

CABINET

27 JANUARY 2011

BUDGET SAVINGS - PROPOSED STAFFING REDUCTIONS

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Alan Jarrett, Deputy Leader

Report from: Tricia Palmer- Assistant Director, Organisational Services

Summary

This report considers the Council's reduction in funding from 31 March 2011 and seeks authorisation to commence formal consultation with staff on the proposed changes.

1. Budget and Policy Framework

- 1.1 Service policy implications are a matter for Cabinet.
- 1.2 Employment matters are a Council side function.
- 1.3 The Cabinet is asked to consider this matter as urgent and not subject to call-in. In line with rule 16.11 of Chapter 4, Part 5 of the Constitution, call-in can be waived where any delay likely to be caused by the call-in process would seriously prejudice the Council's or the Public's interests. To ensure that the consultation process can end in early March, and enable the consideration and determination of the outcome of consultations it is essential that the consultation process commences at the beginning of February. This will enable the Council to maximise the level of savings for the following financial year. It is for this reason that call-in be waived. The Chairman of the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee has agreed to waive call in on this report on the basis that this matter is reasonable in all the circumstances and to it being treated as a matter of urgency in accordance with Rule 16.11 of the Overview and Scrutiny Rules (Part 5 of Chapter 4 in the Constitution).

2. Background

- 2.1 On 20 October 2010 the results of the government's Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) were announced together with the proposed changes to central government spending over the next 4 years. This was followed by the provisional local government settlement on 13 December 2010, which led the Council into identifying a funding gap of £23.5m for the financial year

2011/12. This funding gap was noted by Cabinet on 21 December 2010 and Members instructed Directors to commence formal consultation with staff in respect of the financial implications of the settlement.

- 2.2 Staff consultations have already commenced where the reorganisations and reductions are within the Directors' delegated powers. However there are a number of posts affected by the budget reductions, which are not within the Directors' delegations. These are posts which could have significant service or policy implications and this report outlines the impact of proposed changes and seeks Cabinet's approval to commence consultations.

3. Proposals - Children and Adults

- 3.1 **School Improvement Service** - Two factors make a restructuring of the school improvement service essential and unavoidable:

(i) The Schools White Paper 'The Importance of Teaching', published November 2010, proposes a number of radical changes to school provision and to local authority roles and responsibilities in relation to schools. In particular, the White Paper has important implications for school improvement and the local authority's involvement in this work. This includes the removal by the end of March 2011 of much of the infrastructure and external grant funding which currently supports school improvement. For example, School Improvement Partners (SIPs) will no longer be required. However, although the Local Authority role is changing it retains a crucial mandate to challenge, support and monitor schools which are under performing and do not have the capacity to self improve.

(ii) As part of the 25 per cent (approximately) reduction of central government grant to local government over the next four years, from April 2011, Medway will lose nearly £5 million (£4,930,000) of external grant funding previously targeted on school improvement. This reduction added to cuts in the Medway base budget has resulted in a significant reduction in the funding available to support school improvement.

- 3.2 As a result of these factors local authority funds for school improvement will in the future have to be focused on schools causing concern, because they are under-performing. Beyond that, schools will have greater choice about which school improvement services they use and they will be free to buy this provision on an open market.

- 3.3 Local authorities will be commissioners and trading services if they want to be in the school improvement market, but an unknown factor at this stage is what will be the response of schools. How willing will schools be to buy school improvement, and what will be the scope and value of schools' choices i.e. how much funding of the schools' budget will governing bodies earmark for school improvement? The answers to these questions impact significantly on how the Local Authority should plan for the future and the restructuring of the service, but they are as yet unknown. This makes it very difficult to design a new service. Nevertheless we have started on this work and are currently surveying schools and governing bodies to identify the services that schools are likely to buy. Medway Council will want to be part of the schools

improvement market and this means buying in individuals and their particular skills. It is likely that in future Medway's service will have a local authority core to support schools which need it and a traded services arm.

3.4 At present there are 35 posts in the School Improvement Service in advisory type work plus 25 administrative and support posts. It is proposed that all members of the School Improvement Service be placed 'at risk' while we scope what our school improvement needs will be from April 2011 and construct a new structure to address those needs. Also that all administrative and support staff are placed at risk so that a support function proportionate to the new scope and function of a restructured school improvement function can be put in place.

3.5 A draft outline structure is proposed, to be effective from April 2011, and consists of the following features:

A Challenge and Performance Unit: this will be fully funded by the council and will provide challenge to schools which are at risk of performing below the new floor standards (currently 20 primaries, 4 secondary schools) plus those schools judged by Ofsted to be in a category, plus schools judged by the local authority of being at risk of either of the former. Staffing needs estimated at 10 FTEs plus 2 FTE admin support staff

A Commissioning and Traded Services Unit: this unit will be the commercial traded services arm of the council. It will sell school improvement to schools and the initial offer in terms of breadth will be informed by the survey of schools currently taking place. This unit includes governor services. This unit will be partly funded by the council in its first year of operation but each member of the unit will have to deliver on set targets for fee income and make up the remainder of costs. Staffing needs estimated at 6 FTEs plus 1.5 FTE admin support staff

The 2 units will be managed separately in order to maintain integrity between the challenge role and the support and traded services role.

4. Proposals - Regeneration, Community and Culture

4.1 Safer Communities

Safer Communities currently comprises the following functions:

- Environmental Health, except private rented sector enforcement
- Trading Standards
- Community Team
- Pest Control and Depot Services
- CCTV and Telehealthcare
- Community Safety Partnership coordination

These discharge most, of the council's statutory enforcement responsibilities. Although there is communication between the functions, they are currently managed so that there is some duplication of effort and poor alignment of

operational work. They are over reliant on paper-based systems and do not effectively utilise mobile working solutions. Consequently they are not making best use of technology and are often inputting the same data more than once, and not making best use of intelligence to prioritise and resource work. Staff are professionally qualified and able to cover all enforcement activity, but currently only within a single sphere of operation. The service could improve and enforcement activity become more effective if there was greater flexibility across professional teams.

