

# Derbyshire County Council

## Equality Impact Analysis Record Form

### Derbyshire County Council Revenue Budget 2019/20

Department	ALL
Service Area	ALL
Title of policy/ practice/ service of function	<b>REVENUE BUDGET FOR 2019/20</b>
Chair of Analysis Team	Sarah Eaton, Head of Policy and Research

#### Stage 1. Prioritising what is being analysed

- Why has the policy, practice, service or function been chosen?
- What if any proposals have been made to alter the policy, service or function?

The public sector equality duty requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities. The purpose of this analysis is to ensure that when the Council's annual revenue budget is set each year that an assessment is being made of the likely impacts for local people. As the budget sets the overall spending and income raising levels for the Council, it also determines to some degree the areas of service where savings will be targeted, and as such needs to be included within the Council's processes for meeting the public sector equality duty. The analysis of the main budget will be supported by individual service specific Equality Impact Analyses, to ensure that all possible likely impacts are identified, and where possible steps taken to mitigate them. In the event that adverse impact identified is very serious and cannot be mitigated then members would have to consider whether not to proceed with the proposed savings.

c. What is the purpose of the policy, practice, service or function?

Each year the Council must agree a revenue budget for the next financial year, which reflects the Council's Five Year Financial Plan and which seeks to ensure a balanced budget, taking into account funding from external sources, including Government, and locally raised sources of income.

Specifically, the budget sets the high level controls over where the Council will spend money on delivering local services, and thus helps determine the services that will become available to the people of Derbyshire in the following financial year.

Since 2008 the Council's budget has been reduced by Central Government. This means that each year there are fewer resources to fund local services, and the Council must find ways of changing or cutting services and other activities to stay within budget.

The budget will also set whether or not locally raised income is increased each year, such as through rises in Council Tax and other major charges, impacting on local people, whether or not they use different Council services. It does not exercise control over the levels of Business Rates which are raised, although the Council receives a proportion of these.

The proposals within the Five Year Plan for 2019/20 vary in scale enormously, between a few £million and £several thousand. All proposals need to be considered in context with the size and nature of the service, and ideally, with reference to earlier or future proposals. A number of services are due to identify savings over longer than the period covered by this analysis – 2019/20.

## Stage 2. The team carrying out the analysis

<b>Name</b>	<b>Area of expertise/ role</b>
(Chair) Sarah Eaton	Head of Policy and Research
Simon Hobbs	Deputy Director of Legal Services
Wes Downes	Policy Manager
John Cowings	Senior Policy officer, Equalities
Chris Woodhouse	Head of Finance
Children's Services	Kathryn Boulton
Adult Social Care	Roger Miller
Economy, Transport & Environment	Angela Glithero
Commissioning, Community and Policy	See above
Emma Crapper	Director of OD and Policy

### Stage 3. The scope of the analysis – what it covers

This analysis will examine:

1. The proposed Revenue Budget for Derbyshire County Council for 2019/20
2. Whether the setting of the budget is likely to affect particular groups of service user, residents and staff, and whether these are likely to have protected characteristics and experience other inequality, in line with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010.
3. The issues and feedback provided by the public from consultation carried out in relation to a proposed budget or budget priorities.
4. It will seek to highlight any concerns over the possible impacts for groups of people and communities in Derbyshire, where these are likely to be negative, adverse or could be deemed to be unfair or discriminatory.

### Budget Proposals

The Council's Five Year Financial Plan has identified that the Council will need to make savings of approximately £15.4 million in 2019/20, with expenditure at £517 million for the financial year. The Budget proposals for 2019/20 include:

#### **Adult Social Care & Health**

- Electronic Home Recording Systems (£350,000)
- Increased use of Assistive Technology (£500,000)
- Learning Disability services (£500,000)
- Increased client contributions (co-funding) (£250,000)
- Use of improved Better Care Fund to support Adult Care Services (£4,132,000)

***Total for Adult Social Care & Health = £5,732,000***

#### **Children's Services**

- Home to School Transport (£90,000)
- Outdoor Education (£20,000)
- Support for Inclusion services (£52,000)
- Back office costs (£419,000)
- Donut Creative Arts Studio (£156,000)
- Services for teenagers (£162,000)
- Services for 0 – 5 year olds (£1,000,000)
- Catering (£117,000)
- Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) (£75,000)

**Total for Children's Services = £2,091,000**

**Commissioning, Communities and Policy (CCP)**

- Libraries (£350,000)
- Administration and employment cost savings including reducing staffing in ICT, Finance, Legal & Democratic Services, Trading Standards, Community Safety, and Policy & Research, and Communications (£767,000)
- Insurance reductions (£165,000)
- ICT budget (£200,000)
- Property services/ savings in relation to building and other running costs and the generation of capital scheme fees (£500,000)

**Total for CCP = £1,982,000**

**Economy, Transport & Environment**

- Gold Card Concessionary Fares (£250,000)
- Countryside Service (£100,000)
- Parking services (£90,000)
- Emergency Planning – savings on cost of running services (£57,000)
- Safe and active travel (£240,000)

**Total for ETE = £737,000**

**Totals for DCC in 2019/20 = £10,542,000**

## **Stage 4. Data and consultation feedback**

### **a. Sources of data and consultation used**

<b>Source</b>	<b>Reason for using</b>
Council Budget Report – February 2019	Annual budget which sets spending and income raising levels for the future financial year
Derbyshire County Council Five Year Financial Plan	Strategic document setting the priorities for the Council in relation to its budget and resources
Derbyshire County Council Budget Consultation 2019/20 (conducted in November/ December 2018)	Responses received from the public, residents, service users and staff in relation to the budget priorities and the level of income to be raised through Council Tax for the year being analysed.
Derbyshire performance indicator set	Provide context information in relation to levels and quality of services

<b>Source</b>	<b>Reason for using</b>
Workforce data	Provide context information in relation to staffing levels and pay
Previous Revenue Budget reports and completed EIAs reported to Cabinet	Provide cumulative related information – including whether previous savings made in service area/ department
Equality & Human Rights Commission Guidance – various	Clarifies duties and provides good practice advice in relation to PSED and making decisions
Derbyshire Observatory	Demographic, economic and other data

## Stage 5. Analysing the impact or effects

a. What does the data tell you?

