| Priority: Tal  | king Up  | Leiceste  | ər   |   |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Outcomes:  |  |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Describes the key  | outcomes   | and specific  | c measu  | res/targets   | s that this  | s Priority E  | Board is se   | eking to deliver  |   |
| Outcome: NI 5 Ir   | ncrease the  | percentage  | e of peop  | ole satisfie  | d with th  | eir area  |   |   |   |
| Current performance  | 71.7%  | Targets   | 10/11  | 80%   | 11/12  | 82%   | 12/13   | 84%   |   |
| Outcome: NI 10<br>attend   | Visits to Mu<br>ded a muse   |   |  |   |  |   |   | cal area who sa   | ay they have  |
| Current performance  | 42.4%  | Targets   | 10/11  | 43.4%   | 11/12  | 44.4%   | 12/13   | 45.4%   |   |
| Outcome: NI 11<br>arts a   | Engagemer<br>t least 3 tim   |   |  |   | ult popula   | ation in a l  | ocal area   | that have engag   | ged in the  |
| Current performance  | 32.1%  | Targets   | 10/11  | 33.1%   | 11/12  | 34.1%   | 12/13   | 35.1%   |   |
| Evaluation of pe   |  |   |  |   |  |   |   |   | . , .   |
| What progress ha<br>in relation to the k   |  |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| Currently about 7<br>is below the avera<br>reputation for talki<br>country to improve<br>To promote a sen  | age for Engl<br>ing itself dov<br>e and reside   | and but bet<br>wn. The Lei<br>ents to be p  | ter than<br>icester P<br>roud of t   | in the last<br>artnership<br>he city.   | t survey t<br>o wants t  | hat asked<br>he city's re   | this ques<br>eputation r  | tion. Leicester h<br>egionally and a  | as a<br>cross the   |
| campaign ' One P<br>Christmas. Local<br>Games in the city  | assion, One pride and n  | e Leicester'<br>ational prof  | with pos<br>file was g   | sters, publ<br>generated  | icity, and<br>by holdi   | events sing the Nat   | uch as this   | s year's One Ma   | gical   |
| Festivals and eve<br>city hosts the larg<br>Leicester Comedy<br>festivals as well a<br>Small Festival in t<br>Curve, LCB Depo<br>Creative industrie<br>in place and our for<br>visitors alike. The<br>Promotions under<br>recently appointed | est Caribbe<br>/ is one of th<br>s music fest<br>he UK. The<br>t and Phoer<br>s are crucia<br>ocus is to pr<br>redevelope<br>took a wide | an carnival<br>ne most suc<br>tivals in De<br>ere has bee<br>nix Square a<br>l for the city<br>rovide excit<br>ed city cent<br>spread man | outside<br>ccessful<br>Montfort<br>n major<br>and work<br>r's future<br>ing and e<br>re is part<br>rketing c | Notting H<br>festivals in<br>t Hall and<br>culture lec<br>c underwa<br>prosperit<br>engaging<br>t of raising<br>ampaign f | ill and the<br>h the UK<br>Gardens<br>d regene<br>by for a n<br>y. Leice<br>cultural p<br>g the prof<br>to promo | e largest E<br>, and Leice<br>. In 2008 :<br>ration with<br>ew conten<br>ster now h<br>programmi<br>file of Leice<br>te the new | Diwali cele<br>ester enjoy<br>Summer S<br>state of the<br>porary ar<br>as a high<br>ing which<br>ester outs<br>developm | brations outside<br>ys Riverside and<br>Sundae was vote<br>he art facilities s<br>t gallery on New<br>quality cultural i<br>attracts local pe<br>ide the city. Leic | India.<br>d Heritage<br>ed the Best<br>such as<br>v Walk.<br>infrastructur<br>ople and<br>cestershire |

But there has not been a consistently strong focus on attracting new businesses from outside the area. In the last year the City and County Councils have worked together well to develop Prospect Leicestershire an economic development company to promote the economy of the whole area.

People who use services, and residents, are consulted regularly by individual public sector organisations within the city. Public meetings are used to talk to residents about specific plans and projects. Meetings are held in wards across the city, led by councillors, so that people have a better opportunity to be involved in decisions that affect them and to voice their concerns. This should help people have a sense of belonging.

Recent investment in Leicester Link, the council's civic newspaper, has resulted in increased availability of information on council and city developments to city residents.

Maintaining positive relations with the local media has been challenging during 2009, with a number of sensitive issues hitting the headlines. But good coverage has been achieved on a number of fronts, including recent exam successes at Leicester schools, new cultural facilities like Phoenix Square, further regeneration plans and awards for other developments.

The ongoing success of initiatives like Highcross Leicester, Curve, the renewal of the city centre and job creation have also had a positive effect on the reputation of the city.

Work has begun on raising the quality of how the council's brand is being applied across the council, along with the quality of the material being produced and made available through the council.

Plans are currently being drawn up for a fundamental review of the council's external website, ensuring it is positioned as a key source of information on council services, events and successes.

# Need analysis:

What has needs analysis in relation to this priority shown in terms of impact our actions are having and where we need to focus in the future. This will include national and local data for example on demand and supply and also data from consultation with communities, service users and other stakeholders. What this might mean in terms of resources.