4.2 **Proposal** - The proposal for the safer communities service is to concentrate on core regulatory activity around three main themes:

- Securing compliance in the commercial sector through: business compliance assessment; a tougher common enforcement strategy for non-compliant businesses; self assessment for low risk businesses; and business support services for compliance improvement. This would free up specialist resources to spend more time dealing with the worst businesses needing improvement by developing a lower cost service to carry out cross cutting business compliance audits.
- Putting together services which regulate the environment and deal with envirocrimes, and engaging with the community and ward members to keep Medway clean, green and safe.
- More effective coordination of partnership activities through better use of data analysis to drive the work of the commercial and public realm teams and to ensure that the partnership delivers the priorities in the Community Safety Plan.

These changes will be a first step towards delivering a scalable service that can be developed across professional boundaries.

There will be an inevitable reduction in management and other staffing numbers to meet financial reduction targets of £228,000 for 2011/12. It is anticipated that this will result in the deletion of approximately six posts.

4.3 **Conservation Service – Proposal**

The Urban Design and Conservation Team (within the Planning, Policy and Design service) provides a range of statutory and discretionary services covering listed buildings and conservation areas, urban and landscape design. In reviewing how the team can achieve its saving target for 2011/12 and best discharge its core functions it is proposed that the post of Senior Conservation Officer should be deleted.

4.4 It is recognised that the deletion of this post will reduce capacity within the team. It is proposed that the core work associated with this post will transfer to the Design & Conservation Manager and the Assistant Conservation Officer. This will allow necessary savings to be achieved whilst maintaining a core statutory conservation service.

4.5 Tourism and Heritage Service - Proposal

The Tourism team (within the Tourism and Heritage service) enables the Council to provide strategic leadership of tourism in Medway and to market Medway as a tourist destination. It also operates a visitor information centre in Rochester High Street, two piers and one coach park and works with Tourism South East and Visit Kent to develop the tourism industry in the area. In reviewing how the team can achieve its saving target for 2011/12 it is proposed that the post of Tourism and Heritage Manager be deleted. The current post holder has accepted a new job outside the Council.

- 4.6 It is recognised that the deletion of this post will allow Medway to contribute to provide an effective tourism service, but on a smaller scale. It is proposed that the core work associated with this post will transfer to the Economic Development and Social Regeneration Manager and to others in the tourism team.

4.7 Tree Team – Proposal

The Tree Team is a team of 5.5 posts within Greenspaces. It discharges the Council's legal obligations for tree management through the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, Highways Act 1980 and Occupiers Liability Acts 1957 and 1984.

Specific responsibilities of the Tree Team are:

- Client management of the tree maintenance contract through contract monitoring, financial control and customer enquiries
 - Planning liaison on development management applications, discharging of planning conditions and developer liaison on significant regeneration projects
 - Management of Insurance Claims, High Hedge applications and Tree Preservation Orders.
- 4.8 Due to the anticipated reduction in major planning support work around development management applications, developer liaison and discharging of planning conditions, and the increasing ability of the Development Team to address tree issues, it is proposed that this work will be delivered through a call-off contract using specialist consultants as and when required. The costs of this new management arrangement will be met from fee recharging. Strict adherence to the adopted Tree Management Policy will reduce the requirement for specialist input into the Tree Team's activity, and the Better for Less PWC programme will be presenting options around service delivery, potentially resulting in less customer contact within service directorate teams. The current Greenspaces structure has significant contract delivery of service under the Operations Team; it is therefore proposed to group all contractual activity within that team and the line management of the Tree Team will be undertaken by the Greenspace Operations Manager. The impact of the Tree Team restructure will be the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer that line manages the Tree Team and is the Council's Senior Tree Officer. The annual saving will be £55,000. To maximise performance, there will need to be

investment in systems to provide mobile working solutions and facilitate data flows between systems without the need for repeat data entry.

5. Proposals – Business Support

5.1 Democratic Services/Members Services Proposals

There are currently seven PO2 posts in Democratic Services supporting Council, Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Committees and in-depth reviews, regulatory Committees and a range of other member level and statutory decision-making bodies such as school admission appeals. The proposal is that this team will be reduced by one post, which equates to a reduction in capacity of approximately 216 FTE days in a full year.

Subject to the outcome of the consultation, it is therefore proposed to construct a meetings timetable for 2011/12 for approval at the Annual Council meeting based on a reduction in the frequency of Council, Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny Committees and to restrict the level of in depth scrutiny work as set out below:

Proposal	Reduction in number of meetings where relevant
Reduce from 8 to 6 Council meetings	2
Reduce from 16 to 12 Cabinet/Cabinet Briefings	8
Reduce from 8 to 6 meetings of each Overview and Scrutiny Committee	8
Restrict Overview and Scrutiny to 3 task groups or themed meetings in total per year - see note 1 below	(previously between 4 and 6 Task Groups or themed meeting a year)
Reduce number of International Relations Committee meetings from 4 to 2	2

Note 1: This would be reviewed towards the end of 2011 as it may be possible to reinstate a higher level of in depth review work should the Localism Bill become law with a consequential reduction in work associated with the Standards regime. However the Council may chose to retain a Standards Committee with local procedures for dealing with complaints about member conduct. The impact of the Health and Social Care Bill on the work of Democratic Services is also as yet unknown. The Bill is likely to propose the establishment of a new statutory committee of the Council (The Health and

Wellbeing Board) and a strengthened role for health overview and scrutiny. Legislation creating wider scope for referendums on local issues and the organisation of elections for Police and Crime Commissioners will also create additional work for all staff in Democratic Services if it is enacted.

This proposed reduction in the volume of meetings can be achieved with one change to the Council's Constitution, which says that Overview and Scrutiny Committees will meet at least 8 times a year. The Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee already has responsibility for providing guidance on priorities for scrutiny activity and will be able to express a view on the future work programming of in depth review work in recognition of reduced staffing capacity in Democratic Services.