<b>Protected Characteristic</b>	<b>Findings</b>
<b>Age</b>	<p>The nature of our functions and areas of responsibility as a County Council mean we provide a number of services to older people, younger people and families. Those services which are intended to provide care and support are provided primarily by two departments– Adult Social Care, and Childrens Services. These departments have the largest total budgets. The other Departments also provide some services which the general public use but which, if altered, can specifically lead to implications for people of different ages, such public transport, libraries and consumer protection.</p> <p>The proposals for 2019/20 include important proposed changes that will impact upon people on grounds of their age.</p> <p><u>Older people</u></p> <p>The budget proposed for 2019/20 includes a number of possible savings that could further affect older people, carers and families, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of improved Better Care Fund to support Adult Care Services (£4,132,000)</li> <li>• Electronic Home Recording System (£350,000)</li> <li>• Increased client contributions (co-funding) (£250,000)</li> <li>• Increased use of Assistive Technology</li> <li>• Catering – the portion related to Chesterfield Library from a saving of (£117,000)</li> <li>• Property Services (£500,000)</li> <li>• Library services (£350,000)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administration and employment cost savings including reducing staffing in ICT, Finance, Legal &amp; Democratic Services, Trading Standards, Community Safety, and Policy &amp; Research, and Communications (£767,000)</li> <li>• Gold Card Concessionary Fares (£250,000)</li> </ul> <p>For older people the most obvious proposals which could result in an adverse impact could come from proposed reductions in Co-funding, changes to Electronic Home Recording System, changes arising out of use of the improved Better Care Fund, the re-organisation of Library services, changes within Trading Standards and savings on Gold Card Concessionary Fares, affecting personal and older person care, access to library services, protection from abuse and scams, and lower take-up of concessionary travel.</p> <p>The Better Care Fund was introduced to help improve the co-ordination of health and social care services and reduce admissions and stays in hospitals, especially during the winter. It will be important to analyse the detail proposals in relation to this item, as depending upon proposals, some could have an adverse impact, whilst others may have a positive impact for older people, the NHS and social care services.</p> <p>The remaining services which are listed could also result in reduced service, access to service or support for older people being curtailed, and reduce the quality of life for older people in Derbyshire.</p> <p><u>Children and families</u></p> <p>The budget for 2019/20 will include a number of significant proposals which will affect children, young people, carers and families including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Home to School Transport (£90,000)</li> <li>• Outdoor Education (£20,000)</li> <li>• Support for Inclusion (£52,000)</li> <li>• Donut Creative Arts Studio (£156,000)</li> <li>• Services for teenagers (£162,000)</li> <li>• Services for 0 – 5 year olds (£1,000,000)</li> <li>• SEND (£75,000)</li> <li>• Library services (£350,000)</li> <li>• Property (£500,000) (where this relates to services used by children and families to access services).</li> <li>• Countryside Services (£100,000)</li> </ul>
--	---

- Safe and active travel (school crossing patrols) (£240,000)\* costs transferred to public health budgets

The impact of these proposals could affect a range of different families, depending upon the age, disability status and needs of the children, and whether the Council is involved in caring for or safeguarding children. A number of these services have already made significant savings and been re-organised, so there could also be an important cumulative adverse impact on some families, including those in areas with Children's Centres, support via the Youth Service, and for the families of disabled and SEN children.

A number of health and family services are accessed through Children's Centres, so any reduction in the number of centres, opening times, or the role of the centres, can lead to potential poorer outcomes for younger children.

Spending on youth services nationally has been significantly cut leading to concerns over the lack of such services and crime, gangs and issues in relation to the Prevent agenda.

Locally, services for teenagers are important in helping to support, advice and develop the aspirations of young people, especially in deprived neighbourhoods. They can also be a place that young people go to when they have issues in their lives but don't feel able to seek help from parents in the first instance.

The planned changes to the Libraries service will also impact on families and children, potentially reducing opportunities to use the libraries and to access materials for children of different ages.

Changes to school crossing patrol arrangements also have the potential to impact on younger children and their families, depending upon whether the level or the number of patrols is altered.

#### Potential for impact on older workers within the Council

A number of proposals will include restructuring of staffing teams, although details are not available at this level of the budget.

