



Leicester  
City Council

**EDUCATION AND LIFELONG  
LEARNING**

**DEPARTMENTAL REVENUE  
BUDGET STRATEGY**

**2006/07 TO 2008/09**

**PROPOSALS BY THE INTERIM  
CORPORATE DIRECTOR**

**8 FEBRUARY 2006**

## CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Background to Departmental Revenue Strategies	3
2.	Executive Summary	4
3.	Overview	6
4.	Recent Financial Performance	7
5.	The 2005/06 Budget	8
6.	Performance Management	10
7.	Key Objectives	11
8.	Overview of the Budget Proposals for 2006/07 to 2008/09	14
9.	Cash Target and Spending and Resource Forecast	16
10.	Schools	17
11.	Risk Analysis	18
12.	Growth and Reduction Proposals Details	19
13.	Equalities	20

## **SECTION 1**

### **BACKGROUND TO DEPARTMENTAL REVENUE STRATEGIES**

#### **Corporate Background**

- 1.1 The financial strategy is one of four key resource strategies that support the Council's key policy aims and objectives. It sets out the Council's over-riding financial policies within which departmental medium-term planning and the Council's annual budget setting operate.
- 1.2 Departmental Revenue Strategies are prepared in the context of a corporate strategy. They detail specific budget proposals to balance departmental budgets to agreed planning targets, and respond to the wider objectives of the corporate strategy. Hence they provide the means of delivering the Council's overall Financial Strategy.
- 1.3 Budgets are being prepared on the basis of current Departments. As the new Departments come into being in 2006/07 the budgets will be transferred and reconstructed.

#### **Education and Lifelong Learning**

- 1.4 This document sets out the Revenue Strategy, and describes the context in which the budget strategy is set. It provides details of existing budget allocations and the Department's services and structures, identifies issues relating to existing spending and historic funding, and contains proposals with regard to the budget for the three-year period 2006/07 to 2008/09.

## SECTION 2

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### Overview

- 2.1 Raising educational standards remains the top priority for the Council because learning and success for all is fundamental to the Council's aim of making Leicester more attractive for our diverse communities to live, work and invest in.
- 2.2 Without excellent schools, Leicester will continue to suffer the consequences, educational and otherwise, of selective migration out of the City. Supporting effective classroom practice and leadership and management of schools is vital to this. However, on its own, this is not enough. To achieve excellence, our schools and their pupils require supportive families who, in turn, require jobs and the skills and qualifications to succeed. Excellence also requires schools to learn from each other and to work in partnership with both their local communities and with other service providers. Confident communities that benefit from, and place a high value on, education and lifelong learning are an integral part of the vision for Leicester.
- 2.3 The Education and Lifelong Learning Department is rapidly progressing in a number of key areas aimed at raising educational standards, improving attendance, reducing obstacles to effective teaching and learning, improving outcomes for children and young people who are disadvantaged and widening participation in learning and community development.

#### Legislative Requirements

- 2.4 A wide range of legislation places significant duties on the Council, and governs the Directorate's services.

#### Links with National and Local Plans and Agreements

- 2.5 The Council's key objectives and priorities are set out in the **Corporate Plan**. The Department makes a significant contribution to the following Corporate Plan key priorities:
  - To raise educational standards and skills irreversibly so that all schools are good schools and individuals are committed to learning throughout life.
  - Improve quality and equality in teaching and learning.

- Build on Leicester’s history of including people from all backgrounds in a community free to pursue peace and prosperity.
  - Support children and parents, especially protecting the most vulnerable children.
- 2.6 The Department also supports the priority to invest in continuous improvement in a well-managed organisation, and the values expressed in the Plan, to build trust, value staff, cultivate leadership and deliver quality.
- 2.7 The Corporate Plan key priorities are reflected in other key plans and agreements, which set out specific actions and outcomes that the Department is required to achieve. These include:
- **Leicester Community Plan**
  - **CPA Improvement Plan** to improve certain core services
  - **Local Public Service Agreement** – A second generation LPSA has been developed to cover the period 2005 to 2008. The Department will contribute to the achievement of a number of the priorities for improvement.
  - **Best Value Performance Plan**
  - **Local Area Agreement and Floor Targets**
- 2.8 The **Education Strategic Plan (ESP)** has the following goals:
1. Raise Educational Standards for all children and young people.
  2. Transform and modernise provision across the City.
  3. Improve outcomes for children and young people who are disadvantaged socially excluded or otherwise at risk.
  4. Widen participation in, and increase commitment to, learning and community development.
  5. Strengthen organisational capacity and capability to deliver continuous improvement.