Budget and performance monitoring reports will have to be re-programmed in light of these changes to the frequency of meetings.

5.2 Democratic Services/Member Services Support Officer

The introduction of a new and integrated decision-management system during 2010 has resulted in more efficient working within Democratic Services and it is considered that with some redesign of systems and processes the work undertaken by these 3.5 post holders could be managed if 1.5 posts were to be deleted. However Members may experience some delays in handling their enquiries and correspondence with a reduced level of staffing.

5.3 Empty Homes and Energy Efficiency Team Proposal

This is a dedicated team of 3 FTE posts located within the Private Sector Housing Service, and has been working to bring empty properties back into use and to provide energy efficiency advice to households. The team had administered financial assistance to owners to help bring properties back into use, which is no longer available. Whilst legal duties remain in terms of making properties secure, work to provide advice and assistance is discretionary and officers propose that these be reduced. Increased activity by government and energy companies in promoting energy efficiency has removed the need for a dedicated team for these roles.

It is therefore proposed that following posts of Empty Homes and Efficiency Team Leader, B2 and 2x Vacant FTE Empty Homes and Energy Efficiency Officers, C2, be deleted.

6. Next steps

- 6.1 It is anticipated that many of these proposals will result in compulsory redundancies albeit the option of redeployment will be pursued in the first instance. A summary of the posts affected is shown at Appendix 1. Staff affected will have been informed in advance of the Cabinet meeting and if Cabinet agrees the recommendations, then the formal consultation period will start at the beginning of February 2011. An outline timetable is shown at Appendix 2. Clearly at this stage it is difficult to predict the actual number of redundancies and associated costs. The actual number of redundancies

together with their costs will be reported to the Employment Matters Committee.

7. Diversity Impact Assessment

- 7.1 The Council has a duty in relation to race, gender and disability equality in service provision. It must assess whether any proposed changes have a disproportionately negative effect on people within these areas, which as a result may be contrary to these statutory obligations.
- 7.2 A diversity impact assessment screening exercise has been carried out for these proposals and they are attached at Appendix 2. The impact will be monitored closely to ensure that any unidentified and unintended negative impact is recognised and responded to. The diversity impact assessment for the School Improvement Service will follow shortly.

8. Financial, Risk and legal implications

- 8.1 The financial implications are summarised in the body of the report and the proposed savings are shown at Appendix 1.
- 8.2 Any possible redundancies are subject to consultation with employees and trade unions and it is intended that there will be a 30 day consultation period on these proposals. Officers' delegated authority only applies to reorganisations where there are no significant service or policy implications and therefore Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council that delegated authority is given to the Directors and Chief Executive to consider any alternative proposals presented by employees and the trade unions and implement any subsequent restructure. The process of redundancies will be in accordance with the Council's organisational change policy and procedure.
- 8.3 Any reduction in staffing inevitably has a risk attached to it. Each service has carefully considered the impact of the proposed changes both on services staffing. Any proposed mitigating action is contained in the body of the report, and clearly the consultation period will allow further time to consider this further. Diversity impact assessments have been completed for each service, and strenuous efforts have been made to protect services as far as possible. The main area of concern is the Schools Improvement Service where the grant has been cut and the reduction in resources is significant. It will be important to ensure in the design of the new service that minority groups continue to be appropriately supported especially as much of the service will be dependent on but back from schools. Diversity Impact Assessments will be carried for staff once the impact on individuals is known. However, to protect employees as much as possible many services have identified the deletion of vacancies as the first option. Every effort will be made to redeploy staff and ensure that vital skills remain within the organisation.

9. Recommendations

- 9.1 That Cabinet authorises the Chief Executive and Directors to undertake consultation with staff and trade unions on these proposals.
- 9.2 The Cabinet is asked to agree that the above decision is considered urgent and therefore should not be subject to call-in.
- 9.3 The Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council to authorise the Chief Executive and Directors to consider and determine all consultation responses received in respect of the affected posts and implement any subsequent restructure.
- 9.4 The Cabinet is asked to recommend to the Council a programme of meetings to reflect the proposals as outlined in paragraph 5.1 in the report.

10. Suggested reasons for decision

- 10.1 To respond to the reduction in funding from April 2011.

Lead officer contact

Tricia Palmer – Assistant director, Organisational Services

Background papers

None

Posts affected by saving proposals

Service	Posts affected	Saving 2011/12 (£K)	Posts at risk
Learning and Achievement	Reorganise School Improvement Service	500 (dependant on grant - to be confirmed)	60 (a residual function will remain with approx.20 posts)
Safer Communities	Integrate Enforcement teams	228	6
Conservation Service	Delete Senior Conservation Officer	55	1
Tourism	Service Manager	55	1 (resigned)
Greenspaces	Tree Manager	50	1
Democratic Services	All staff in Democratic Services and 1 Members Services Officer (Temp)	92	2
Strategic Housing Services	Empty Homes and Efficiency Team Leader , B2 and 2x FTE Empty Homes and Energy Efficiency Officers, C2	90	1 occupied and 2 vacant.