The Council has an older workforce, with an average age of almost 50 years of age. Wherever possible the authority will try to offer workers who might be at risk the opportunity to retire or leave on a voluntary basis. This is subject to age and status restrictions, affordability, through the impact on

	<p>the budget and pension fund, and the need to retain skills in some areas. This policy has helped to avoid forcibly making workers redundant. Over recent years the number of employees retiring or taking advantage of the voluntary schemes has helped avoid enforced redundancies.</p> <p>The proposals for 2019/20 include a number where restructuring will take place, leading to the potential for workers to face redundancy. This could impact significantly on older workers, especially older female workers.</p>
<b>Disability</b>	<p>The functions and responsibilities of the County Council means we provide important services and support to disabled people, carers and the families of disabled people. Some specialist services are targeted at people with sensory impairments, people experiencing poor mental health, people with a learning disability, and people with dementia. Cuts to these services or changes in the way support is provided can have a significant impact on the lives of these customers, their ability to participate in society, their well-being and life chances. Any changes proposed for non-statutory entitlement to bus travel concessions/ support for travel would be likely to impact adversely on disabled people, since the statutory entitlement rules are largely set by national Government.</p> <p>The budget proposals for 2019/20 include a number of proposals which could affect disabled people, adults and children, carers and the families of disabled people, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning Disabilities (£500,000)</li> <li>• Increased client contributions (co-funding) (£250,000)</li> <li>• Use of improved Better Care Fund to support Adult Care Services (£4,132,000)</li> <li>• Support for Inclusion (£52,000)</li> <li>• Home to School Transport (£90,000)</li> <li>• Support for inclusion (early years support) (£52,000)</li> <li>• SEND (£75,000)</li> <li>• Library services (£350,000)</li> <li>• Administration and employment cost savings including reducing staffing in ICT, Finance, Legal &amp; Democratic Services, Trading Standards, Community Safety, and Policy &amp; Research, and Communications (£767,000) (£767,000)</li> <li>• Property Services (£500,000)(where this impacts on buildings used by older and disabled people to receive or access services)</li> <li>• Gold Card Concessionary Fares (£250,000)</li> </ul>



	<p>In particular the proposals in relation to people with learning disabilities could result in some people who currently use the service receiving a reduced or changed service. This is likely to impact adversely on people who currently rely upon the Council's services or support, and the families/ carers of people with learning disabilities. This particular review will be examining current day-care provision and could lead to some geographical locations being adversely affected, although it could also lead to improved access in others.</p> <p>Amongst the services which do not deliver care or support, the proposals to further reduce the mobile library service, reduced staffing in Trading Standards and in Community Safety could reduce access to services, advice and support for vulnerable people, including older and disabled people, victims of crime and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Savings in relation to concessionary travel have been identified due to reduced demand for Gold Cards. Further information will need to be reviewed if reductions in demand continue, as this would suggest that older and disabled people could become less mobile and experience further difficulties accessing local services.</p> <p><u>Disabled workers</u></p> <p>The number of employees who have declared a disability makes up around 3% of the Council's total workforce. This has remained relatively unchanged over the last 10 years.</p> <p>Levels of disability vary across departments but are higher in Adult Social Care and Health. Proposals in this department could therefore impact on a disproportionate number of disabled workers. Changes such as relocation, changes to duties and responsibilities, or to terms and conditions, including pay, can also affect disabled employees in a negative way. This can include the disruption which can result from staffing and other changes.</p>
<b>Gender (Sex)</b>	<p>Many of our direct customers are women. They are more likely to feature as carers, as residents of care homes/ user of older person services, user of libraries, benefit from community safety services and protection type services, and as amongst parents needing support.</p> <p>Women make up almost 80% of the total workforce and a similar majority of the many part-time workers we employ. Proposals within this budget include a number to restructure service teams, where women, by nature of the proportion they represent, are likely to be affected to a greater degree.</p>

	<p>Amongst the proposals, the following are likely to impact on women to a greater extent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased client contributions (co-funding) (£250,000)</li> <li>• Electronic Home Recording System (£350,000)</li> <li>• Increased use of assertive technology (£500,000)</li> <li>• Use of the improved Better Care Fund (£4,132,000)</li> <li>• SEND 75,000)</li> <li>• Donut Creative Arts Studio (£156,000)</li> <li>• Services for 0 – 5 year olds (£1,000,000)</li> <li>• Catering (£117,000)</li> <li>• Library services (£350,000)</li> <li>• Administration and employment cost savings including reducing staffing in ICT, Finance, Legal &amp; Democratic Services, Trading Standards, Community Safety, and Policy &amp; Research, and Communications (£767,000) (where these services are specifically providing support or help to vulnerable individuals/ dealing with abuse/ harassment)</li> <li>• Property services (£500,000) (where this will impact upon access to services, facilities in public buildings, cleaning and workplaces).</li> </ul> <p>Women as mothers/ parents could be adversely affected by proposals such as those in relation Services for 0 – 5 year olds, and changes to Catering Services, if this were to impact on school meals in primary schools. Teenage girls and young women could be adversely affected by proposals in relation to Services for Teenagers, where they currently interact with these services. Older women could be affected by the Adult Social Care and Health proposals, having levels of care reduced and other services which enable older people to remain in their own homes.</p> <p><u>Female and male workers</u></p> <p>With women making up almost 80% of employees, and a similar proportion of part-time workers, proposals which would alter staffing structures, numbers, working hours or duties could adversely affect men and women differently. Whilst staffing reductions might be in proportion to the size of the male or female workforce in the Council, the fact that the authority employs many more women, will mean that women are likely to be affected in greater numbers, and to a greater degree in the case of part-time and lower paid employees .e.g. catering, care and children's services. Libraries.</p>
<b>Gender re-assignment</b>	<p>The incidence of gender re-assignment is rarely monitored but we do know that the number of people is increasing in</p>

