

## **Social Care and Safeguarding Division Budget Summary 2011/12**

### **1. Summary**

- 1.1 The Social Care and Safeguarding Division is responsible for providing the City Council's statutory response to children in need, children in need of safeguarding and children in care, as defined by the 1989 and 2004 Children Acts.
- 1.2 Safeguarding pressures have been recognised by the Council and £750K growth is proposed in the budget.
- 1.3 Four grants totalling just over £1.5M previously received as part of the former Area Based Grant will also transfer into the Council's formula grant. This is not new money and there will be a net reduction of £150K which will be absorbed by the division.
- 1.4 Savings in 2011/12 total £306K are around management and transport efficiencies.

### **2 Background**

- 2.1 Throughout 2010/11 the division has been dealing with a significant increase in workload. There has been a 40% rise in referral rates and a rise in the number of children subject to Child Protection Plans and those involved in care proceedings. These safeguarding pressures have been recognised by the council and £750K growth is proposed in the budget. £500K reflects the level of overspend the division is dealing with and £250K is because of the safeguarding pressures the division is experiencing.
- 2.2 In the budget proposals are four grants currently received as part of the Area Based Grant settlement that will transfer into the Council's formula grant and thus become part of the base budget. These are the grants for Children in Care (Care Matters), Child Death Review Processes, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and the Carers Grant. This is not new money and the Chief Finance Officer has estimated that there will be a total reduction of £150k and plans are already in place to ensure that children's services absorbs these cuts and delivers the services within existing resources. All of the grants ensure that the Council meets its statutory obligations in relation to some of our most vulnerable children.
- 2.3 The Council has recognised that it would not be possible to run safe and robust services if the funding available to the division was to reduce significantly. As a result, the division has identified potential savings that are achievable with minimal impact on the Council's ability to keep children safe. These savings in 2011/12 total £306K and are around management and transport efficiencies.

### **3 Rationale for savings proposed**

- 3.1 Whilst the Council has protected front line services provided by Social Care and Safeguarding, the division is still required to make a contribution to the council efficiency savings. The priority was to protect front line staff across the division and front line managers particularly in fieldwork and within all the looked after children services.
- 3.2 Savings in 2011/12 total £306K and are around management and transport efficiencies.
- 3.3 In terms of transport savings, we have already reviewed transport arrangements to ensure that we only commission transport for children in care and that more systematic, regular reviews of all arrangements take place. We are also going to properly remunerate foster carers for providing transport to children in care, which will both reduce costs and improve quality.
- 3.4 In relation to management efficiencies, we propose to achieve a number of efficiencies across the division through the deletion of 2 Service Manager posts and 2.5 Team Manager posts. These are in the areas of Specialist Family Support, the Family Change Service in Fieldwork, the Hospital Social Work Team and the Children and Family Support Team.
- 3.5 There will also be a 10% reduction in the former Area Based Grant provided to improve the Children's Social Care Workforce. This grant now sits within the Early Intervention Grant.

### **4 Risk Assessment**

- 4.1 Overall the Council has recognised in the proposed budget that it would not be possible to run safe children's social care services if the funding available to the division was to reduce significantly. As a result, the division has identified potential savings that are achievable with minimal impact on the Council's ability to keep children safe. This approach was accepted by the Council and informed the budget planning for the division.
- 4.2 The Management efficiencies proposed in the budget are assessed not to have any adverse implications on service delivery. The proposed efficiencies are linked with wider reviews taking place across Investing in our Children, such as the 0-19 strategic review and the review completed in the Duty and Assessment Service.
- 4.3 The 10% cut to the Children's Social Care Workforce grant will not reduce the number of staff seconded to social work programmes and supported by the Council.

## **5 Equality Impact Assessment**

- 5.1 Impact assessments completed show that the proposed budget cuts are not anticipated to have any adverse impact on any specific staffing groups or in terms of service delivery impacting on any groups within the local community.