**PROPOSED TIMETABLE
WHERE POSTS ARE PROPOSED AS CEASING**

ACTION	DUE DATE	ACTIONED BY
Share proposals informally with staff	18/19 January 2011	Manager
Early Consultation with Trade Unions	19 January 2011	AD (Organisational Services)
Report to Cabinet to consider service policy implications and agree proposal to consult	27 January 2011	AD (Organisational Services)
Consultation meeting with Trade Unions and staff	2 February 2011	Manager/HR
Invite Next Steps and Job Centre Plus to devise redeployment support programme	January/ February 2011	Manager/HR
Issue formal 30 day consultation letter to trade unions and staff to inform them of proposals.	3 February 2011	Manager / HR
Hold 1:1 meetings with staff directly affected. Complete before end of consultation period.	February 2011	Manager
Report to Council seeking delegation of responsibility to consider outcome of consultations to Director	24 February 2011	AD (Organisational Services)
End of formal consultation process with staff and trade unions. Final date for comments or counter proposals.	6 March 2011	Staff/Trade Unions
Meet to discuss consultation responses and prepare written responses	w/c 7 March 2011	Manager
Provide written responses to employees and trade unions as part of counter proposals	By 11 March 2011	Manager
Organise the redeployment support programme	February/ March 2011	Manager/HR
Prepare and issue redundancy notices. Issue redeployment letters and add staff to re-deployment register.	21 March 2011	Manager/HR
Lodge any appeals against redundancy within 10 working days of notice letter being received	4/5 April 2011	Staff
Respond to any appeals against redundancy and confirm the panel and dates for the hearing.	Mid/end April 2011	Manager / HR
Implementation Date	When notice expires	

NB . Please note dates referred to in this timetable should be used as a guide only and may be subject to change/ updates.

**PROPOSED TIMETABLE
WHERE THERE IS A DIMINUTION IN POSTS**

ACTION	DUE DATE	ACTIONED BY
Share proposals informally with staff	18/19 January 2011	Manager
Early Consultation with Trade Unions	19 January 2011	AD (Organisational Services)
Report to Cabinet to consider service policy implications and agree proposal to consult	27 January 2011	AD (Organisational Services)
Consultation meeting with Trade Unions and staff	2 February 2011	Manager/HR
Prepare job profiles to share with staff for benchmarking or grading	January 2011	Manager / HR
Invite Next Steps and Job Centre Plus to devise redeployment support programme	January/ February 2011	Manager/HR
Issue formal 30 day consultation letter to trade unions and staff to inform them of proposals, structure charts and job profiles if available.	3 February 2011	Manager / HR
Hold 1:1 meetings with staff directly affected. Complete before end of consultation period.	February 2011	Manager
Draft selection redundancy criteria for posts where reduction in number	January/ February 2011	Manager/HR
Share redundancy selection criteria to affected staff and trade unions for comment as part of consultation	Early February 2011	Manager/HR
Report to Council seeking delegation of responsibility to consider outcome of consultations to Director	24 February 2011	AD (Organisational Services)
End of formal consultation process with staff and trade unions. Final date for comments or counter proposals.	6 March 2011	Staff/Trade Unions
Meet to discuss consultation responses and prepare written responses	w/c 7 March 2011	Manager
Provide written responses to employees and trade unions as part of counter proposals	By 11 March 2011	Manager
Organise the redeployment support programme	February/ March 2011	Manager/HR
Write to staff confirming whether their post slots or not	w/c 14 March 2011	Manager/HR
Invite staff who are directly affected to apply for vacancies	w/c 14 March 2011	Manager/HR
Date for receipt of completed applications	w/c 28 March 2011	Manager/HR
Interviews to be held	w/c 4 April 2011	Manager/HR

Prepare and issue redundancy notices if appropriate. Issue redeployment letters and add staff to re-deployment register.	By end April 2011	Manager/HR
Lodge any appeals against redundancy within 10 working days of notice letter being received	By Mid May 2011	Staff
Respond to any appeals against redundancy and confirm the panel and dates for the hearing.	By End May 2011	Manager / HR
Implementation Date	1 June 2011	

NB . Please note dates referred to in this timetable should be used as a guide only and may be subject to change/ updates.

Diversity Impact Assessment: Screening Form

Directorate	Name of Function or Policy or Major Service Change	
RCC	Review of Tree Team reporting structure	
Officer responsible for assessment	Date of assessment	New or existing?
Simon Swift	18 January 2011	New
Defining what is being assessed		
1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives	<p>Greenspace Services forms part of the Leisure & Culture Division within the Regeneration, Culture & Community Directorate (RCC) and are responsible for the management and development of Medway's Greenspace Estate. This DIA relates to the Tree Team which undertake the Council's legal obligations for Tree Management through the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, Highways Act 1980 and Occupiers Liability Acts 1957 and 1984.</p> <p>A review of the way the service is delivered, service expectations through the Planning System and the Better for Less Programme has led to changes in reporting structures. As such the Principal Tree Officer post is no longer required.</p> <p>The budget reductions announced by the Government require changes to the budgets agreed by Council to avert an over spend occurring and bring the planned expenditure for the Council back in line with the funding available. As such it is proposed to delete the Principal Tree Office post from the establishment structure</p> <p>This Diversity Impact Assessment reviews the impact of this action.</p>	
2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?	Savings are intended to be achieved in a way that ensures financial sustainability whilst not disproportionately impacting on unfairly disadvantage any sections of the Council, its residents or businesses.	
3. What outcomes are wanted?	The removal of the Principal Tree Officer post will be undertaken in a way that does not disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage, any sections of the Council, its residents or businesses.	
4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Contribute Consultation	Detract Consultation doesn't take place.
5. Who are the main	Medway Council, its residents, customers,	

stakeholders?	businesses and partner organisations.	
6. Who implements this and who is responsible?	Simon Swift – Head of Greenspace Services	
Assessing impact		
7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial/ethnic groups</i> ?	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	<p>A review of the way the service is delivered, service expectations through the Planning System and the Better for Less Programme has led to changes in reporting structures. As such the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer will not affect service provision.</p> <p>It is not envisaged that the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer post will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage race/ethnic groups relative to services provided by the Tree Team.</p>	
8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i> ?	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	As per comments above.	
9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i> ?	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	As per comments above.	
10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i> ?	NO	It is not envisaged that the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer post will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to their sexual orientation relative to services provided by the Tree Team
What evidence exists for this?	<p>A review of the way the service is delivered, service expectations through the Planning System and the Better for Less Programme has led to changes in reporting structures. As such the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer will not affect service provision.</p>	
11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>religion or belief</i> ?	NO	It is not envisaged that the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer post will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to their religion or beliefs relative to services provided by the Tree Team