	<p>the UK. This makes it difficult to gain accurate figures for the numbers of residents and people who use our services, who have or are undergoing gender re-assignment. We do know that a small number of services work with people who have this protected characteristic as a target group, such as community safety, to tackle issues such as hate crime, or public health services in relation to well-being or sexual health. As an employer we are becoming increasingly experienced in supporting people who transition,</p> <p>This means that amongst our residents and people who use our services, people with this protected characteristic will be represented and could be additionally affected in some cases.</p> <p>A number of proposals within the budget could potentially have low adverse impact on this group of people including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Donut Creative Arts Studio (£156,000)</li> <li>• Services for teenagers (£162,000)</li> <li>• Library services (£350,000)</li> <li>• Administration and employment cost savings including reducing staffing in ICT, Finance, Legal &amp; Democratic Services, Trading Standards, Community Safety, and Policy &amp; Research, and Communications (£767,000) (£797,000) where these might reduce work with transgender people and organisations</li> <li>• Property Services (£500,000) – if this affects facilities in publicly accessed buildings/ workplaces</li> </ul>
<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	<p>The public sector duties in relation to marriage and civil partnership seek to ensure that anyone in a civil partnership does not experience less favourable treatment than those who have entered into a marriage. The main area where the Council engages with people over marriage or civil partnership would be through the registration service, where a small saving is planned for 2019/20, although this is not expected to directly affect the ability of people to marry or form a civil partnership.</p>
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	<p>There is much research which has revealed that women who become pregnant can experience discrimination, especially in relation to employment, but also because of attitudes towards issues such as breastfeeding.</p> <p>A range of public health and children's services commonly work with expectant mothers and new parent households. Changes to these services, such as the proposals for Early Years could have a significant impact on pregnant or expectant mothers/ households where these individuals or families require support or engage with local services.</p>

	<p>Recent legislative changes have extended the rights of parents to share parental leave. The Council has developed a clear policy for supporting employees who take shared parental leave.</p> <p>Of the proposals within the budget for 2019/20 it is considered that the following could result in an adverse impact on expectant and new mothers or families taking shared parental leave:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services for 0 – 5 year olds (£1,000,000).</li> <li>• Support for inclusion (£52,000)</li> <li>• Libraries Services (£350,000)</li> <li>• Property Services (£500,000) (if this were to impact on facilities within Council publicly accessed buildings)</li> <li>• Countryside Services (if this limits access to leisure/ facilities for people using the countryside)</li> </ul>
<b>Race</b>	<p>When compared to the nearby cities of Derby, Nottingham, Sheffield, and Manchester/ Stockport, which are within easy reach of Derbyshire, the county has a lower than average population of people from a BME background. Derbyshire's BME population is spread across a broad range of different racial and ethnic groups, including people from the EU and Eastern Europe, from Black, Chinese and Asian communities. Only one area within Derbyshire has a BME population which represents more than 10% of the total population, the Stenson Fields area on the edge of Derby City but within the administrative area of South Derbyshire. Chesterfield, Long Eaton and Shirebrook are also known to have identifiable communities of BME people.</p> <p>Over the last decade the Council has invested in developing consultation with BME based community and voluntary organisations, establishing the BME Community Forum. This Forum has worked closely in the past with Adult Social Care to improve understanding of the needs of BME customers, and ensure services are culturally sensitive to their needs. This work has also meant that funding has been made available to help develop the capacity of BME community and voluntary sector organisations. During 2019/20 a review of how the Council works with and funds the community and voluntary sector is planned, although any changes to actual funding would commence in 2020/21.</p> <p>A number of the proposals within the budget plans for 2019/20 could impact adversely upon BME households, but to a similar degree to non-BME households, and are</p>

	<p>dependent upon the extent to which those households use or engage currently with services. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electronic Home Recording Systems (£350,000)</li> <li>• Increased client contributions (co-funding) (£250,000)</li> <li>• Use of improved Better Care Fund to support Adult Care Services (£4,132,000)</li> <li>• SEND (£75,000)</li> <li>• Donut Creative Arts Studio (£156,000)</li> <li>• Services for Teenagers (£162,000)</li> <li>• Services for 0 – 5 year olds (£1,000,000)</li> <li>• Library services (£350,000)</li> <li>• Administration and employment cost savings including reducing staffing in ICT, Finance, Legal &amp; Democratic Services, Trading Standards, Community Safety, and Policy &amp; Research, and Communications (£767,000) (£797,000) (where savings being made in relation o any work with BME communities and their organisations)</li> <li>• Gold Card Concessionary Fares (£250,000)</li> </ul> <p><u>BME employees</u></p> <p>Around 3% of the Council's workforce is from a BME community. This rate has only increased very slowly and by a small amount over the last decade. This rate is higher in Adult Social Care and Health, but lower in other departments, reflecting the occupational segregation of our BME workers. Re-structuring proposals in Adult Social Care could affect BME representation, if job cuts were to be made in relation to jobs carried out by BME employees.</p>
<b>Religion and belief including non-belief</b>	<p>Religion and belief, including non-belief, can often mean that people will have different cultural or dietary needs, which as service users, will need to be met or taken regard of. Faith often features as an issue in relation to schooling, school transport, or the services which are provided to people we support or care for, and services which work in communities tackling abuse or exclusion.</p> <p>A small number of the proposals could have an adverse impact upon some people from a religious minority background, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Home to School Transport (£165,000)</li> <li>• Library services (£350,000)</li> <li>• Administration and employment cost savings including reducing staffing in ICT, Finance, Legal &amp; Democratic Services, Trading Standards, Community Safety, and Policy &amp; Research, and Communications (£767,000)</li> </ul>