## **SECTION 3**

### **OVERVIEW**

#### **Structure of the Department**

3.1 The Directorate's services are delivered through four Divisions, together with the emerging structure for the Leicester Federation of Children's Services.

- Standards and Effectiveness.
- Pupils and Student Support.
- Lifelong Learning and Community Development.
- Policy and Resources.

#### **Staff on the Establishment and Employed**

3.2 There are some 1,260 full-time equivalent posts (fte) on the establishment list across the Department.

#### **The Budget**

3.3 The Department's revenue budget for 2005/06 is £192.5 million of which approximately £34 million is in the LEA Block (including one-off for BSF, etc.). This is funded by the Council, together with income from Government grants, charges to service users and other external income. The Department also manages a capital programme, which in 2005/06 is £25 million.

#### **LEA Block / Schools Block**

3.4 The Department's budget is allocated across two blocks. Growth and reduction proposals only apply to the LEA block.

#### **Nationally-Led Structural Changes**

3.5 The transfer two years ago of responsibility at national level for large parts of Children's Services from the Department of Health to the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) introduced new complexities to the direction of national policy and the future funding position for Children's Services. Following the new primary legislation in the 2004 Children Act, councils are required to appoint a Director of Children's Services.

## **SECTION 4**

### **RECENT FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE**

#### **2005/05 Outturn**

- 4.1 The net controllable revenue budget outturn was an underspend of £8,000.

#### **Current 2005/06 Financial Position**

- 4.2 It is anticipated that spending in 2005/06 will be contained within the available resources, including reserves. An overspend of £1.1 million is projected at December 2005/06.
- 4.3 The Department continues to face a range of demanding operational pressures, including:
- Recruitment and Retention of suitably experienced and qualified staff.
  - Responding to national expectations around the “Gershon” review of public service efficiency.
- 4.4 The stringent measures that continue to be taken to stay within available resources include:
- Challenging managers.
  - The management of service risk within the available resources.
  - Maximising external funding.

#### **Reserves**

- 4.5 At the commencement of the financial year the Department had available reserves of £2,070,000. It is anticipated that spending pressures, particularly for transport, will result in a balance of £930,000 at 31/3/06.

## SECTION 5

### THE 2005/06 BUDGET

5.1 This section shows the 2005/06 base budget for the LEA Block, excluding one-off sums for BSF, etc.

#### **EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING DEPARTMENT - REVENUE BUDGET (LEA BLOCK)**

##### **DIRECTORATE**

CD / SD / PA's	568,200	1.8%
Projects / Charges	80,000	0.3%
<b>TOTAL DIRECTORATE</b>	<b>648,200</b>	<b>2.1%</b>

##### **LIFELONG LEARNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Early Years	2,784,900	9.0%
Adult Education	-500,000	-1.6%
Youth Services	2,643,000	8.5%
Junior Youth Service	700,000	2.3%
Corporate / Core Projects	1,098,600	3.5%
Community Services	1,195,000	3.9%
Other LLCD	547,100	1.8%
Libraries	4,245,000	13.7%
Awards & Grants	280,000	0.9%
<b>TOTAL LIFELONG LEARNING &amp; COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>12,993,600</b>	<b>41.9%</b>