- Audit Commission Data for Culture and Heritage shows a high cost per head of population when compared to LCC's nearest neighbour authorities, and also to comparable cities
- The high cost compared to residents' satisfaction and usage is because Leicester provides a wide range of cultural activities and facilities either directly or through Grant Aid, including a number of national and regional attractions, museums, theatres and festivals.
- In addition to the scale of activities, and their regional nature, provision is targeted at a very diverse range of traditional and new communities, providing high quality targeted activities with hard to reach communities
- Participation in arts and museums is low in relation to national comparators although local indicators show strong engagement in arts and museums including by hard to reach groups
- 55% of LCC's Arts and Museums users live in the city. Although the demographic spread of users is good, and user satisfaction is high, overall residents' usage and satisfaction are below average for similarly sized regional centres with comparable levels of deprivation.
- 27% of users come from Leicestershire and 18% from further afield. These proportions have increased significantly in recent years, as user figures have grown, demonstrating Leicester's potential as a tourist destination and the contribution of culture to its economic development.
- 7 out of 10 residents say they are 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with the area as a place to live, which is below the average for England but better than in the last survey that asked this question. Poor perceptions of the city will be addressed by the development of a strong One Leicester brand to shift perceptions, as well as enhancing the city's regional and national awareness and position
- The level of information residents had about the about council services and benefits fell in the last residents' survey (2008) – a fall directly matching the change in Leicester Link's positioning as a key source of information caused by a significant reduction in publication frequency. Publication of a new A-Z of council services shortly after the survey, increased investment in Leicester Link and a more proactive approach to celebrating success, should see this position rectified in future surveys.

#### LCC Priority Board Annual Commissioning Statement 2010/11 Same format for all Boards

# Delivery plan for 2010/11: Projects / Programmes

#### Current projects/programmes in the Priority Board portfolio

Projects and programmes which have been agreed and are already underway - these should be listed in priority order.

| Project / Programme title                    | Description of outcomes /<br>target benefits  | Programme /<br>Project Manager | Start<br>date   | End date          | Resourcing position<br>including source of<br>funding                              | Other comments  |
|--|---|--------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|---|
| Replacement City Gallery                     | New Contemporary Art Gallery on<br>New Walk adjacent to New Walk<br>Museum and art gallery, capable<br>of taking regional, national and<br>international exhibitions                      | Mike Candler                   | August<br>2009  | September<br>2011 | Funded from Capital, One<br>–Off Funds, Prudential<br>borrowing and ACE Grant      |   |
| One Leicester Marketing<br>Campaign          | Promotion of Leicester and<br>Development of City Brand   | Tess Booth                     | April<br>2009   | March<br>2010     | External funding to<br>develop the brand, funded<br>by EMDA expires on<br>31/03/10 |   |
| Leicester Castle Feasibility                 | Comprehensive review of options<br>for future use of the Castle and<br>their feasibility following<br>competion of a conservation plan<br>for the site                                    | Sarah Levitt                   | April<br>2009   | December<br>2009  | Jointly funded by City and<br>County Councils                                      | Decision required on way<br>forward following<br>completion of the<br>feasibility study |
| Permanent Big Screen                         | Provision of Big Screen showing<br>both national and local content<br>and the provision of linked<br>activities to London 2012  | Richard Watson                 | January<br>2009 | January<br>2010   | Funded from LCC<br>Revenue and contribution<br>from LOCOG towards<br>installation  | Screen operational but<br>legal contracts<br>outstanding                                |
| Quality of council branding and publications | Review of brand guidelines,<br>material produced and key<br>channels used, along with<br>proactive brand discipline across<br>the council will see the quality of<br>our outputs improve. | Mark Bentley                   | Nov 2009        | Dec 2010          | Funded from existing resources   |   |
|  |   |                                |                 |                   |  |   |

#### LCC Priority Board Annual Commissioning Statement 2010/11 Same format for all Boards

#### **Proposed projects**

Any new projects / programmes which are being proposed.

| Project / Programme title              | Description of outcomes /<br>target benefits   | Estimated cost to<br>deliver  | Funding source | Likely timescales                | Current stage this has reached   |
|--|--|---|----------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Review of Creativity Works             | Improved quality, service and value for money  | To be identified as<br>part of the<br>preferred option<br>business case | ODI programme  | To be completed by<br>April 2011 | Cabinet approval for a new<br>operating model being sought<br>on 25 January 2010 |
| Development of a new Cultural Strategy | High quality cultural facilities and<br>opportunities which support the<br>One Leicester priorities and which<br>are well used and valued by local<br>people | £35,000   | Service budget | Development<br>March 2010 - 2011 | Cabinet Member approval  |
|  |  |   |                |                                  |  |
|  |  |   |                |                                  |  |
|  |  |   |                |                                  |  |
|  |  |   |                |                                  |  |
|  |  |   |                |                                  |  |

### **Service delivery**

#### **Current challenges**

Commentary on current challenges in relation to existing service delivery that supports this priority

- Maximising value for money
- Increasing satisfaction by improving visitor experiences, displays and exhibitions
- Increasing arts and museums participation (NI10 and NI11) by maximising participation by local people through focussed marketing and community engagement and more diverse programming
- Increasing children and young people's participation in culture through the Find Your Talent Pathfinder programme
- Increasing support for community cohesion and economic development through city centre activities/festivals
- Increasing impact of investment in visual arts through replacement of the City Gallery
- Developing place marketing strategy and associated funding streams

#### **Commissioning priorities**

Commentary on commissioning priorities and implications for service delivery where known

We can only succeed by working in partnership to deliver the following

- Champion Leicester using the One Leicester brand to promote Leicester and raise our profile outside the City
- Work with Prospect Leicestershire to develop a place marketing strategy
- Further develop the city's cultural offer with programmes that attract local people and visitors alike
- Develop the city's renowned festivals programme
- Promote pride and celebrate our successes, showing that everyone that Leicester is a great place to live, work and visit.
- Involve and engage with our citizens to promote creative, problem solving approaches, building on work already undertaken in some of our communities like Braunstone
- Develop an active role at the heart of regional policy in key areas that affect our residents

| Describes the areas where the Priority Board has identified efficie | ancies can be achieved in projects/programm | nes activities and | services relatin | a directly to the priority |
|---|---|--------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Description of efficiency   | 2010/11                                     | <u>2011/12</u>     | 2012/13          |                            |
|   | £000s                                       | £000s              | £000s            |                            |
| Cash releasing:   |   |                    |                  |                            |
| Review of Creativity Works  | (100)                                       | (100)              | (200)            | Andy Keeling               |
| Reduced media advertising   | (90)  | (90)               | (90)             | Fiona Skene                |
| Non-cash releasing:   |   |                    |                  |                            |
| Total efficiency savings  | (190)                                       | (190)              | (290)            |                            |

Cash releasing savings should also be reflected at Appendix A.