What evidence exists for this?	A review of the way the service is delivered, service expectations through the Planning System and the Better for Less Programme has led to changes in reporting structures. As such the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer will not affect service provision.	
12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's age?	NO	It is not envisaged that the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer post will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to their age relative to services provided by the Tree Team
What evidence exists for this?	A review of the way the service is delivered, service expectations through the Planning System and the Better for Less Programme has led to changes in reporting structures. As such the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer will not affect service provision.	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being trans-gendered or transsexual</i>?	NO	It is not envisaged that the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer post will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to being trans-gendered or transsexual relative to services provided by the Tree Team
What evidence exists for this?	A review of the way the service is delivered, service expectations through the Planning System and the Better for Less Programme has led to changes in reporting structures. As such the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer will not affect service provision.	
14. Are there any <i>other</i> groups that would find it difficult to access/make use of the function (e.g. speakers of other languages; people with caring responsibilities or dependants; those with an offending past; or people living in rural areas)?	No	It is not envisaged that the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer post will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage groups that may fall into this category relative to services provided by the Tree Team
What evidence exists for this?	A review of the way the service is delivered, service expectations through the Planning System and the Better for Less Programme has led to changes in reporting structures. As such the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer will not affect service provision.	
15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (e.g. disability <u>and</u> age)?	No	It is not envisaged that the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer post will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage groups that may fall into this category relative to services provided by the Tree Team
What evidence exists for this?	A review of the way the service is delivered, service expectations through the Planning System and the Better for Less Programme has led to changes in reporting structures. As such the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer will not affect service provision.	

Conclusions & recommendation		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?		Not relative to the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer post for reasons detailed above
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?		N/A

Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?	
NO	<p align="center">It is not envisaged that the deletion of the Principal Tree Officer post will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage any of the groups in the categories mentioned above relative to the Tree Team Service</p>

Action plan to make Minor modifications		
Outcome	Actions (with date of completion)	Officer responsible

Planning ahead: Reminders for the next review	
Date of next review	
Areas to check at next review (e.g. new census information, new legislation due)	
Is there <i>another</i> group (e.g. new communities) that is relevant and ought to be considered next time?	

Signed (completing officer/service manager) 	Date	18 January 2011
Signed (service manager/Assistant Director)	Date	

NB: Remember to list the evidence (i.e. documents and data

Directorate	Business Support Directorate	
Business Support Department	Democratic Services and Members Services	
Officers responsible for assessment Julie Keith Head of Democratic Services/Jane Ringham Head of Members Services and Elections	Date of assessment 18 January 2011	New or existing? Existing
Defining what is being assessed		
1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives	<p>Purpose: To restructure the Democratic Services and Members Services Teams to respond to the extreme financial constraints facing the Council and reduce the expenditure of these two teams;</p> <p>Objectives: To undertake the restructure in a way which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has minimal service implications in priority areas of work; • manages the increase of work in particular areas in the most cost effective manner; • utilizes the staffing resource in the most efficient manner • ensures consistency of support for Members. 	
2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?	<p>The benefit is to the council and taxpayer by reducing revenue costs and redeploying the resources of the Democratic Services and Members Services Teams in priority areas of work.</p> <p>Savings are intended to be achieved in a way that ensures financial sustainability whilst not disproportionately impacting on or unfairly disadvantaging sections of the community and specific staff groups. This will underpin the ongoing work by officers to deliver the savings.</p>	
3. What outcomes are wanted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue savings • Streamlined & effective support for the formal decision-making processes of the Council and elected members 	
4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	<p>Contribute</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication with, engagement and commitment of staff and management to ensure an effective and efficient service. • Management commitment 	<p>Detract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resistance to change • Timescales • Potential staff redundancies • Reduced level of service
5. Who are the main stakeholders?	<p>Employees</p> <p>Members of the public affected by Council decisions</p> <p>Elected Members</p>	


6. Who implements this and who is responsible?	Assistant Director (Customer First, Leisure, Culture Democracy and Governance)/Head of Democratic Services/Head of Members Services and Elections
---	---

Assessing impact	
7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>ethnicity/ racial groups</i>?	YES
	NO
What evidence exists for this?	<p>All the staff affected by this restructuring proposal are white British. As all staff are of the same ethnicity/ racial group, then there is no choice over impacts on that group.</p> <p>The service impact of the proposed restructuring represents a small reduction in the frequency of meetings but not the scope of support provided to elected members and the public in relation to participation in decision-making. In fact recent legislative change has extended the scope for all groups to participate eg e-petitioning, Councillor Call for Action.</p> <p>The capacity to support in depth scrutiny reviews will be diminished but this should not impact on any one particular group over another.</p>
8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?	YES
	NO
What evidence exists for this?	<p>There are currently no staff in Democratic Services or Members Services with a disability.</p> <p>The service impact of the proposed restructuring represents a small reduction in the frequency of meetings but not the scope of support provided to elected members and the public in relation to participation in decision-making</p> <p>In fact recent legislative change has extended the scope for all groups to participate eg e-petitioning, Councillor Call for Action.</p> <p>The capacity to support in depth scrutiny reviews will be diminished but this should not impact on any one particular group over another</p>
9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?	YES
	NO
What evidence exists for this?	<p>Of the 10 staff affected 3 are male. Proportionately therefore there are slightly more female employees at risk of redundancy, but it is not considered that this demonstrates a differential impact due to gender as it</p>