##### **STANDARDS & EFFECTIVENESS**

Standards And Effectiveness	1,995,800	6.4%
Multicultural Services	244,600	0.8%
Other Multicultural	47,300	0.2%
SACRE	11,400	0.0%
Arts In Education Service	20,600	0.1%
Sports Development Joint Arrangement	47,000	0.2%
Forest Lodge Education Centre	2,200	0.0%
Standards Fund	2,493,000*	8.0%
<b>TOTAL STANDARDS &amp; EFFECTIVENESS</b>	<b>4,861,900</b>	<b>15.7%</b>

##### **PUPILS & STUDENT SUPPORT**

Admissions & Exclusions	110,500	0.4%
Appeals Panel	25,800	0.1%
Educational Psychology	1,204,700	3.9%
Special Education Service	557,800	1.8%
Education Welfare Service	811,900	2.6%
<b>TOTAL PUPILS &amp; STUDENT SUPPORT</b>	<b>2,710,700</b>	<b>8.7%</b>



**POLICY & RESOURCES**

Finance	328,300	1.1%
Human Resources	621,700	2.0%
Health & Safety	78,700	0.3%
Client Services	275,600	0.9%
Information Management	470,600	1.5%
EDISS	27,400	0.1%
Policy & Communications	251,600	0.8%
Planning And Property	245,400	0.8%

**TOTAL POLICY & RESOURCES** 2,299,300 **7.4%**

**EXTERNAL SERVICES**

Home To School Transport	3,436,800 *	11.1%
School Crossing Patrol Service	143,600	0.5%
Property Services	240,300	0.8%
Governors Support	140,000	0.5%

**TOTAL EXTERNAL SERVICES** 3,960,700 **12.8%**

**DEPARTMENT WIDE**

Postage / Photocopying	187,200	0.6%
Human Resources	165,000	0.5%
Property	31,500	0.1%

**TOTAL DEPARTMENT WIDE** 383,700 **1.2%**

**RECHARGES**

Recharges General	321,300	1.0%
IT to Libraries	245,000	0.8%
HR Recharges	59,000	0.2%
IT Recharges	507,000	1.6%
DA Charges	29,500	0.1%
Switchboard	54,000	0.2%

**TOTAL RECHARGES** 1,215,800\* **3.9%**

**OTHER**

Premature Retirement And Compensation	1,000,000	3.2%
PRC - County Commitments	933,500	3.0%

**TOTAL OTHER** 1,933,500\* **6.2%**

**TOTAL EDUCATION & LIFELONG LEARNING** 31,007,400 **100.0%**

**TOTAL THAT CANNOT BE CUT ( \* )** 9,079,100

**REVISED** 21,928,300

## SECTION 6

### PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

#### Performance Measurement and Reporting

- 6.1 A wide range of performance measures and indicators are used to assess the Department's management and services. Comprehensive returns covering all services are sent annually to the Department for Education and Skills (DfES).
- 6.2 Service performance, via the Annual Performance Assessment, is reported to the DfES.
- 6.3 Each section produces an annual business plan, in line with the corporate requirements and standards. It includes information on performance, targets, finances, human resources, short-term and long-term objectives, etc. They are used as working documents, and form the basis for setting the objectives of managers and their teams.
- 6.4 These plans are aggregated into a single over-arching **Education Strategic Plan (ESP)**, the goals of which are set out in Section 2.

## SECTION 7

### KEY OBJECTIVES FOR THE DEPARTMENT

- 7.1 The following sets out the key issues to guide the prioritisation of the resources available to the service and to ensure they are maximised accordingly. It also sets out the key areas with significant budget implications and which form part of the overall strategy.
- To address the Corporate Plan priority for education.
  - To reflect the emerging needs and priorities of the new departmental configuration.
  - To reflect the funds to be directly allocated to schools through the new established Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) as appropriate in the context of the Department's revenue strategy.
  - To address the transfer of resources from the City Council's budget to the DSG.
  - To continue to prioritise a high level of funding for our schools and for departmental support for them, (ESP 5).
  - To reflect the principle of self-managing, self-evaluating schools.
  - To continue to scrutinise demand-led budgets to ensure the level of resources in schools is maximised.
  - To ensure available schools funds are most effectively targeted through the LMS formula to support the addressing of the Raising Attainment targets in the Education Strategic Plan (ESP), and the objective to narrow attainment gaps and tackle under-achievement for particular groups of pupils (ESP 14).
  - To review the LMS formula generally to ensure it addresses school issues and funding priorities and specifically in the areas of new schools social deprivation, SEN, and small schools protection; and to continue to consider the implications specifically for School Workforce reform.
  - To continue to implement three-year school budgets and a policy on use of school balances (ESP 5).
  - To ensure funding to support the proposals to transform and modernise provision across the City – secondary (ESP 7 and 8), special (ESP 9) and primary (ESP 11).