### **Further work**

Commentary on the further work to be done by the Priority Board to build on this initial commissioning statement

# TALKING UP LEICESTER

|                         | r vision<br>omes | as widely as po<br>in Partnersh<br>businesses<br>organisations : | across the city                      | Leicester:<br>recognised<br>nationally and | s profile is<br>regionally,<br>internationally | as proud as p<br>ci                          | Leicester are<br>ossible of their<br>ty | live work                              | ı great place to<br>< and visit        | have played a<br>leicester a gre                                 | le of leicester<br>part in making<br>nat place to live                        | leicester<br>addressed<br>ideas and<br>disc                     | challenges to<br>have been<br>by generating<br>widespread<br>ussion                          | leicester at<br>regional poli<br>developed thi<br>national and<br>partni | res that place<br>the heart of<br>icy have been<br>ough regional,<br>f international<br>erships | Leicester voice is heard in the<br>key areas that affects its<br>citizens                                |
|-------------------------|------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
|                         | THEMES           |  | Championii                           | ng leicester                               |  | Pi   | romoting pri                            | de & Succe                             | ss                                     | Genera   | ating More I  | deas for the  | Future   | Giv  | /ing leiceste   | r a Louder Voice   |
| Talking Up<br>Leicester | Aims             | One Leicester<br>Brand<br>developed and<br>used widely           | organisations                        | Leicester has<br>a strong<br>profile       | Leicester is<br>recognised<br>internationally  | Leicester is a<br>desirable<br>place to live | residents are                           | Leicester has<br>a thriving<br>economy | Leicester<br>attracts many<br>visitors | Residents are<br>engaged with<br>decision<br>making<br>processes | Leicester<br>people help<br>shape and<br>direct the<br>future of<br>Leicester | Many<br>opportunities<br>to generate<br>ideas and<br>discussion | The<br>successes<br>and<br>achievements<br>of residents<br>are<br>recognised<br>and rewarded | Leicester is at<br>the heart of<br>regional policy                       | Key areas<br>that affects<br>the citizens of<br>leicester are<br>identified and<br>supported    | Representation of Key areas to<br>regional, national and<br>international government and<br>institutions |
|                         |                  | Business Surve<br>done to promot                                 | ey: Proportion tł<br>te Leicester    | ninking enough                             | was being                                      |  |   | NI 5 Satis                             | sfaction with Loo                      | al Area as a Pl  | ace to Live   |   |  | Place Survey<br>improving  | Q2: Which of th   | ese things most needs  |
|                         |                  | NI 7 Environme   | ent for a Thriving                   | Third Sector                               |  | **Residents Su                               | irvey: How Prou                         | d Are you of Le                        | eicester                               | Number of peo<br>Elections)                                      | ple who vote (L   | ocal Elections /  | 'European  |  | urvey: Which of<br>ned with Place \$  | these things have most<br>Survey)  |
|                         |                  |  | Work Employe<br>eicester City Co     |  | to work for my                                 | YouGov Pride (<br>Leicester                  | of Britain Index:                       | Number of resi                         | idents 'proud' of                      | NI 4 % of peop<br>locally  | ile who feel they   | / can influence   | their decisions  |  |   | onal & National resources<br>f EMDA funding allocation to  |
|                         |                  |  | Work Employe<br>ve difference to t   |  |  | Place Survey: I<br>dark                      | How Safe do yo                          | u feel in your lo                      | ocal area after                        | NI 3 Civic Parti   | icipation in the l  | ocal area   |  | **Number of st<br>the region   | trategies led or  | developed by Leicester across  |
| Headline                | measures         |  | Index - Desirabi<br>o be replaced by |  |  | Business Survi<br>do business                | ey: How Good L                          | eicester City is.                      | s as a place to                        | Place Survey (<br>decisions in th                                | Q13: People wh<br>eir local area in   |   |  |  |   | s used as a pilot / pathfinder<br>tives or used as examples of   |
|                         |                  | **Number of pla  | aces One Leice:                      | ster brand is us                           | ed positively                                  | Indices of Mult<br>rank of areas.            | iple Deprivation:                       | Leicester's po                         | sition on the                          | **Number of ci<br>Meetings                                       | tizens engaged  | with Ward Con   | nmunity  |  | and representa<br>iternational part   | tion of Leicester on regional,<br>nerships   |
|                         |                  | **people who re<br>Leicester Bran                                | ecognise and re<br>d                 | spond positively                           | r to the One                                   | Number of peo                                | ple visiting Leice                      | ester                                  |  |  | sidents awarde<br>.g. 'Lord Mayor   |   |  |  |   | s mentioned in a poisitive<br>al and international media.  |
|                         |                  |  |                                      |  | note: **                                       | indicates th                                 | at either the                           | measure do                             | oes not curr                           | ently exist o  | r needs furt  | her develop   | ment - for d   | iscussion  |   |  |