	<p>(£797,000) ( where this might affect work done by Policy and Research, Trading Standards and Community Safety with religious minority communities)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property Services (£500,000) (if this results in limitations to facilities within publicly accessed buildings)</li> </ul> <p><u>Employees who follow a faith or religion</u></p> <p>There are very small number of people from the Muslim, Sikh, Hindu, Jewish and Buddhist communities within the Council's workforce. Most workers have indicated that they are either Christian or have no religion.</p> <p>When considering the likely impact on employees of staffing restructures and other proposals, the issue of religion and belief is unlikely to feature highly, and there is unlikely to be a measurable adverse impact.</p>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<p>Although monitoring data is not always available in every walk of life, and there is still evidence that people may not provide this information in every situation, estimates suggest that LGBQ people to make up between 2 and 5% of the population, and accordingly of people who use our services, and people who rely upon our support based services.</p> <p>This is likely to mean that they will feature amongst all groups of customers but may not self-identify specifically as LGBQ.</p> <p>Over recent years we have improved the extent to which our services have become aware of the needs that LGBQ people in relation to a number of services or functions of the Council</p> <p>It is likely therefore that proposed savings across most areas of service will also impact on LGBQ people as they would on heterosexual people, and that as a consequence, where the protected characteristic of sexual orientation might require a different or adapted services, that these are also affected by cuts or changes, in some cases in an adverse impact for people who are LGBQ. Issues which are commonly raised include personal safety, support for young people making future life and identity choices, the provision of same sex marriage ceremonies and civil partnership ceremonies, public health including sexual health, mental health support, employment, policy development and how the Council communicates with its LGBTQ communities and residents.</p> <p>A small number of the proposals are believed to have implications for people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or who identify differently than heterosexual including:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEND (£75,000)</li> <li>• Donut Creative Arts Studio (£156,000)</li> <li>• Services for teenagers (£162,000)</li> <li>• Library services (£350,000)</li> <li>• Administration and employment cost savings including reducing staffing in ICT, Finance, Legal &amp; Democratic Services, Trading Standards, Community Safety, and Policy &amp; Research, and Communications (£767,000) (£797,000) (Where this might stem from reduced work with LGBT people and organisations over issues such as community safety, community engagement and tackling abuse).</li> </ul> <p><u>LGBQ employees</u></p> <p>Lesbian gay, bisexual and other non-heterosexual workers LGBQ workers make up around 2% of the workforce, and are represented across the authority, with slightly higher proportions working in Adult Social Care and Health, and lower than average proportions in Economy Transport and Environment.</p> <p>The LGBT Employee Network has historically provided useful feedback to the Council over how new or changing policies and service might impact upon or be used/ accessed by LGBQ and T people. There is no current evidence to suggest that as employees they have been disproportionately adversely affected by changes to the workforce arising out of budget savings.</p>
--	--

## Non-statutory

Socio-economic and social mobility	<p>Derbyshire has a high variation between households who are affluent and those which experience deprivation or socio-economic disadvantage. Many services provided by the Council are designed to meet people with fewer resources, people who may experience poorer health, or have lower life chances. Accordingly, for many of our customers, deprivation or disadvantage will be a key determining factor which accounts for access and consumption.</p> <p>Most of the proposals in the budget will exercise a potential adverse impact on those who have fewest resources, or who are least able to cope when services are reduced or removed.</p> <p>The following proposals are expected to exercise a significant possible adverse impact of people with fewer resources, or living in deprived communities, including:</p>
------------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Savings in relation to children and families, including Services for Teenagers and Services for 0 – 5 year olds</li> <li>• Savings from changes to Learning Disability Services, and services which ensure that care and support is available to older and vulnerable people. This could also include how such savings impact on carers.</li> <li>• Changes to charging policies and eligibility for services</li> <li>• Proposed savings in relation to public transport, resulting in greater isolation, removing access to work, local services and leisure opportunities including libraries, and further aid the decline of small town high streets and shopping centres.</li> </ul> <p>Social mobility is determined though a number of factors, many of which are beyond the control, but not necessarily the influence, of the County Council. The state of the national and local economy exercises significant influence over whether individuals or households are able to improve their standard of living, and achieve a better life for themselves, accessing choice and control which was previously denied or out of reach, or by gaining skills and resources to change things. In Derbyshire those with least social mobility can be found in our deprived communities and neighbourhoods, and amongst a number of protected characteristic groups, especially disabled people, and women. The proposed savings in the budget for 2019/20 could further limit some aspects of social mobility. This will include savings in relation to public transport, support to families and children, and changes to older and disabled people's care and other services. That said, the Council continues to invest its energies in attracting and supporting local, businesses and jobs, which if successful provides a key lever for people to access social mobility opportunities, and generating additional opportunities. Importantly, new jobs need to get to local people from deprived communities and groups, or part of the potential benefit is lost, and social mobility cannot be improved.</p> <p>The Council employs people from across Derbyshire, including many workers who live in poorer and deprived communities. Additionally many such workers will work in the same or a nearby community to that they live in. Reductions in jobs in such localities, albeit small in number, can result in a negative impact in those same communities and reduce opportunities for social mobility.</p>
Rural	The Council provides a number of services which may be delivered differently or may be more costly to deliver in its