- To secure resources to support the priority (ESP 10) to develop a strategy for West Leicester with a focus on New College, to include external funding.
- To ensure schools are well placed to address ESP objective 12 to improve teacher supply, recruitment and retention, and remodel the school workforce.
- To ensure funds are appropriately targeted to enable attendance and behaviour targets to be met (ESP 2).
- To ensure that the youth service meets its ESP 20 funding targets.
- To maintain the current level of expenditure for Adult and Family Learning (ESP 21), or at a level funded by LSC.
- To ensure the library service meets its ESP 22 targets.
- To continue to secure funding for a network of Children's Centres and further develop a network of extended schools (ESP 23).
- To negotiate pooled budgets under Section 31 (Health Act) in developing a federation (Children's Trust) of children's services (ESP 18).
- To assess and address, as appropriate, the ending of grant regimes, in particular NRF and Standards Fund grants.
- To ensure all income streams are maximised and well focussed.
- To continue to give a high scrutiny profile to all budgets which carry a significant risk element – statementing, independent school placements, recoupment, and premature retirement and compensation, (Schools Block); and transport (LEA Block).
- To continue to strengthen financial management and control in the Department.
- To address Gershon efficiency and Council savings targets.
- To ensure schools are well supported and challenged as appropriate in making the best use of their resources in the context of self-managing, self-evaluating schools.
- To maximise external sources of revenue to supplement Council resources and to ensure all such resources are well aligned and focussed on priorities.

- To continue to develop the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) project.
- To support the establishing of new schools – Queensmead, Bendbow/Crescent, Madani High School, Samworth Academy.

## **SECTION 8**

### **OVERVIEW OF THE BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR 2006/07 TO 2008/09**

#### **Introduction**

- 8.1 The proposals for the three-year budget strategy are set out in Sections 12 and 13.
- 8.2 The proposals:
- Reflect the pressures outlined in the preceding Sections, where the detail behind the proposals can be found, in particular meeting CPA targets;
  - Achieve a balance between the requirements to provide effective, efficient services and the resources available through specific grants and from the Council; and
  - Stay within the overall funding total to which the Department has been asked to work, and take full account of expected changes in specific grants from the Government;
  - Address the need to secure savings of £1.3 million to meet the ongoing over-commitment in the Lifelong Learning and Community Development budget;
  - Reflect the fact that a significant part of the Department's budget is chargeable to the Schools Block;
  - Reflect the fact that a number of areas of the budget cannot be cut as they are continuing irreversible commitments, e.g. PRC, or recharges subject to the BIP review;
  - That it would not be prudent to cut provision supporting Standards Fund expenditure as grant income would be lost;
  - That the resulting sum from which savings can be produced is significantly reduced.

#### **Overarching Themes and Links**

- 8.2 The proposals reflect a number of key overarching themes:
- National service priorities
  - Local priorities to maintain and develop services
  - The need to make best use of external funding, charges to service users and to continue to seek efficiency savings; and

## **Managing these Pressures**

- 8.3 The accumulated effect of the action taken to manage budget pressures since Local Government Reorganisation in 1997 means that only limited further options remain to absorb the new pressures. These options proposed can be summarised as:
- Withdraw services or close facilities.
  - Raise eligibility criteria for services.
  - Reduce quality (staffing levels, opening hours)
  - Increases in charges.
  - Efficiency gains in administration and staff.
- 8.4 The proposals in this Strategy are focussed on:
- Maximising Government grant and other external income.
  - Increasing income from charges, within the amount that individuals are assessed as being able to afford to pay.
  - Reconfiguring the way services are delivered to enable service users' needs to be met at less cost and in a more modern way.
  - Efficiency savings on administrative and support costs.
- 8.5 However, any further savings requirement would mean that service reductions or raised eligibility criteria would have to be considered.
- 8.6 Further efficiency savings are required from within the Business Improvement Programme. The Integrated Services Programme includes a reductions target.