Appendix A

| Bud | Iget Growth & Reduction Proposals                                      |                  |                  |                  |
|-----|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|     |  | 2010/11<br>£'000 | 2011/12<br>£'000 | 2012/13<br>£'000 |
|     | Growth Proposals   |                  |                  |                  |
|     | Total Growth   |                  |                  |                  |
|     | Reduction Proposals  |                  |                  |                  |
| 5   | Review of Creativity Works   | (100)            | (100)            | (200)            |
| 10  | Savings already achieved - advertising                                 | (100)            | (90)             | (90)             |
|     | Sub total efficiency reduction proposals                               | (190)            | (190)            | (290)            |
| 1   | Rationalisation and reorganisation of Arts & Museums Outreach services | (15)             | (50)             | (50)             |
| 2   | Rationalisation and reorganisation of Arts & Museums Learning services | (10)             | (45)             | (45)             |
| 3   | Museum Curatorial services - staffing reduction                        | 0                | (23)             | (23              |
| 4   | Reduce festivals/arts partnership grant funds                          | (11)             | (11)             | (11)             |
| 6   | Music studio at Fosse Arts   | 0                | (19)             | (19              |
| 7   | Museums operational management – staffing reduction                    | (10)             | (35)             | (35)             |
| 8   | Increased income from arts and museums activities                      | 0                | (10)             | (20)             |
| 9   | Rationalisation of museum winter opening hours                         | (15)             | (15)             | (15              |
|     | Sub total other reduction proposals                                    | (61)             | (208)            | (218)            |
|     | Total Reductions   | (251)            | (398)            | (508)            |
|     | Net Growth / (Reduction)   | (251)            | (398)            | (508)            |

#### CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

#### SERVICE AREA – Arts & Museums

Proposal No: 1

#### Purpose of Service:

Arts & Museums Outreach Service - to increase participation in museums

# <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> - Rationalisation and Re-organisation of Arts and Museums outreach work

This proposal reduces the scale and scope of our community engagement work. Discussions are continuing with Children's Services to consider opportunities for more joint working in this area which should reduce the impact of the reduction.

#### Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)

Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Service Reduction/Other

Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)

We will mitigate the impact by building the outreach function more closely into our mainstream museum provision.

| Date of earliest implication/ date of p | proposed im | olication      |                |                |
|---|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|   |             |                | ember 2010     |                |
| Financial Implications of Proposal      | 2009-10     | <u>2010-11</u> | 2011-12        | 2012-13        |
|   | £000s       | £000s          | £000s          | £000s          |
| Effects of Changes on budget            |             |                |                |                |
|   | Existing    | Prop           | osed Reduc     | tion           |
|   | Budget      | -              |                |                |
| Staff                                   | 75          | (15)           | (50)           | (50)           |
| Non Staff Costs                         | 10          |                |                | · · ·          |
| Income                                  | 0           |                |                |                |
| Net Total                               | 85          | (15)*          | (50)           | (50)           |
| Staffing Implications                   |             | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE)          | 2.5         | 2.5            | 2.5            | 2.5            |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE)                   | 1.5         | 1.5            | 1.5            | 1.5            |
| Current vacancies (FTE)                 | 0.5         | 0.5            | 0.5            | 0.5            |
| Individuals at risk (FTE)               | 2           | 2              | 2              | 2              |
|   |             |                | ·              |                |

#### CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

#### SERVICE AREA - Arts & Museums

Proposal No: 2

#### Purpose of Service:

Arts & Museums Learning Service – to support the achievement of outcomes for children and young people

#### <u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u> -- Rationalisation and Re-organisation of Museums Learning Services

Our learning service will continue to be delivered, but from a smaller number of sites ie New Walk Museum, the City Gallery, Newarke Houses, and Jewry Wall. Self directed school visits will continue, however at the Guildhall, Belgrave Hall and Abbey Pumping Station.

<u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u> Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Service Reduction/Other Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)

We will mitigate the impact of the budget reduction by building the remaining learning function more closely into our mainstream museum provision and by using operations officers at sites more for learning development. We will also be working more closely with CYPS to support delivery of this function

| Data of carlingt implication/ data of |              |                |                |                |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Date of earliest implication/ date of | proposea imp |                |                |                |
|                                       |              | Date: Septe    | ember 2010     |                |
| Financial Implications of Proposal    | 2009-10      | 2010-11        | 2011-12        | 2012-13        |
|                                       | £000s        | £000s          | £000s          | £000s          |
| Effects of Changes on budget          |              |                |                |                |
|                                       | Existing     | Prop           | osed Reduct    | tion           |
|                                       | Budget       | -              |                |                |
| Staff                                 | 173          | (10)           | (45)           | (45)           |
| Non Staff Costs                       | 13           |                |                |                |
| Income                                | 59           |                |                |                |
| Net Total                             | 127          | (10)           | (45)           | (45)           |
| Staffing Implications                 |              | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |
| Current service staffing (FTE)        | 3            | 3              | 3              | 3              |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE)                 | 1.5          | 1.5            | 1.5            | 1.5            |
| Current vacancies (FTE)               | 0            | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| Individuals at risk (FTE)             | 1.5          | 1.5            | 1.5            | 1.5            |