	<p>rural areas. The county's market towns often have "branch" type offices of local services, where teams of staff are based and work in the community and surrounding rural areas. Additionally, some services, such as the financial support for public transport, may be concentrated into supporting services which specifically serve rural areas, to ensure these areas have services and are accessible.</p> <p>Proposals which could lead to a reduction or the removal of services in the county's rural areas can have a large negative impact upon the sustainability and resilience of rural communities, and cause significant difficulties for poorer or less mobile residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electronic Home Recording Systems (£350,000)</li> <li>• Increased use of Assistive Technology (£500,000)</li> <li>• Learning Disability services (£500,000)</li> <li>• Increased client contributions (co-funding) (£250,000)</li> <li>• Use of improved Better Care Fund to support Adult Care Services (£4,132,000)</li> <li>• Home to School Transport (£165,000)</li> <li>• Outdoor Education (£20,000)</li> <li>• Support for Inclusion (£52,000)</li> <li>• Services for 0 – 5 year olds (£1,000,000)</li> <li>• Catering services (£117,000)</li> <li>• Gold Card Concessionary Fares (£250,000)</li> <li>• Countryside Service (£100,000)</li> <li>• Parking services (£90,000)</li> <li>• Emergency Planning (£57,000)</li> </ul> <p>The Council employs people from across Derbyshire, including many people who live in its rural areas. The extent to which job losses amongst workers will impact on rural communities is un-researched.</p>
Other groups of people and businesses	<p><u>Motorists</u></p> <p>Motorists will not experience significant cuts in funding for services under the budget proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Civil parking enforcement (£90,000)</li> </ul> <p><u>Businesses in Derbyshire</u></p> <p>A number of the proposals could affect businesses which provide services to the Council. For example, where the Council is proposing to make savings in relation to purchased goods and services, where the maintenance of buildings and assets will be affected, and in relation to</p>

	<p>opportunities to tender or bid for contracts and commissioned services, changes to frontline and back office services can lead to external businesses and other providers being adversely affected. This could also be the case where the Council proposes to move out of buildings in town centres and communities, leaving them blighted as the range of local services declines.</p> <p>This could have a negative impact on the local economy during a difficult economic outlook, and the uncertainty of Brexit and the continued decline of the high street. How expenditure takers place in relation to regional and local economic development support is also of relevance. Including the priorities and eligibility criteria fixed for businesses seeking to access help and support. The Council's relative success in attracting investment into Markham Vale does not necessarily benefit businesses in other areas of Derbyshire.</p> <p><u>Public and private partners</u></p> <p>A number of the proposals could lead to changes in procurement and commissioning arrangements, or affect the Council's capacity to work with public and other partners, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electronic Home Recording Systems (£350,000)</li> <li>• Increased use of Assistive Technology (£500,000)</li> <li>• Learning Disability services (£500,000)</li> <li>• Increased client contributions (co-funding) (£500,000)</li> <li>• Use of improved Better Care Fund to support Adult Care Services (£4,132,000)</li> <li>• Home to School Transport (£165,000)</li> <li>• Outdoor Education (£20,000)</li> <li>• SEND (£75,000)</li> <li>• Donut Creative Arts Studio (£156,000)</li> <li>• Services for 0 – 5 year olds (£1,000,000)</li> <li>• Catering services (£117,000)</li> <li>• Library services (£350,000)</li> <li>• Administration and employment cost savings including reducing staffing in ICT, Finance, Legal &amp; Democratic Services, Trading Standards, Community Safety, and Policy &amp; Research, and Communications (£767,000) (£797,000)</li> <li>• Property Services (£500,000)</li> <li>• Countryside Service (£100,000)</li> <li>• Safe and active travel (£240,000)</li> </ul>
--	---

	In a number of the proposals (which have become more detailed and are now being consulted upon) assumptions have been included which expect service reductions or re-organisation to be aided or mitigated by services from the community and voluntary sector, or because schools are being expected to carry out functions or provide advice and support instead. There are few signs in these reports which establishes that the sector can do all of this, nor are there indications that funding will be increase to this sector to enable them to develop the capacity or resources to do so.
--	---

- b. What does customer feedback, complaints or discussions with stakeholder groups tell you about the impact of the policy, practice, service or function on the protected characteristic groups?

The consultation completed asked the public a small number of questions and used the Council Plan priorities as the basis for priority area expenditure. As some distinct communities are not easily visible or represented within these priorities, this makes analysis of the consultation responses more difficult to interpret in relation to the 9 protected characteristic groups.

<b><i>Protected Group</i></b>	<b><i>Findings</i></b>
Age	When the public was asked which priorities it supported, a number of those selected support looking after older people, and providing a positive start in life for children. This perhaps also reflects the work of our two largest spending departments Adult Social Care and health and Children's Services.
Disability	<p>The recent public consultation asked those taking part to indicate if they have a disability, so it is possible to review feedback in relation to people who have a disability and those who indicated they did not. Of those who took part 13% of respondents indicated they had a disability, slightly lower than as a percentage of the adult population with a disability or long-term illness (the definition used within the Census).</p> <p>The responses from the general public indicated that just over 1 in 10 people felt investing in services for people with learning disabilities should be one of the top 3 priorities of the Council in budget terms. There was more support for looking after older and younger people, and it should be recognised that many older people have acquired a disability, whether it be a mobility, visual or hearing impairment, so there is likely to be more support for investing in services which support the broader community of disabled people.</p>

	<p>No specific questions were asked in relation to mental health so it difficult to tell from the consultation whether the public would see investing in mental health services as a distinct priority. It could be expected that the strong support for expenditure which supports and encourages healthy lifestyles will impact positively on some areas of disability, including mental health.</p>
Gender (Sex)	<p>A slightly higher proportion of those who took part were female (52%) rather than male (48%).</p> <p>This might be expected since some of the Council services are likely to have direct contact or impact on women as mothers/ parents, older people, carers and users of services such as our libraries.</p>
Gender reassignment	<p>People who have or are undergoing gender re-assignment will feature amongst the population of Derbyshire who had an opportunities to participate, and may well feature amongst those who have responded.</p> <p>It is not possible to identify specific impacts on the basis of gender re-assignment from the consultation which has been carried out.</p>
Marriage and civil partnership	<p>Those participating were not asked to indicate if they had this protected characteristic. This is not believed to have been a factor which would significantly determine impact and as such opinion within the budget consultation.</p> <p>However, amongst the support for specific priorities, there was support for investing in services which support families and children, and keeping children safeguarded.</p>
Pregnancy and maternity	<p>Those participating were not asked to indicate if they had this protected characteristic.</p> <p>There was support amongst those who took part for services for families and children, and for work which supports healthy lifestyles, both of which are likely to be specifically relevant to expectant parents and newly born children.</p>
Race	<p>Those participating were not asked to indicate if they had this protected characteristic.</p> <p>From the responses received it is not possible to identify specific views from our BME communities in relation to the budget consultation.</p> <p>Historically regular consultation with BME community based organisations has highlighted the importance of social care</p>