## SECTION 9

### CASH TARGET AND SPENDING AND RESOURCE FORECAST

9.1 This section shows the resources available in 2006/07 and the spending changes identified for the next three years.

	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>	<b>£000</b>
Cash Target	194,340	194,340	194,340
Growth	3,032	2,646	2,646
Savings	2,624	5,134	5,154
<b>Net</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>(2,488)</b>	<b>(2,508)</b>



## **SECTION 10**

### **SCHOOLS**

- 10.1 Schools will be in receipt of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) from April 2006. DSG can only be spent on items specified in the Schools Block, i.e. individual schools budgets and certain central services.
- 10.2 There are a number of pressures in that part of the budget held for central (LEA run) services. These are:
  - Independent School Placements.
  - Premature Retirement and Compensation (PRC).
  - Nursery Education Grants (NEG).
  - Pupil Referral Units.
  - Statemented Pupils.
- 10.3 The Schools Forum is charged with agreeing how to meet these pressures within the overall DSG. This has to be agreed by the end of February.
- 10.4 A number of the growth and reduction proposals impact on schools.

## SECTION 11

### RISK ANALYSIS

12.1 A number of risks are inherent in the budget proposals, some of which are highlighted in the preceding sections. This section seeks to draw together the key identified risks.

12.2 The risks include:

- Severe pressure on the budget occurring during the year, due to increasing demand for services and the need to comply with statutory service requirements.
- The funding for independent sector places.
- Corporate initiatives such as the car allowances review and job evaluation have a net unfunded cost to the Department.
- The Directorate is unable to recruit, retain or afford sufficient staff with the required skills and experience.
- A significant overspend on service user transport if the efficiencies anticipated in the corporate review are not delivered; and
- The potential for disruption to usual management arrangements as services move from the current departments into the new departmental structures – particularly if management attention is re-focussed away from managing the service to managing the change, or if there are significant management changes as a result of staff movement or efficiency measures.

12.3 Any further financial restrictions on lower priority services and limited service development and modernisation could also lead to an adverse impact on external inspection reports, departmental star-ratings, and consequently the Corporate Performance Assessment.

12.4 Specific risk on the proposals are annotated on the growth / reduction summary.

## **SECTION 12**

### **GROWTH AND REDUCTION PROPOSALS**

12.1 See Appendix A (Attached).

## **SECTION 13**

### **EQUALITIES**

#### **Background**

- 13.1 The Council has a general duty under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 to promote race equality. This means the Council must have due regard for the need to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and promote good relations between people of different racial groups. The Council has a policy of fully integrating equalities into all aspects of its business and services. It also has a commitment towards the Equality Standard for Local Government, which requires new and reviewed policies to undergo an Equality Impact Assessment at all key stages in the decision-making process.

#### **Equalities Assessment of this Budget Strategy**

- 13.2 This budget strategy has been assessed for equalities implications in the context of all service and spending plans. Details are set out below.

