	8
6	M	White British	0	9, 10, 10, 12, 12,	33
3	F		0	16 10, 11, 12	
1	F	White Irish	0	14	8
1	M		0	11	
1	M	White Other	0	11	4

The % change in the profile is as follows:

Characteristic		Pre Implementation	Post Implementation
<b>Gender</b>	Female	48%	50%
	Male	52%	50%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	Asian Bangladeshi	7%	8%
	Asian Indian	3%	4%
	Black African	13%	8%
	Black British	19%	19%
	Black Caribbean	7%	4%
	Black Other	3%	4%
	Other Any Group	7%	8%
	White British	31%	33%
	White Irish	7%	8%
White Other	3%	4%	
<b>Disability</b>	Yes	11%	8%
	No	89%	92%
<b>Grade</b>	5	3%	0%
	9	26%	15%
	10	19%	19%
	11	13%	15%
	12	19%	15%
	14	13%	12%
	16	3%	4%

The savings proposals show no significant impact in terms of ethnicity, disability or gender in relation to the proportions in the whole division. The proposals do appear to affect staff at lower grades to a greater extent but the numbers involved are so small that it would be difficult to influence a more balanced outcome.

## Appendix 2

### Assessment of budget savings proposals for 2013-2014

Further savings options have been put forward for future years based on the organisation as it exists now and the current savings requirements over 3 years. All of these may be subject to review.

Area	Category	Heading	Brief Outline	Saving	Potential FTE Impact
Community Sector Support Grants Programme	Service Reduction	Phased reduction in size of grants programme	Refocus grants programme noting efficiency and effectiveness of grant awarded bodies. Applying the saving across all 33 organisations in the programme would threaten viability of all organisations - 20% reduction is equivalent to removing the grant to 7 organisations.	200,000	0.0
Commissioning Team	Service Reduction	Reducing Commissioning Officers Posts	Delete one commissioning officer post within the VSC team	45,000	-1.0
Neighbourhoods Team	Efficiency	Streamline community councils while maintaining localism	Democracy Commission phase 2 to consider savings. Proposal is linked to Community Council saving within Democratic Services	63,000	-1.0
				<b>308,000</b>	<b>-2.0</b>

In relation to the impact on staffing again due to the small numbers involved there is no particular imbalance between ethnic and gender groups. Reductions in the Community Sector Programme and the Neighbourhoods Team will need a full equalities impact assessment in 2011.

### Phase 1 equality impact assessment of Legal Services budget savings proposals for 2011-2012

The savings proposals:

Area	Category	Heading	Brief Outline	Saving	Potential FTE Impact
Housing	Efficiency	Reduce Housing Possessions Team.	Right size possessions team to reflect falling volumes.	85,000	-3.0

C&A	Efficiency	Rebalance workload between lawyers and legal assistants.	Ensure work is performed by the most appropriate member of the legal team.	90,000	0.0
Cross Service	Efficiency	Reduce training budget.	Reflect historic levels of training spend.	21,500	0.0
External Legal Expenditure	Efficiency	Reduce external legal expenditure.	Implement measure to procure external services more effectively. Legal to gate-keep process.	100,000	0.0
Property	Efficiency	Remove long standing vacant post.	To reflect new levels of service demand.	41,000	-1.0
Cross Service	Efficiency	Fundamental review of service delivery	Fundamental review of structures and working practices of legal teams.		
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>337,500</b>	<b>-4.0</b>

The reduction in the Housing Possessions Team is in response to a downturn in work following a decision by the Housing client to undertake this work themselves. At this stage, it is anticipated that there will be a reduction of 3 FTE positions. The staffing profile of the Housing Team is primarily women of African Caribbean descent and the proposal to reduce the size of the team is likely to have a disproportionate impact on that group. One member of staff is disabled. To minimise the impact of any reorganisation, staff have already been transferred to vacant posts within other sections of the department and offered training to undertake new roles. However, it is likely that it may not be possible to redeploy all affected staff to alternative full time positions within the service.

The reorganisation of the Housing Team will be conducted in accordance with the councils Reorganisation, Redeployment & Redundancy Procedure and will be subject to a further detailed EqIA.

The reorganisation of the Children & Adults Team has already been completed with no adverse impact on staff or reduction in posts.

### **Training Budget Reduction**

The reduction in the training budget will result in less funding being available to offer external training, however this budget has traditionally been under spent. The profile of the legal department is predominately women with the ethnic split of 45% Black, 45% White, 6% Asian and 4% other, two members of staff are disabled. There is the possibility that women and disabled staff could be disproportionately affected by the reduction in the budget as access to training funds are reduced.

To manage the impact of this, the department have developed their own in-house training plan which will provide all Lawyers access to accredited training. In addition, following negotiations with our External Panel Solicitors, they have agreed to continue to provide free training to all lawyers within the service. For these reasons, the impact of the reduction of the budget will not have a disproportionate impact on any group within the service.

### **Reduction in the External legal spend**

There are no equalities issues arising from the reduction in the external legal spend.

### **Property Team**

This savings proposal involves the deletion of this post. This post has been vacant for some considerable time and there is currently insufficient work within the team to justify maintaining the post on the structure

### **Cross Service Efficiency**

This savings proposal takes place in 2012/13 and 2013/2014; it involves a reorganisation of Legal Services to achieve £600k savings. This reorganisation will be conducted in accordance with the councils Reorganisation, Redeployment & Redundancy Procedure and be subject to a further EIA.

	Black	White	Asian	Other	Total
Male					19%
Female					81%
Totals	<b>45%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Doreen Forrester-Brown**  
**Head of Legal Services**  
**7 January 2011**