	<p>is unlikely that there would not be this level of differentiation in favour of one gender given the number of posts involved.</p> <p>The service impact of the proposed restructuring represents a small reduction in the frequency of meetings but not the scope of support provided to elected members and the public in relation to participation in decision-making.</p> <p>In fact recent legislative change has extended the scope for all groups to participate eg e-petitioning, Councillor Call for Action.</p> <p>The capacity to support in depth scrutiny reviews will be diminished but this should not impact on any one particular group over another</p>	
10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i> ?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	There is no evidence available. Monitoring of sexual orientation has been identified as an issue requiring a corporate approach and is being considered by the Council's Equalities and Core Value Group	
11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>religion/belief</i> ?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	There is no evidence to suggest that there will be a detrimental impact on particular employees or other stakeholders as a consequence their religion or belief.	
12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>age</i> ?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	There is no evidence to suggest that there will be a detrimental impact on particular employees or other stakeholders as a consequence their age.	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being transgendered or transsexual</i> ?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	There is no evidence available. Monitoring of sexual orientation has been identified as an issue requiring a corporate approach and is being considered by the Council's Equalities and Core Value Group	
14. Are there any <i>other groups</i> that would find it difficult to access/make use of services, or who might experience unfavourable	YES	

treatment, as a result of the change (eg people with caring responsibilities or dependants, those with an offending past, or people living in rural areas)?	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	The service impact is offset by recent innovations to encourage access to decision-making and members of the Council eg e-petitioning, councillor call for action. The capacity to support in depth scrutiny reviews will be diminished but this should not impact on any one particular group over another	
15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (eg disability and age)?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	The service impact is offset by recent innovations to encourage access to decision-making and members of the Council eg e-petitioning, councillor call for action. The capacity to support in depth scrutiny reviews will be diminished but this should not impact on any one particular group over another	
Conclusions & recommendations		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?	YES	
	NO	
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?	YES	
	NO	N/A

Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?	
NO	This service change complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case.
YES	
Planning ahead: Reminders for the next review	
Date of next review	
Areas to check at next review (eg new census information, new legislation due)	

<p>Is there <i>another group</i> (eg new communities) that is relevant and ought to be considered next time?</p>			
<p>Signed (completing officer/service manager)</p>	<p>Date</p>		
<p> Signed (Assistant Director)</p>	<p>Date</p>		

Related documents

Directorate RCC	Name of Function or Policy or Major Service Change Review of Safer Communities		
Officer responsible for assessment Tim England Head of Safer Communities	Date of assessment 17 January 2011	New or existing? New	
Defining what is being assessed			
1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives	<p>This diversity impact assessment reviews the impact of a proposed restructure of the Safer Communities service to realise efficiencies and improve effectiveness.</p> <p>The Safer Communities Service discharges Medway Council's statutory enforcement responsibilities for legislation that regulates commerce in relation to food safety, occupational health and safety at work and trading standards as well as environmental protection legislation designed to secure public health.</p> <p>The service is responsible for managing the Community Safety Partnership (CSP). The authority is required to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder, anti-social behaviour, substance misuse and reduce reoffending in the area. Local authorities have a statutory duty to work with other local agencies and organisations to develop and implement strategies to tackle crime and disorder including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment as well as the misuse of drugs in their area through CSPs.</p> <p>The service manages a team of community officers, whose role is to engage with communities, deal with and report envirocrimes and monitor cleansing and waste contracts.</p> <p>A reduction in funding, resulting from the government's comprehensive spending review, necessitates a fundamental review of the service, to explore linkages with other regulatory services, to deliver savings while minimising the impact of those cuts on service delivery at the front line.</p>		
2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?	All service users, who will receive a more targeted and proportionate service delivery		
3. What outcomes are wanted?	Reduced operating costs, more joined up and targeted service delivery; More streamlined, consistent and intelligence-led processes through a fair and proportionate restructuring process		

4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Contribute Fair and equitable process Consultation	Detract Failure to invest to save
5. Who are the main stakeholders?	Outcomes: residents; members; businesses; internal and external partner agencies Process: Safer Communities staff; trades unions; HR	
6. Who implements this and who is responsible?	AD Front Line Services; Head of Safer Communities; HR	
Assessing impact		
7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial/ethnic groups</i>?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	Brief statement of main issue
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	
What evidence exists for this?	<p>The reductions in staffing will reduce the resources available to all stakeholders, irrespective of background. Medway is characterised by diverse businesses, which are frequented by residents and visitors across race and ethnic communities. While regulatory compliance may place additional burdens on ethnic SME businesses due to language issues, their customers deserve the same protection as anyone else. Therefore it is not envisaged that the review will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to ethnicity or racial group. The revised service will continue to support equal access and fairness for all sections of the community through its work with these stakeholders and will seek to minimise impacts through more modern ways of working.</p> <p>The Council's procedure for organisational change to be followed including consultation with employees concerned and unions. Advice to be sought and involvement with human resources at all stages.</p>	
8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	Brief statement of main issue
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	
What evidence exists for this?	<p>The reductions in staffing will reduce the resources available to all stakeholders, irrespective of ability.</p> <p>Therefore it is not envisaged that the service review will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to a disability. The revised service will continue to support equal access and fairness for all sections of the community through its work with these</p>	

		<p>stakeholders and will seek to minimise impacts through more modern ways of working</p> <p>The Council's procedure for organisational change to be followed including consultation with employees concerned and unions. Advice to be sought and involvement with human resources at all stages.</p>
<p>9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<p>Brief statement of main issue</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>		<p>The reductions in staffing will reduce the resources available to all stakeholders, irrespective of their gender.</p> <p>Therefore it is not envisaged that the service review will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to their gender. The revised service will continue to support equal access and fairness for all sections of the community through its work with these stakeholders and will seek to minimise impacts through more modern ways of working</p> <p>The Council's procedure for organisational change to be followed including consultation with employees concerned and unions. Advice to be sought and involvement with human resources at all stages.</p>
<p>10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i>?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<p>Brief statement of main issue</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>		<p>The reductions in staffing will reduce the resources available to all stakeholders, irrespective of sexual orientation or sexual preference.</p> <p>Therefore it is not envisaged that the service review will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to their sexual orientation. The revised service will continue to support equal access and fairness for all sections of the community through its work with these stakeholders and will seek to minimise impacts through more modern ways of working</p> <p>The Council's procedure for organisational change to be followed including consultation with employees concerned and unions. Advice to be sought and involvement with human resources at all stages..</p>
<p>11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<p>Brief statement of main issue</p>