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
<b>LLCD</b>							
G20	G01(KG)	Division wide	Yes	No	No. Implementation of the proposal whilst being an established recovery target will require very careful assessment to reduce impact.	Yes	Formal consultation where required, and negotiation with Stakeholders and unions, as appropriate.
G21	G02 (SG)	Located in Beaumont Leys, has a city-wide remit especially attracting early years and children with parents and grandparents	No	Yes	No, although other external funding streams could be accessed presently the capacity of the project would not be able to realise this within the timescales	No	Monitoring process in place and regular visits form compliance Officer

<b>New proposal reference number</b>	<b>Old proposal reference number</b>	<b>Service users/communities primarily affected</b>	<b>Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?</b>	<b>Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?</b>	<b>Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?</b>	<b>Is there impact on LCC staff?</b>	<b>What control action is proposed?<sup>i</sup></b>
G22	G03 (SG)	Predominately used by the Bangladeshi community, especially children and young people undertaking the GCSE Language Course	No	Yes	Currently there are no other ways of funding this project which transferred from voluntary project status to direct LCC funding	Yes, the tutors are contracted staff	Line Management responsibilities in place.
G23	G04 (SG)	Highfields Centre attracts users for the local community which is a diverse community of racial backgrounds	No	Yes	The bid would allow for the continuing progress to realise the community governance option for the operation of the centre	Yes, the Project Manager is on a temporary contract and other costs will effect advisory staff i.e. Legal and Property	Line Management responsibilities in place

<b>New proposal reference number</b>	<b>Old proposal reference number</b>	<b>Service users/communities primarily affected</b>	<b>Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?</b>	<b>Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?</b>	<b>Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?</b>	<b>Is there impact on LCC staff?</b>	<b>What control action is proposed?<sup>i</sup></b>
G24	G05 (BB)	LEA Employees and Work Place Nursery staff	Yes	No – Both users and staff are aware the future of the WPN is uncertain	This proposal only supports the WPN until August 2006	Yes	A decision regarding the future of the WPN is required early to allow time for consultation with users and staff. Minimum of 3 months notice is required.
G25	G07	Areas of high-level disadvantage, ASB and Youth Service priority groups	N	Y	No. In this case, the objective is to explicitly target more 'vulnerable' service users	Yes. It will partly mitigate the impact of R6b.	Ring-fencing option. Resources to be deployed on basis of service user need.

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
<b>INHERITED DECISIONS</b>							
G28	G11a) (PL)	<b>Psychology Service</b> Disabled Children and those with Learning Difficulties, their families and education providers will be supported by this bid. The post will also contribute to develop the Community Cohesion work of the Psychology Service working with groups from the diverse range of communities in Leicester to support better life outcomes.	N	Y	The proposal to reinstate cuts differentially advantages vulnerable groups by maintaining levels of service provision.	N	If this reversal of cuts is not approved then inevitable reductions in services to vulnerable groups will need to be explained to parents, schools and other agencies.



New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
<b>G28</b>	G11b) (PL)	<b><u>Education Welfare Service</u></b> Vulnerable and disadvantaged groups are the primary service users	N	Y	The proposal to reinstate cuts differentially advantages vulnerable groups by maintaining current levels of service provision.	Yes –this growth bid will avoid need for redundancies.	If this reversal of cuts is not approved then inevitable reductions in services to vulnerable groups will need to be explained to parents, schools and other agencies.
G29	G12 (JS)	Children receiving free home to school transport	No	Yes	Yes	No	N/a
G30	G13 (JS)	Children receiving free home to school transport	No	Yes	Yes	NO	N/a

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
<b>NEW GROWTH REQUIREMENTS</b>							
G32	G17 (PL)	All children/young people	NO	YES – fulfils Council’s commitment to participation in national initiative	NO	Staff currently employed under 3-way agreement with County and Rutland would be affected	Authority will need to explore other methods of complying with Information-sharing requirement.
G33	G19 (PF)	All adults and children living in Braunstone, Hamilton, Humberstone, Netherhall and Thurnby Lodge areas as well as wider city communities.	No	Yes	Yes	No	None required
<b>DEPARTMENT WIDE</b>							