| SERVICE AREA - Arts & Museums   |   | Proposa   | II NO: 3   |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| Purpose of Service:   |   |   |  |  |
| Stewardship of the museum biology coll  | ections   |   |  |  |
| Details of Proposed Reduction: - Mus  | eum Curatoria   | I Services –  | Staffing Rec   | luction  |
| Type of Reduction (delete as approp   | priate)   |   |  |  |
| Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Ser  | rvice Reduction   | / <del>Other</del>  |  |  |
| Service Implications (including imp   | act on One Lei  | icester) & liı  | nk to SIEP (   | <u>service</u>   |
| <u>plan)</u>  |   |   |  |  |
| prepare them ourselves as we have dor<br>relevant collections care standards and  | legal requireme   |   |  |  |
|   | posed implicati   | nts.  |  |  |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of pro   | posed implicati   | nts.<br><u>on</u><br>Date: 1/4/11   |  |  |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of pro   | posed implicati   | nts.  | <u>2011-12</u><br>£000s  | 2012-13  |
| relevant collections care standards and   | 2009-10<br>£000s  | nts.<br>on<br>Date: 1/4/11<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s   | 2011-12<br>£000s   | 2012-13<br>£000s                                       |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of pro   | 2009-10<br>£000s  | nts.<br>on<br>Date: 1/4/11<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s   | 2011-12  | 2012-13<br>£000s                                       |
| relevant collections care standards and<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of pro<br>Financial Implications of Proposal<br>Effects of Changes on budget  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget                            | nts.<br><u>on</u><br>Date: 1/4/11<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s<br>Propo                             | 2011-12<br>£000s   | 2012-13<br>£000s                                       |
| Trelevant collections care standards and<br><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of pro</u><br><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u><br><u>Effects of Changes on budget</u>  | 2009-10<br>£000s  | nts.<br>on<br>Date: 1/4/11<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s   | 2011-12<br>£000s   | 2012-13<br>£000s                                       |
| Pate of earliest implication/ date of pro <b>Date of earliest implication/ date of pro Financial Implications of Proposal Effects of Changes on budget</b> Staff (check)         Non Staff Costs  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>46                      | nts.<br><u>on</u><br>Date: 1/4/11<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s<br>Propo                             | 2011-12<br>£000s   | 2012-13<br>£000s                                       |
| The relevant collections care standards and         Date of earliest implication/ date of pro         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff (check)         Non Staff Costs         Income                                    | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>46<br>0                 | nts.<br><u>on</u><br>Date: 1/4/11<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s<br>Propo                             | 2011-12<br>£000s   | 2012-13<br>£000s                                       |
| Televant collections care standards and         Date of earliest implication/ date of pro         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff (check)         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total                      | Existing<br>Budget<br>0   | nts.<br><u>on</u><br>Date: 1/4/11<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s<br>Propo                             | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>Desed Reducti                                | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>on<br>(23)                         |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of pro         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff (check)   | Existing<br>Budget<br>0   | nts.<br>on<br>Date: 1/4/11<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s<br>Propo<br>0<br>0                          | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reducti<br>(23)<br>(23)                 | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>on<br>(23)                         |
| Pate of earliest implication/ date of pro         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff (check)         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>46<br>0<br>0<br>46      | nts.<br><u>on</u><br><u>Date: 1/4/11</u><br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s<br>Propo<br>0<br>0<br>2010-11 | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reducti<br>(23)<br>(23)<br>2011-12      | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>on<br>(23)<br>(23)<br>2012-13      |
| Pate of earliest implication/ date of pro         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff (check)         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications         Current service staffing (FTE) | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>46<br>0<br>0<br>46<br>2 | nts.<br><u>on</u><br>Date: 1/4/11<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s<br>Propo<br>0<br>2010-11<br>2        | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reducti<br>(23)<br>(23)<br>2011-12<br>2 | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>on<br>(23)<br>(23)<br>2012-13<br>2 |

| SERVICE AREA - Arts & Museums  |  | Proposa   | al No: 4  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Purpose of Service:  |  |   |   |  |
| Provision of grants fund to support increa   | ased participat  | ion in the arts   | 5   |  |
| Details of Proposed Reduction: - Arts/   | Festivals par  | tnership gra  | nt funds  |  |
| Reduction in grant funds for participatory   | arts and festiv  | vals.   |   |  |
| Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate as a specific as a specif | <u>riate)</u>  |   |   |  |
| Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Serv  | vice Reduction   | n/ <del>Other</del>   |   |  |
| Service Implications (including impa plan)   | <u>ct on One Le</u>  | eicester) & li  | nk to SIEP (                                    | <u>service</u>                           |
| This reduction can be mitigated by the which can be used for the same purpose.   | •  | eased use of  | f ward comm                                     | ittee funds                              |
| • •  |  |   |   | ittee funds                              |
| which can be used for the same purpose.  | broposed imp<br>2009-10  | <u>Dication</u><br>Date: 1/4/10<br><u>2010-11</u>                     | <u>2011-12</u>                                  | 2012-13                                  |
| which can be used for the same purpose. Date of earliest implication/ date of p Financial Implications of Proposal   | proposed imp   | <u>plication</u><br>Date: 1/4/10                                      | )   |  |
| which can be used for the same purpose. Date of earliest implication/ date of p  | broposed imp<br>2009-10  | Dication<br>Date: 1/4/10<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s                   | <u>2011-12</u>                                  | 2012-13<br>£000s                         |
| which can be used for the same purpose.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff   | eroposed imp<br>2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0                            | Dication<br>Date: 1/4/10<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Prope                 | 2011-12<br>£000s                                | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion                 |
| which can be used for the same purpose.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff       Non Staff Costs   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>31                                      | Dication<br>Date: 1/4/10<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s                   | 2011-12<br>£000s                                | 2012-13<br>£000s                         |
| which can be used for the same purpose.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>31<br>0                                 | Dication<br>Date: 1/4/10<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>(11)         | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>Desed Reduct<br>(11)        | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(11)         |
| which can be used for the same purpose.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>31                                      | Dication<br>Date: 1/4/10<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>(11)<br>(11) | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(11)<br>(11) | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(11)<br>(11) |
| which can be used for the same purpose.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>31<br>0<br>31                           | Dication<br>Date: 1/4/10<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>(11)         | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>Desed Reduct<br>(11)        | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(11)         |
| which can be used for the same purpose.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications         Current service staffing (FTE)   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>31<br>0<br>31<br>0                      | Dication<br>Date: 1/4/10<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>(11)<br>(11) | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(11)<br>(11) | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(11)<br>(11) |
| which can be used for the same purpose.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications         Current service staffing (FTE)         Post(s) deleted (FTE)   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>31<br>0<br>31<br>0<br>31<br>0<br>0<br>0 | Dication<br>Date: 1/4/10<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>(11)<br>(11) | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(11)<br>(11) | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(11)<br>(11) |
| which can be used for the same purpose.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications         Current service staffing (FTE)   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>31<br>0<br>31<br>0                      | Dication<br>Date: 1/4/10<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>(11)<br>(11) | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(11)<br>(11) | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(11)<br>(11) |