impact due to <i>religion or belief</i>?	<input type="checkbox"/> NO	
What evidence exists for this?	<p>The reductions in staffing will reduce the resources available to all stakeholders, irrespective of faith or religious belief.</p> <p>Therefore it is not envisaged that the service review will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to religion or belief. The revised service will continue to support equal access and fairness for all sections of the community through its work with these stakeholders and will seek to minimise impacts through more modern ways of working</p> <p>The Council's procedure for organisational change to be followed including consultation with employees concerned and unions. Advice to be sought and involvement with human resources at all stages..</p>	
12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's age?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Brief statement of main issue
What evidence exists for this?	<p>The reductions in staffing will reduce the resources available to all stakeholders, irrespective of their age.</p> <p>Therefore it is not envisaged that the service review will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to age differences. The revised service will continue to support equal access and fairness for all sections of the community through its work with these stakeholders and will seek to minimise impacts through more modern ways of working</p> <p>The Council's procedure for organisational change to be followed including consultation with employees concerned and unions. Advice to be sought and involvement with human resources at all stages.</p>	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being transgendered or transsexual</i>?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Brief statement of main issue


<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p>The reductions in staffing will reduce the resources available to all stakeholders, irrespective of gender preference or gender status.</p> <p>Therefore it is not envisaged that the service review will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage people due to their being to being trans-gendered or transsexual. The revised service will continue to support equal access and fairness for all sections of the community through its work with these stakeholders and will seek to minimise impacts through more modern ways of working</p> <p>The Council's procedure for organisational change to be followed including consultation with employees concerned and unions. Advice to be sought and involvement with human resources at all stages.</p>	
<p>14. Are there any <i>other</i> groups that would find it difficult to access/make use of the function (e.g. speakers of other languages; people with caring responsibilities or dependants; those with an offending past; or people living in rural areas)?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> YES</p>	<p>If yes, which group(s)?</p>
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>	<p>The reductions in staffing will reduce the resources available to all stakeholders. While this may mean that the availability of funds to permit the commissioning of translation and/or interpreting services will be more limited than was the case previously, the improved use of partnership resources will mitigate this loss.</p> <p>A part of the service's work is focused on issues pertinent to rural communities, e.g. animal health and welfare and fertilisers and feedstuffs. This work will continue.</p> <p>Therefore it is not envisaged that the service review will disproportionately impact on, or unfairly disadvantage these other groups. The revised service will continue to support equal access and fairness for all sections of the community through its work with these stakeholders and will seek to minimise impacts through more modern ways of working</p> <p>The Council's procedure for organisational change to be followed including consultation with employees concerned and unions. Advice to be sought and involvement with human resources at all stages.</p>
<p>15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES</p>	<p>Brief statement of main issue</p>

impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (e.g. disability and age)?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	
What evidence exists for this?	The service has specific programmes targeted at addressing issues of importance to elderly and vulnerable people through, for example the Fair Trader Scheme and partnership work targeted at artifice crime. It is not envisaged that this work will be adversely impacted by the review and there will be a renewed focus on these sections of the community.	

Conclusions & recommendation		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	However, as this is taken forward any unforeseen implications will be taken into account
	<input type="checkbox"/> NO	
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES	Not applicable
	<input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?		
NO	This function/ policy/ service change complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case.	

Action plan to make Minor modifications		
Outcome	Actions (with date of completion)	Officer responsible

Planning ahead: Reminders for the next review

Date of next review		
Areas to check at next review (e.g. new census information, new legislation due)		
Is there <i>another</i> group (e.g. new communities) that is relevant and ought to be considered next time?		
Signed (completing officer/service manager)	Date	
	Date	


NB: Remember to list the evidence (i.e. documents and data sources) used

Directorate RCC	Name of Function or Policy or Major Service Change Design & Conservation Team in the Planning Policy & Design Group		
Officer responsible for assessment Brian McCutcheon Planning Policy & Design Manager	Date of assessment 17 January 2011	New or existing? New	
Defining what is being assessed			
1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives	<p>The Design & Conservation team provides a range of statutory and discretionary services, including dealing with listed building applications, developments in conservation areas and other work related to heritage assets.</p> <p>The necessity of reducing budgets across the authority caused by reduced Government funding has required a critical assessment as to how a conservation service can be best delivered. This assessment has concluded that the post of Senior Conservation Officer should be deleted and essential work covered by a combination of two other posts.</p> <p>This Diversity Impact Assessment reviews the impact of this action.</p>		
2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?	Necessary savings are intended to be achieved in ways that will not disproportionately impact on or disadvantage any section of the Council, its residents and its businesses.		
3. What outcomes are wanted?	A reduction in the establishment of the Design & Conservation team that minimises the potential impact on any sections of the Council, its residents or businesses.		
4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Contribute Consultation	Detract Lack of consultation	
5. Who are the main stakeholders?	Medway Council and residents and businesses owning, occupying or using designated built assets, including listed buildings and properties located in designated conservation areas.		
6. Who implements this and who is responsible?	Medway Council Cabinet, Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture and Planning Policy & Design Manager.		

Assessing impact		
7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial/ethnic groups</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>religion or belief</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's <i>age</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being trans-gendered or transsexual</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for	No change to the pattern in which the service is	

this?	delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
14. Are there any <i>other</i> groups that would find it difficult to access/make use of the function (e.g. speakers of other languages; people with caring responsibilities or dependants; those with an offending past; or people living in rural areas)?	NO	If yes, which group(s)?
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (e.g. disability <u>and</u> age)?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	

Conclusions & recommendation		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?	NO	
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?	N/A	
Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?		
NO	This service change complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case.	