<b>New proposal reference number</b>	<b>Old proposal reference number</b>	<b>Service users/communities primarily affected</b>	<b>Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?</b>	<b>Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?</b>	<b>Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?</b>	<b>Is there impact on LCC staff?</b>	<b>What control action is proposed?<sup>i</sup></b>
R51	R13 (JJ)	Schools. Internal services.	No	Yes	Yes	Staff will need to adopt new ways of working through the use of Information Communications Technologies. This is seen as a positive impact.	A formal PRINCEII project has been established. Schools are involved in the project.
R52	R14 (JG)	Internal customers (staff in E&I)	No	No	Yes	Yes – the working conditions in administrative buildings will be poorer	Careful planning and prioritisation of expenditure – should be easier to plan once the outcome of the accommodation review becomes clearer

<b>New proposal reference number</b>	<b>Old proposal reference number</b>	<b>Service users/communities primarily affected</b>	<b>Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?</b>	<b>Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?</b>	<b>Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?</b>	<b>Is there impact on LCC staff?</b>	<b>What control action is proposed?<sup>i</sup></b>
R53	R15 (TP)	Service-wide	N	N	Yes	Yes. This proposal will require redundancy or redeployment of a staff member	Rationalised service must take account of the needs of respective client groups (e.g, access, language provision, confidential interview facilities, etc)
R54	R16 (GS)	None	N	N	Yes	No.	

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
<b>LIFELONG LEARNING</b>							
R55	R22	Southfields area	Y (low)	N	No	Yes	Careful deployment of opening hours to ensure suitable access for all sectors of the community and provision for 'vulnerable' users. Redeployment option for staff at risk.
R56	R18	People in the Hamilton area with limited mobility (very small number)	Y (low)	N – but a good case for promoting as raising standard of local provision	No	Yes	Library users with limited mobility can be assessed for a place on the Library Minibus service. Redeployment option for staff at risk

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
R57	R21	Fosse area	Y (low)	N	No	Yes	Careful deployment of opening hours to ensure suitable provision for 'vulnerable' users. Redeployment option for staff at risk.
R57	R21a	None	N	N	Yes	Yes	New staff timetables and reallocation of duties to ensure continuity of provision

<b>New proposal reference number</b>	<b>Old proposal reference number</b>	<b>Service users/communities primarily affected</b>	<b>Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?</b>	<b>Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?</b>	<b>Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?</b>	<b>Is there impact on LCC staff?</b>	<b>What control action is proposed?<sup>i</sup></b>
R58	R20	Thurnby Lodge area - older people, people with mobility problems, carers with young families	Y (low)	N – but a good case for promoting as raising standard of local provision	No	Yes	Alternative, self-service provision at the local community centre and nearby Children's Centre for 'vulnerable' users. Redeployment option for staff at risk.
R59	R19	Stocking Farm area – older people, people with mobility problems, carers with young families	Y (low)	N	No	Yes	Alternative, self-service provision at the local community centre for 'vulnerable' users. Redeployment option for staff at risk.

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
R60	R23 (BB)	Early Years Service Middle Managers	Yes	No	Yes. It is not envisaged these changes will impact directly upon service users.	Yes. This proposal is based on realigning Early Years Middle Managers	Sensitive early consultation with staff on the options for the proposed new management structures.
<b>POLICY AND RESOURCES</b>							
R61	R24 (BW)	None	N	N	Yes		
R62	R25 (JJ)	Internal service only	No	Yes	Yes	Impact on the substantive post holder.	Protocol review.
<b>OTHER</b>							
<b>R63</b>	R01	Elderly people (travelling distance, suitable transport)  People with mental health problems	Y	N	No. Implementation of the proposal will need careful and sensitive assessment to minimise impact	Yes - minor	Formal consultation on the proposals, and negotiations with local community groups on options



New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
R63	R02	Service-wide	N	N	Yes	No	Consultation on reduction to minimise objection
R64	R04	Service-wide for Adventure Playground element  BME and LGB young people for the Youth Service element	Y (low to medium)	N	No. Implementation of the proposal will need careful and sensitive assessment to minimise impact	No	Analysis of need/impact on a project-by-project basis.  Advice to projects on securing balance through efficiency savings
R65	R05	Service-wide	N	N	Yes	Yes - minor	Priority for sickness absence cover to be given to disabled staff
<b>LIFELONG LEARNING</b>							