#### DEMOCRATIC SERVICES DIVISION BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

#### SERVICE AREA – Creativity Works

Proposal No: 5

#### Purpose of Service:

Design, print and media solutions trading service

#### **Details of Proposed Reduction:**

To review the business and potentially outsource some or all of the existing constituent functions.

#### Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)

Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Service Reduction/Other

# Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)

The review of this area is intended to identify the most appropriate model for service delivery for each constituent function. The make or buy decision will be based on a full option appraisal taking into account the needs and requirements of existing users (namely existing Council services) together with value for money and quality.

Current service staffing consists of 30 FTEs however 15 of these posts are vacant and are temporarily covered by agency staff. This has been a deliberate policy to be able to react to fluctuations in demand and as preparation for the review of the business.

|  |                    | Date:          |                |         |
|--|--------------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Financial Implications of Proposal     | 2009-10            | <u>2010-11</u> | <u>2011-12</u> | 2012-13 |
|  | £000s              | £000s          | £000s          | £000s   |
| Effects of Changes on budget           | · · · ·            | ·              | ·              |         |
|  | Existing<br>Budget | Prope          | osed Reduc     | tion    |
| Staff                                  | 653                |                |                |         |
| Non Staff Costs                        | 1,127              | (100)          | (100)          | (200)   |
| Income                                 | (1,782)            |                |                |         |
| Net Total                              | (2)                | (100)          | (100)          | (200)   |
| Staffing Implications                  |                    | 2010-11        | 2011-12        | 2012-13 |
| Current service staffing (FTE)         | 30                 |                |                |         |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE)                  |                    |                |                |         |
| Current vacancies (FTE) (Agency staff) | 15                 |                |                |         |
| Individuals at risk (FTE)              | 15                 |                |                |         |

| SERVICE AREA - Arts & Museums   |  | Propos  | al No: 6   |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Purpose of Service:   |  |   |  |   |
| Provision of music studio at Fosse Arts   |  |   |  |   |
|   |  |   |  |   |
| Details of Proposed Reduction:  |  |   |  |   |
| Music Studio at Fosse Arts due to high or   | perating costs   | and low leve  | ls of usage.   |   |
| Type of Reduction (delete as approp   | riate)   |   |  |   |
|   |  |   |  |   |
| Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Serv   | lice Reduction   | n <del>/Otner</del>                                 |  |   |
| Service Implications (including impa  | act on One I   | _eicester) &  | link to SIE  | P (service  |
| <u>plan)</u>  |  |   |  |   |
| The My Space young people's hub will  |  | rding studio  | and we will e  | explore the   |
| feasibility of transferring the equipment the   | nere and direc   | ting users to                                       |  | - F   |
|   |  | -   |  |   |
| feasibility of transferring the equipment the provide the equipment the |  | -   | that facility.   |   |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p   | proposed imp   | <u>plication</u><br>Date: Septe                     | that facility.   | ·   |
|   |  | olication   | that facility.   | 2012-13<br>£000s  |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p   | proposed imp<br>2009-10  | Dication<br>Date: Septe                             | that facility.<br>ember 2010<br><u>2011-12</u>   | 2012-13   |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p   | proposed imp<br>2009-10  | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s         | that facility.<br>ember 2010<br><u>2011-12</u>   | 2012-13<br>£000s  |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>98,800   | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s         | that facility.<br>Ember 2010<br>2011-12<br>£000s   | 2012-13<br>£000s  |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>98,800<br>38,000                                       | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s         | ember 2010<br>2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduc   | 2012-13<br>£000s  |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>98,800<br>38,000<br>(54,600)                           | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s         | that facility.<br>Ember 2010<br>2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduc<br>(19)   | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(19)                            |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>98,800<br>38,000                                       | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Prop | that facility.<br><b>2011-12</b><br>£000s<br><b>0sed Reduc</b><br>(19)<br>(19)                                 | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(19)                            |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>98,800<br>38,000<br>(54,600)<br>82,200                 | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s         | that facility.<br>mber 2010<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s<br>osed Reduc<br>(19)<br>(19)<br><u>2011-12</u>         | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(19)<br>(19)<br>2012-13         |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications         Current service staffing (FTE)   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>98,800<br>38,000<br>(54,600)<br>82,200                 | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Prop | that facility.<br>mber 2010<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s<br>osed Reduc<br>(19)<br>(19)<br><u>2011-12</u><br>0.75 | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(19)<br>(19)<br>2012-13<br>0.75 |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications         Current service staffing (FTE)         Post(s) deleted (FTE)   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>98,800<br>38,000<br>(54,600)<br>82,200<br>0.75<br>0.75 | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Prop | that facility.<br>mber 2010<br>2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduc<br>(19)<br>2011-12<br>0.75<br>0.75               | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(19)<br>2012-13<br>0.75<br>0.75 |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications         Current service staffing (FTE)   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>98,800<br>38,000<br>(54,600)<br>82,200                 | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Prop | that facility.<br>mber 2010<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s<br>osed Reduc<br>(19)<br>(19)<br><u>2011-12</u><br>0.75 | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(19)<br>(19)<br>2012-13<br>0.75 |