	and family based services, but also services such as local libraries and the arts, in recognition that equal access to services and acknowledging the diversity of our communities is important to racial and probably other communities.
Religion and belief including non-belief	<p>Those participating were not asked to indicate if they had this protected characteristic.</p> <p>From the responses received it is not possible to identify specific views from our religious minority communities in relation to the budget consultation.</p>
Sexual orientation	<p>Those participating were not asked to indicate if they had this protected characteristic.</p> <p>From the responses received it is not possible to identify specific views from people who are LGBTQ in relation to the budget consultation. From previous consultations with organisations representing LGBTQ people we do know that investment in community safety and public health services can feature as a priority with LGBTQ people, although they are just as likely to be supportive of expenditure on looking after older people, support for younger people and issues such as jobs and the economy, the environment, road and transport and tourism and the visitor economy as non LGBTQ people.</p>

## Non-statutory

Socio-economic	<p>Those participating were not asked to indicate if they had this protected characteristic.</p> <p>A quarter of respondents supported investment in helping children get the best start, 18% in economic and skills investment, and 12% in unlocking economic opportunities for people, activities which are more likely to benefit our disadvantaged communities. Those who support expenditure on looking after older and vulnerable people may also be highly represented amongst respondents from disadvantaged communities, since these services can be more important to poorer older people. It should also be recognised that many people with disabilities, including those with learning disabilities are likely to have lower incomes and more likely to experience economic disadvantage, so the support for learning disability services if translated into investment, can benefit people in our poorer and disadvantaged communities.</p>
----------------	---

Rural	<p>From the consultation responses it is possible to identify the proportion of respondents who supported investment in improving access to rural services, those who supported investment into the environment and those supporting road maintenance and repairs expenditure (although this does mean all supporters were rurally based).</p> <p>Some 8% of respondents supported rural based expenditure, 37% supported investment in roads, 25% in the environment, and 5% of respondents supported investment in the tourist and visitor economy, much of which benefits the Peak District and Derbyshire's more rural areas.</p>
-------	---

- c. Are there any other groups of people who may experience an adverse impact because of the proposals to change a policy or service who are not listed above?

The Council spends a significant amount of its budget buying, procuring and commissioning services from local businesses, charities, partners and other organisations based in Derbyshire and elsewhere.

Proposals which seek to alter whether a service is purchased in this way, perhaps by bringing a service in-house, or by placing a service out within a tendering process, can result in negative or positive impacts for these organisations. Where the amount we have to spend with other companies or organisations is reduced, this can lead to unintended consequences for them, reducing income, affecting their futures and leading to reductions in the number of people they employ.

Increasingly services are identifying a role for the community and voluntary sector within their proposals that involve these organisations and volunteers directly delivering some services. To be able to do this successfully, services need to be clear about whether this capacity already exists or whether they will need to help- develop this, and on the time and levels of resources that would be required.

Within the responses received to spending priorities it is clear that motorists have featured amongst those who took part. One of the highest levels of support was for expenditure on roads maintenance/ repair. This level of support has been repeated each time consultation has taken place in relation to the budget or Council priorities. This type of expenditure is universally important. Support for social care services has also featured highly over repeated consultations in recent years.

d. Gaps in data

What are your main gaps in information and understanding of the impact of your policy and services? Please indicate whether you have identified ways of filling these gaps.

Gaps in data	Action to deal with this
Data in relation to the protected characteristics of race and ethnicity, religion and belief including non-belief, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, sexual orientation and gender re-assignment in relation to customer and consultation data.	Review how data can be improved before next year's budget analysis, including by designing in further ways to engage with communities and groups over budget proposals.
Consultation feedback disaggregated by protected characteristics of race and ethnicity, religion and belief, sexual orientation, and gender re-assignment status.	The ONS has been exploring how to expand and develop questions and monitoring for the 2021 Census and other data collection. If this leads to improved data in relation to the protected characteristics, then it is more likely that public bodies will also extend to carry out such monitoring, as it becomes capable of comparison, and more regular.

**Stage 6. Ways of mitigating unlawful prohibited conduct or unwanted adverse impact, or to promote improved equality of opportunity or good relations**

<p>It is important that departments engage genuinely in consultation with residents, people who use our services, partners and staff, in case they have ideas or suggestions which could help reduce or avoid adverse impacts for the people of Derbyshire or specific groups of service users.</p> <p>This could be alternative ways of delivering the proposed service, seeking out other sources of funding, or the improved management of performance so that more can be gained for less, avoiding wastage or overcharging.</p> <p>The process is intended not to be fixed, and the authority is required to consider ideas which might mitigate against adverse outcomes. In some cases it may be possible to identify other resources, but this may also mean that other services will need to be cut or reduced instead.</p> <p>In terms of mitigating against adverse impacts arising out of these budget proposals, it is expected that each proposal will be covered by a detailed equality impact analysis and that these should, having identified in more detail, the nature of any impact, will identify</p>
---

and outline the proposed measures that will be taken to mitigate against unwanted and adverse impacts.