**Budget 2011/12**  
**Social Care & Safeguarding**  
**(Councillor Dempster)**

		2011/12 £000	2012/13 £000	2013/14 £000
	<b>Grant Transfers:</b>			
	Children in Care / Care Matters	348	348	348
	Child Death Review Process	50	50	50
	CAMHS	840	840	840
	Carers' - children's element	329	329	329
	<b>Budget Pressures:</b>			
SCS G1	Social Care & Safeguarding	750	750	750
SCS G2	Grant Loss on Transfers	142	142	142
	<b>Proposed savings:</b>			
SCS R1	Review arrangements for contact transport	(104)	(125)	(125)
SCS R2	Delete Specialist Family Support Service Manager post	(55)	(55)	(55)
SCS R3	Reduce Service Manager capacity within Fieldwork Family Change Service by deleting one of two posts	(37)	(55)	(55)
SCS R4	Relocation of LRI SW team to DAS and delete a Team Manager post	(48)	(48)	(48)
SCS R5	Delete half a Team Manager post in Specialist Family Support	(16)	(24)	(24)
SCS R6	Delete one of two Team Managers in Children and Family Support Team	(32)	(48)	(48)
SCS R7	Absorb losses on mainstreamed grants (offsets SCS G2)	(150)	(150)	(150)
SCS R8	Reduce funding for Social Care Workforce Development by 10%	(14)	(14)	(14)
	<b>Total Net Growth</b>	<b>2,003</b>	<b>1,940</b>	<b>1,940</b>

**SOCIAL CARE AND SAFEGUARDING DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA Divisional</b>	<b>Proposal No: SCS G1</b>
--------------------------------	----------------------------

**Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:**

The Division continues to be under significant pressure, and requires additional funding to ensure that appropriate safeguarding arrangements are in place, covering both social work staffing, placements and other support services. The growth would offset the current overspend and provide for further demand pressures in 2011/12.

**Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)**

Service Improvement

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

This additional funding for safeguarding pressures would be deployed in those areas where there is particular pressure and capacity difficulties. For example, this would include increasing Team Manager capacity in the Child Protection and Proceedings Service by two Team Managers, an additional Independent Chair and up to four newly qualified social workers.

**Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication**

**Date:**

**Financial Implications of Proposal**

<b><u>2010-11</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b>
<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>£000s</u></b>

**Effects of Changes on budget**

	Existing Budget	Proposed Addition		
Staff	19,023	270	270	270
Non Staff Costs	14,944	480	480	480
Income	(555)			
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>33,412</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>750</b>
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Extra post(s) (FTE)		6	6	6

**SOCIAL CARE AND SAFEGUARDING DIVISION**  
**BASE BUDGET GROWTH PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b>		<b>Proposal No: SCS G2</b>		
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Project(s) Growth:</u></b></p> <p>Four Government grants relating to Social Care and Safeguarding transfer into the Council's Formula Grant, but the amount transferred is £142,000 less than the sum of the individual grants. The grants are Care Matters, Child Death Review Processes, CAMHS and the Carers Grant. Savings proposal SCS R7 refers.</p>				
<b><u>Type of Growth (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Other				
<b><u>Service implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
None identified.				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				Date: <input type="text" value="April 2011"/>
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Proposed Transfers</b>	<b>Proposed Addition</b>		
Staff				
Non Staff Costs	1,567	142	142	142
Income				
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>1,567</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>142</b>
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		N/A	N/A	N/A
Extra post(s) (FTE)		N/A	N/A	N/A

**SOCIAL CARE AND SAFEGUARDING DIVISION  
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Divisional		<b>Proposal No:</b> SCS R1			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b>					
To facilitate transport for children to and from contact sessions (e.g. with a parent)					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>            We have reviewed transport arrangements to ensure that we only commission transport for children in care and that more regular, systematic review of transport takes place for each child. In addition, we propose to increase the remuneration to foster carers for providing transport to and from contact, which we estimate would be significantly better value than commissioning a taxi and ultimately better for the child.</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>            We have reviewed transport arrangements to ensure that we only commission transport for children in care and that more regular, systematic review of transport takes place for each child. In addition, we propose to increase the remuneration to foster carers for providing transport to and from contact, which we estimate would be significantly better value than commissioning a taxi and ultimately better for the child.</p>
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>            We have reviewed transport arrangements to ensure that we only commission transport for children in care and that more regular, systematic review of transport takes place for each child. In addition, we propose to increase the remuneration to foster carers for providing transport to and from contact, which we estimate would be significantly better value than commissioning a taxi and ultimately better for the child.</p>					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>					
Efficiency					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>No adverse service implications are envisaged.</td> </tr> </table>					No adverse service implications are envisaged.
No adverse service implications are envisaged.					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>					
				Date: <input type="text" value="April 2011"/>	
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14 £000s</u></b>	
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff					
Non Staff Costs	1,252	(104)	(125)	(125)	
Income					
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>1,252</b>	<b>(104)</b>	<b>(125)</b>	<b>(125)</b>	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		n/a			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		n/a			
Current vacancies (FTE)		n/a			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		n/a			