| SERVICE AREA - Arts & Museums   |   | Proposa   | al No: 7  |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Purpose of Service:   |   |   |   |  |
| Operational management of Museum site   | es  |   |   |  |
| <u> Details of Proposed Reduction: - Muse</u>   | um Operatio   | nal Manager   | nent – Staff I  | Reduction  |
| Reduction from two to one operations ma   | nager posts   |   |   |  |
| Type of Reduction (delete as approp   | riate)  |   |   |  |
| Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Serv   | ice Reductior   | n <del>/Other</del>   |   |  |
| Service Implications (including impac<br>plan)  | ct on One Le  | eicester) & li  | nk to SIEP (  | <u>service</u>   |
| It is considered that this reduction can be<br>other operational staff and new ways of w  |   | re-allocating   | responsibilitie   | es between   |
| other operational staff and new ways of w   | vorking   | olication   |   | es between   |
| other operational staff and new ways of w   | vorking   | _   |   | es between   |
|   | vorking   | olication   |   |  |
| other operational staff and new ways of w<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of p<br>Financial Implications of Proposal  | vorking   | olication<br>Date: Septe  | mber 2010   | 2012-13  |
| other operational staff and new ways of w<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of p<br>Financial Implications of Proposal  | roposed imp<br>2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing   | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s   | ember 2010<br>2011-12   | 2012-13<br>£000s   |
| other operational staff and new ways of w<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of p<br>Financial Implications of Proposal<br>Effects of Changes on budget  | roposed imp<br>2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget   | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Prope                                      | ember 2010<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s<br>osed Reduct  | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion                                 |
| other operational staff and new ways of w<br><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of p</u><br><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u><br><u>Effects of Changes on budget</u><br>Staff  | roposed imp<br>2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing   | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s   | ember 2010<br>2011-12<br>£000s  | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion                                 |
| other operational staff and new ways of w<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of p<br>Financial Implications of Proposal<br>Effects of Changes on budget<br>Staff<br>Non Staff Costs  | roposed imp<br>2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>70                                     | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Prope                                      | ember 2010<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s<br>osed Reduct  | 2012-13<br>£000s   |
| other operational staff and new ways of w<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of p<br>Financial Implications of Proposal<br>Effects of Changes on budget<br>Staff<br>Non Staff Costs<br>Income  | roposed imp<br>2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>70<br>0                                | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Prope                                      | ember 2010<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s<br>osed Reduct  | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(35)                         |
| other operational staff and new ways of w<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of p<br>Financial Implications of Proposal<br>Effects of Changes on budget<br>Staff<br>Non Staff Costs<br>Income<br>Net Total<br>Staffing Implications  | roposed imp<br>2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>70<br>0<br>0                           | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>(10)                              | ember 2010<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(35)                                | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(35)                         |
| other operational staff and new ways of w<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of p<br>Financial Implications of Proposal<br>Effects of Changes on budget<br>Staff<br>Non Staff Costs<br>Income<br>Net Total<br>Staffing Implications<br>Current service staffing (FTE)                          | vorking<br>roposed imp<br>2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>70<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>2 | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Prope<br>(10)<br>(10)<br>2010-11<br>2      | ember 2010<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(35)<br>(35)                        | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion                                 |
| other operational staff and new ways of w<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of p<br>Financial Implications of Proposal<br>Effects of Changes on budget<br>Staff<br>Non Staff Costs<br>Income<br>Net Total<br>Staffing Implications<br>Current service staffing (FTE)<br>Post(s) deleted (FTE) | roposed imp<br>2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>70<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>70<br>2<br>1      | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>(10)<br>(10)<br>2010-11<br>2<br>1 | ember 2010<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(35)<br>(35)<br>2011-12<br>2<br>1   | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(35)<br>2012-13<br>2<br>1    |
| other operational staff and new ways of w<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of p<br>Financial Implications of Proposal<br>Effects of Changes on budget<br>Staff<br>Non Staff Costs<br>Income<br>Net Total<br>Staffing Implications<br>Current service staffing (FTE)                          | vorking<br>roposed imp<br>2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>70<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>2 | Dication<br>Date: Septe<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Prope<br>(10)<br>(10)<br>2010-11<br>2      | ember 2010<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(35)<br>(35)<br><u>2011-12</u><br>2 | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(35)<br>(35)<br>2012-13<br>2 |