### **Stage 7. Do stakeholders agree with your findings and proposed response?**

Consultation carried out with the public and other stakeholders did not at this stage cover specific proposals.

As proposals are worked up and made subject to consultation, more detailed and direct or targeted consultations will take place to ensure more detailed information is obtained to inform each EIA and report to Cabinet/ Council.

### **Stage 8. Main conclusions**

The budget proposals for 2019/20 will impact much more directly on front services than earlier budgets and mean significant changes to Council services affecting many more people than in earlier years of austerity savings. The savings identified in Adult Social Care and Children's Services are likely to have the most direct adverse impact on older, younger and disabled people, reducing levels of service and support, especially for those with lower and medium levels of need. The proposals will also see further movement towards a position of providing statutory services and support, in which services respond or intervene to avoid safeguarding and other risks.

The areas identified within the Five Year Plan for savings in 2019/ 20 will mean a likely adverse impact for:



- Older people using care and support services, which is likely to include those with higher levels of need, and people living with dementia
- Families with younger children
- Young people (teenagers and young adults)
- People with a learning disability
- Women as service users and employees
- Disabled people requiring support and care
- Users of public transport and motorists (the former will include more people with disabilities, older people, and people on lower incomes)
- The general public who use libraries (which will include people from all protected characteristic groups)
- People who may be vulnerable or subjected to abuse or harassment due to age, disability, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, race or religion and belief.
- Groups using health and advice services commissioned by the Public Health Team (often vulnerable groups of people or people living in poorer communities)
- Potentially poorer and vulnerable people living in rural communities, including where local public and other transport may be affected.

As many of the savings are likely to be achieved by reducing staffing costs or numbers, through restructuring and service redesign, employees, especially female and older employees are expected again to be impacted, potentially in a negative way.

The nature of the list of proposed savings also limits the potential for making choices or to prioritise services, based on needs. The information available does not suggest that an exercise will take place to determine priorities or give much room for Members to reject proposals, without a need to find further savings elsewhere.

The detailed proposals will need to be subject to a more localised and focused equality impact analysis, to ensure that the detailed proposals are properly assessed, and opportunities for mitigation identified.

## Stage 9. Objectives setting/ implementation

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Planned action</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>How will this be monitored?</b>
Ensuring fair decision-making, including when deciding upon detailed proposals to meet budget requirements	All detailed proposals requiring formal decision to be accompanied by a detailed equality impact analysis	All departments	As proposals made and considered	Monitoring exercise in April 2019
Ensure that affected groups and communities will have a full opportunity to consider and be consulted upon detailed proposals to aid budget implementation	All detailed proposals requiring formal decision to be accompanied by a detailed and appropriate consultation, including by consulting with groups identified as likely to experience impact.	All departments	As proposals made and prior to formal decision-making process	Monitoring exercise in April 2019
Ensure that proposals affecting employees are made available for consultation	In addition to formal consultation under policies in relation to redeployment or redundancy, proposals affecting employees are subject to consultation with affected staff and the Trade Unions	All departments	Before being finalised	Through Trade Union and management meetings
Improve participation in budget consultation	Prior to the 2020/21 budget review and revise, as necessary, the methods for consulting over the proposed budget, including by asking differently/ focusing on actual budget choices rather than Council Plan priorities	Led by Finance with department support	2019	Analysis of who takes part  Redesign of consultation and more use of focus groups and community groups
Improve the focus of consultation to gain better information.	Alter the approach and design of consultation on the budget to focus on likely areas where there will be proposed savings	Led by Policy and Research and legal Services	2019	Redesign of consultation content

Improve post implementation monitoring of impact	<p>Departments to carry out post implementation monitoring and use to feed into future decisions</p> <p>Development of post implementation customer surveys/ consultation.</p>	<p>Improvement and Scrutiny?</p> <p>Policy and Research/ Departments</p>	2019	I & S review of how agreed proposals implemented and monitored.
Continue to identify opportunities to improve customer and service user data to aid future analysis.	<p>Continue to develop customer segmentation, service user, and customer satisfaction and performance data.</p> <p>Review equality monitoring in light of changes to national monitoring introduced in the 2021 Census, to better enable comparison between demographic and customer data to take place.</p>	<p>Departments</p> <p>Policy &amp; Research</p> <p>Human Resources</p>	2021	Evidence of improved data and understanding of impact and ability to complete cumulative impact analysis/ monitoring.

## **Stage 10. Monitoring and review/ mainstreaming into business plans**

Please indicate whether any of your objectives have been added to service or business plans and your arrangements for monitoring and reviewing progress/ future impact?

Departments will need to consider a range of actions which enable them to monitor the actual impacts which come out of implementing proposals and to use this learning to shape future decision making. This information will also need to be shared across the organisation so that the Council can continue to develop cumulative analysis of impacts on people with a protected characteristic.

## **Stage 11. Agreeing and publishing the completed analysis**

Completed analysis approved by \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_

Where and when published?

With report recommending adoption of budget.

## **Decision-making processes**

**Where linked to decision on proposals to change, reduce or withdraw service/ financial decisions/ large-scale staffing restructures**

**Attached to report (title):**

**Date of report: 18 January 2019.**

**Author of report: Senior Policy officer, Equalities**

**Audience for report e.g. Cabinet/ date: February 2019.**

**Web location of report:**

**Outcome from report being considered**

**Details of follow-up action or monitoring of actions/ decision undertaken**

**Updated by:**

**Date:**