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
R66	R27 (PF)	Schools who buy into Library Services to Education Provided by Leicestershire County Council	Yes	No	Yes	No	Education Department to work with the County to achieve withdrawal from the joint arrangement and ensure effective communication to city schools of implications.
R67	R28	None	N	N	Yes	Yes	Redeployment option for staff at risk.
R68	R29	Bengali community	Y	N	Yes. With proactive control measures	Yes	A range of initiatives to ensure suitable provision for 'vulnerable' users. Consultation with the Bengali community

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
R69	R30	None	N	N	Yes	Yes	Redeployment option for staff at risk.
<b>EXTERNAL SERVICES</b>							
R70	R31 (JS)	Special needs children and special schools	Yes	No	No	No	Close monitoring of exceptional transport requests and collaboration with other budget holders
<b>OTHER</b>							

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
R74	R06b	Service-wide	N	Y	Yes	Yes – may impact disproportionately on female staff	Formal consultation with staff and unions. Ring-fencing option. Redeployment option.
R78	R07	Communities served by participating primary schools	<i>This issue is not addressed.</i>	N	Yes. The intention is to work with schools to become self-financing.	<i>This issue is not addressed.</i>	None

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
R79	R08	Mums on low-income. BME communities.	Y	N	No. The move to a traded arrangement will result in increased costs for service users	Yes – will impact disproportionately on female staff	Extensive consultation with local communities, staff and other stakeholders on the proposals and options for alternative provision (e.g. childminding)
<b>LIFELONG LEARNING</b>							

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
R80	R09	Those served by voluntary sector projects currently funded through grant aid	Y	N	No. Implementation of the proposal will need careful and sensitive assessment to minimise impact	No	Analysis of need on a project-by-project basis in consultation with VCS under the terms of an emerging Compact and commissioning agreement
<b>PUPIL AND STUDENT SUPPORT</b>							
R81	R35 (JS)	Excluded children and their families	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Hard to place protocol plus more use of exclusions booklets
<b>POLICY AND RESOURCES</b>							

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
R82	R36	Service-wide, especially those for whom legal protection has only recently been extended (e.g. people with disabilities, GLB people, people of religious belief, older people)	Y	N	Yes – with specified controls	Only indirectly – lack of consistent advocacy for people who are currently under-represented in the authority's workforce	Briefing to all departmental managers on the change in implementation strategy. Delegation of residual functions, including incorporation into appraisal targets
R83	R37 (GS)	Service-wide	N	N	Yes		
R84	R38 (JJ)	Internal service only	Yes	No	No	Impact on one substantive post holder.	Protocol review.
R85	R39 (JG)	All - but predominantly young people	Yes - by some increased financial risk and loss of opportunity	Yes - by some reduction in bureaucracy	No – but it may not be evident	No– loss of one post currently occupied by agency staff	Reduce team workload by reducing level of speculative funding bids.

New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
<b>EXTERNAL SERVICES</b>							
R86	R40	Post-16 students with SEN in receipt of mobility allowance (n=184)	Y (high)	N	No	<b>None specified</b>	Consultation with service users. Advice to service users on securing alternative sources of support. Appeals mechanism for cases of exceptional hardship.



New proposal reference number	Old proposal reference number	Service users/communities primarily affected	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as adverse?	Is impact of proposal likely to be perceived as favourable?	Can the objective be achieved without a differential impact upon service users?	Is there impact on LCC staff?	What control action is proposed? <sup>i</sup>
R87	R43	<p>Secondary school children travelling to Babington, Hamilton, Judgemeanow, Riverside and City of Leicester schools.</p> <p>Predominance of low income, recent immigrants, poor attenders amongst those travelling to Babington and Hamilton</p>	Y (high)	N	No	<b>None specified</b>	<p>Consultation with service users. Advice to service users on public transport, promotion of parental responsibility for school attendance.</p>

e.g. consultation on the proposals with relevant 'experts', revised proposals, briefing service users on the reasons for the decision, enhanced monitoring of service impact

---