Signed (completing officer/service manager)	Date	
Signed (service manager/Assistant Director)	Date	
		

Directorate RCC	Name of Function or Policy or Major Service Change Tourism Team in the Tourism and Heritage Service		
Officer responsible for assessment Stephen Gaimster Assistant Director Development, Economy & Transport	Date of assessment 17 January 2011	New or existing? New	
Defining what is being assessed			
1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives	<p>The Tourism team provides a range of services, including tourism development, strategy and marketing, managing the Visitor Information Centre in Rochester and managing piers and the coach park.</p> <p>The necessity to reduce budgets across the authority caused by reduced Government funding has required a critical assessment of how a tourism service can be best delivered. This assessment has concluded that the post of Tourism and Heritage Manager should be deleted and essential work covered by a combination of other posts.</p> <p>This Diversity Impact Assessment reviews the impact of this action.</p>		
2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?	Necessary savings are intended to be achieved in ways that will not disproportionately impact on or disadvantage any section of the Council, its residents and its businesses.		
3. What outcomes are wanted?	A reduction in the establishment of the Tourism and Heritage Service that minimises the potential impact on any sections of the Council, its residents or businesses.		
4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Contribute Consultation	Detract Lack of consultation	
5. Who are the main stakeholders?	Medway Council, tourist visitors, Medway Tourist Association, owners of major visitor attractions, rail operators, residents and businesses involved in Medway's tourist industry.		
6. Who implements this and who is responsible?	Medway Council Cabinet, Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture and Assistant Director, Development, Economy & Transport.		

Assessing impact		
7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial/ethnic groups</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>religion or belief</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's age?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being trans-gendered or transsexual</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups.

What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
14. Are there any <i>other</i> groups that would find it difficult to access/make use of the function (e.g. speakers of other languages; people with caring responsibilities or dependants; those with an offending past; or people living in rural areas)?	NO	If yes, which group(s)?
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	
15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (e.g. disability <u>and</u> age)?	NO	Brief statement of main issue: Although some reduction in service is inevitable it is not considered that this would result in a differential impact on any individuals or groups
What evidence exists for this?	No change to the pattern in which the service is delivered is expected other than an overall reduction in the level of activity.	

Conclusions & recommendation		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?	NO	
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?	N/A	
Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?		
NO	This service change complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case.	

Signed (completing officer/service manager)	Date	
Signed (service manager/Assistant Director) 	Date 17 January 2011	

Directorate Business Support Department	Business Support Directorate Empty Homes & Energy Efficiency Team	
Officers responsible for assessment Matthew Gough Head of Strategic Housing	Date of assessment 14 th January 2011	New or existing? For Review of Structure – Service DIA still current
Defining what is being assessed		
1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives	Purpose: To make revenue budget savings as set out in the proposals agreed by cabinet on the 21 December 2010. Objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To respond to changes in the funding of work on empty homes. • To realign services in light of increased activity in connection to energy efficiency by Government Direct and energy companies. • To rationalise the roles within specific areas within the Strategic Housing Service and re-align the number of posts to current workloads. • Which have removed the need for a dedicated team for these roles. • To reduce revenue costs (deletion of five posts) whilst maintaining an effective Housing Service. • Allow for the legal duties in relation to empty properties to be dealt within the remaining structure. 	
2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?	The benefit is to the council and taxpayer by reducing revenue costs. These savings are intended to be achieved in a way that ensures financial sustainability whilst not disproportionately impacting on or unfairly disadvantaging sections of the community. This will underpin the ongoing work by officers to deliver the savings.	
3. What outcomes are wanted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue savings • Streamlined & effective housing services and operations 	
4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Contribute <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication with, engagement and commitment of staff and management to ensure an effective and efficient service. • Management commitment 	Detract <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resistance to change • Timescales • Potential staff redundancies • Reduced level of service

5. Who are the main stakeholders?	• Residents of Medway and elected Members	
6. Who implements this and who is responsible?	Assistant Director Housing and Corporate Services	
Assessing impact		
7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>ethnicity/ racial groups</i>?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	There will be no impact on service users in terms of ethnicity/ racial groups as the service to the public will not be effected as the deletion of posts reflects a loss of workload.	
8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	There is no effect on our service users in terms of their disability.	
9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	There will be no impact on service users in terms of gender as the service to the public is not based on gender.	
10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i>?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	Monitoring of sexual orientation has been identified as an issue requiring a corporate approach and is being considered by the Council's Equalities and Core Value Group	
11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>religion/belief</i>?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	There is no evidence to suggest that there will be a detrimental impact on particular staff or service users as a consequence their religion or belief.	
12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>age</i>?	YES	
	NO	

What evidence exists for this?	There is no differential effect on our service users in terms of age as the criteria for the services effected are not age.	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being transgendered or transsexual</i> ?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	Monitoring of sexual orientation has been identified as an issue requiring a corporate approach and is being considered by the Council's Equalities and Core Value Group	
14. Are there any <i>other groups</i> that would find it difficult to access/make use of services, or who might experience unfavourable treatment, as a result of the change (eg people with caring responsibilities or dependants, those with an offending past, or people living in rural areas)?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	There is no effect on our service users as the deletion of posts reflects a loss of workload rather than a reduction of service provision.	
15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (eg disability and age)?	YES	
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?		
Conclusions & recommendations		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?	YES	
	NO	
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?	YES	N/A
	NO	

Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?	
NO	This service change complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case.

YES	Give details of key person responsible and target date for carrying out full impact assessment (see DIA Guidance Notes)	
-----	---	--

Planning ahead: Reminders for the next review

Date of next review	N/a for full review, but the overall service will be subject to annual DIA.	
Areas to check at next review (eg new census information, new legislation due)	None.	
Is there <i>another group</i> (eg new communities) that is relevant and ought to be considered next time?	No.	
Signed (completing officer/service manager) Matthew Gough, Head of Strategic Housing	Date	14/01/2011
Signed (Assistant Director) Deborah Upton, Assistant Director Housing and Corporate Services	Date	

Related documents