| SERVICE AREA - Arts & Museums  |  | Proposa   | al No: 8  |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Purpose of Service:  |  |   |   |   |
| Increase participation in arts and visits t access to Leicester's historic buildings a   |  |   | stewardship o                                   | of and  |
| Details of Proposed Reduction:   |  |   |   |   |
| Increased income from Arts & Museums   | activities   |   |   |   |
| Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate and the second se | <u>riate)</u>  |   |   |   |
| Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Serv  | vice Reductior   | n/Other   |   |   |
|  |  |   |   |   |
| This can be achieved by prioritising fur across the service.<br>Date of earliest implication/ date of p  |  | lication  | me generatin                                    | g activities                                    |
| across the service.  |  |   | me generatin                                    | g activities                                    |
| across the service.  |  | lication  | me generatin<br><u>2011-12</u><br>£000s         | g activities<br><u> <b>2012-13</b></u><br>£000s |
| across the service.  Date of earliest implication/ date of p   | roposed imp<br><u>2009-10</u>  | Dication<br>Date: 2011<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s             | 2011-12<br>£000s                                | 2012-13<br>£000s                                |
| across the service.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget   | roposed imp<br><u>2009-10</u>  | Dication<br>Date: 2011<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s             | <u>2011-12</u>                                  | 2012-13<br>£000s                                |
| across the service.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff   | roposed imp<br><u>2009-10</u><br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0            | Dication<br>Date: 2011<br><u>2010-11</u><br>£000s             | 2011-12<br>£000s                                | 2012-13<br>£000s                                |
| across the service.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0                                  | Dication<br>Date: 2011<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo           | 2011-12<br>£000s                                | 2012-13<br>£000s                                |
| across the service.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income  | roposed imp<br><u>2009-10</u><br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0            | Dication<br>Date: 2011<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo           | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduct                 | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(20)                |
| across the service.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0                                  | Dication<br>Date: 2011<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>0<br>0 | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(10)<br>(10) | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(20)<br>(20)        |
| across the service.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications  | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>0<br>(632)                    | Dication<br>Date: 2011<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo           | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduct                 | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(20)                |
| across the service.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications         Current service staffing (FTE)   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>0<br>(632)<br>0               | Dication<br>Date: 2011<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>0<br>0 | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(10)<br>(10) | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(20)<br>(20)        |
| across the service.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications         Current service staffing (FTE)         Post(s) deleted (FTE)   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>(632)<br>0<br>(632)<br>0<br>0 | Dication<br>Date: 2011<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>0<br>0 | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(10)<br>(10) | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(20)<br>(20)        |
| across the service.          Date of earliest implication/ date of p         Financial Implications of Proposal         Effects of Changes on budget         Staff         Non Staff Costs         Income         Net Total         Staffing Implications         Current service staffing (FTE)   | 2009-10<br>£000s<br>Existing<br>Budget<br>0<br>0<br>(632)<br>0               | Dication<br>Date: 2011<br>2010-11<br>£000s<br>Propo<br>0<br>0 | 2011-12<br>£000s<br>osed Reduct<br>(10)<br>(10) | 2012-13<br>£000s<br>tion<br>(20)<br>(20)        |

#### CULTURAL SERVICES DIVISION BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

# SERVICE AREA - Arts & Museums

Proposal No: 9

#### Purpose of Service:

Increase visits to museums and provide access to Leicester's historic buildings and collections

#### **Details of Proposed Reduction:**

Review of Museum Winter Opening Hours to reflect lower levels of usage at outlying sites.

#### Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)

Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Service Reduction/Other

# <u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) & link to SIEP (service plan)</u>

NB the saving will be made by economies in use of casual staff across all museum and gallery sites through the winter, potentially vacancy savings and voluntary reductions in hours.

| Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication |                |                    |                |                |  |
|--|----------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|--|
|  | Date:          |                    |                |                |  |
| Financial Implications of Proposal                         | <u>2009-10</u> | <u>2010-11</u>     | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |  |
|  | £000s          | £000s              | £000s          | £000s          |  |
| Effects of Changes on budget                               |                |                    |                |                |  |
|  | Existing       | Proposed Reduction |                |                |  |
|  | Budget         |                    |                |                |  |
| Staff  | 15             | (15)               | (15)           | (15)           |  |
| Non Staff Costs  | 0              |                    |                |                |  |
| Income   | 0              |                    |                |                |  |
| Net Total  | 15             | (15)               | (15)           | (15)           |  |
| Staffing Implications (*See note                           |                | <u>2010-11</u>     | <u>2011-12</u> | <u>2012-13</u> |  |
| above)   |                |                    |                |                |  |
| Current service staffing (FTE)                             |                |                    |                |                |  |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE)                                      |                |                    |                |                |  |
| Current vacancies (FTE)                                    |                |                    |                |                |  |
| Individuals at risk (FTE)                                  |                |                    |                |                |  |
|  |                |                    |                |                |  |

#### HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2010-11

| SERVICE AREA – Human Resources  | i -                      | Proposa                 | al No: 10              |                        |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Purpose of Service:   |                          |                         |                        |                        |
| Responsible for the strategic managemer   | nt of the Cour           | ncil's workforc         | е.                     |                        |
| Details of Proposed Reduction:  |                          |                         |                        |                        |
| Reduction in recruitment advertising  |                          |                         |                        |                        |
| Type of Reduction (delete as approp   | <u>riate)</u>            |                         |                        |                        |
| Decisions already taken/Efficiency/Serv   | <del>vice Reductio</del> | n/Other                 |                        |                        |
| Service Implications (including impared plan)<br>75% of job applications are now receit accessibility to this form of media. As su advertising expenditure. | ived on-line             | which indicat           | es the rapid           | growth in              |
| Date of earliest implication/ date of p   | roposed im               | plication               |                        |                        |
| Date: 1 <sup>st</sup> January 2010  |                          |                         |                        |                        |
| Financial Implications of Proposal  | <u>2009-10</u><br>£000s  | <u>2010-11</u><br>£000s | 2011-12<br>£000s       | 2012-13<br>£000s       |
| Effects of Changes on budget  | Existing<br>Budget       | Proposed Reduction      |                        |                        |
| Staff   |                          |                         |                        |                        |
| Non Staff Costs   |                          | (90)                    | (90)                   | (90)                   |
| Income<br>Net Total   |                          | (00)                    | (90)                   | (00)                   |
| Staffing Implications   |                          | (90)<br><b>2010-11</b>  | (90)<br><b>2011-12</b> | (90)<br><b>2012-13</b> |
| Current service staffing (FTE)  |                          | 2010-11                 | 2011-12                | 2012-13                |
| Post(s) deleted (FTE)   |                          |                         |                        |                        |
| Current vacancies (FTE)   |                          |                         |                        |                        |
| Individuals at risk (FTE)   |                          |                         |                        |                        |
|   |                          |                         |                        |                        |