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

### SCS R1 – Review Arrangements for Contact Transport

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: The proposal is to reduce Transport costs by 10%. These costs are incurred in transporting mainly Young People in the care of the local authority to school, contact and other key events. It is anticipated that these savings can be made by a combination of review of current arrangements and strict adherence to guidelines for approval of transport. On this basis it is not anticipated that any group and young people in the care of the Authority as a whole will experience a negative impact.</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? Careful review of services required and how they can be delivered in a cost effective way.</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: These proposals will not impact on any particular area of the city.</b>
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: These proposals will not impact on any one gender more than the other. There is a rough equivalence of male/female in terms of the 'children looked after' population.</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? No negative impact foreseen.</b>



<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk. It is not anticipated that disabled children in the care of the local authority will experience a negative impact by these proposals</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? Any possible impact will be mitigated by careful review of need and how that need is met.</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk No, it is not anticipated that there will be any impact in relation to Community cohesion.</b>

**SOCIAL CARE AND SAFEGUARDING DIVISION  
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Divisional		<b>Proposal No:</b> Below		
<b>Purpose of Service</b> Social work support to children and families    Proposals: SCS R2 / R3 / R4 / R5 / R6				
<p><b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>  <b>Management Efficiencies</b>          It is proposed to achieve a number of management efficiencies across the Division, through the deletion of 2 Service Manager posts and 2.5 Team Managers. These are in Specialist Family Support, Fieldwork Family Change Service, Hospital Social Work and the Children and Family Support Team.</p>				
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Efficiency				
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
<p>No adverse service implications are envisaged and EIAs are not required for the management efficiencies as no equalities implications are envisaged. The proposed efficiencies are linked with wider review processes, e.g. the 0-19 strategic review and the relocation of the Social Work Team at the Leicester Royal Infirmary to the Duty and Assessment Team at the Greyfriars base.</p>				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				Date: <input type="text" value="March 2011"/>
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>		
Staff	4,373.4	(188)	(230)	(230)
Non Staff Costs				
Income				
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>4,374.4</b>	<b>(188)</b>	<b>(230)</b>	<b>(230)</b>
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)				
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		4.5	4.5	4.5
Current vacancies (FTE)		3.5	3.5	3.5
Individuals at risk (FTE)		1	1	1

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

### SCS R3 – Reduce Service Manager Capacity in the Fieldwork Family Change Service

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: We are proposing to reduce the number of Service Managers in the 'Fieldwork' service of Social Care and Safeguarding by one. Specifically this will mean a reduction in the Family Change service from two current Service Managers to one. This will affect the current 'service manager' group in fieldwork as a whole and could potentially have a negative impact on the ethnic profile of staff at this level depending on the outcome of the staff reduction process. It will not however negatively impact on the delivery of service to the public or it is anticipated any particular racial group.</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? The staff reduction exercise will apply to all relevant Service managers and take into account their current skills and involve an interview process. It is expected that this will ensure fairness in the eventual outcome.</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: There is no impact on any particular area of the city.</b>
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: There is no indication that there will be a negative impact in relation to gender.</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A</b>

<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk. This proposal will not result in a negative impact in relation to Disabled people.</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A</b>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk No impact on Community cohesion expected.</b>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

### SCS R4 – Relocation of LRI Social Work Team to Duty and Assessment and Delete a Team Manager post.

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> It is proposed to reduce the Team management complement of Duty and Assessment services by one post. This post is currently vacant. It is not anticipated on that basis that there will be any negative impact on any racial group.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?. N/A</b>
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: There is no impact on any particular area of the city</b>
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: There is no expected impact on any particular gender.</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A</b>
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk. There is no expected impact on disabled people as a result of this proposal.</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce</b>

	or remove the negative impact? N/A
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk. There is no expected impact on community cohesion as a result of this proposal.</b>

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

### SCS R6 – Delete one of two Team Managers in Children and Family Support Team

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> The proposal is to reduce a Team Manager in the Children and Family support Team from two to one. There is no proposal to reduce the operational role and function of the team. These posts are currently filled. The service provided by this team is a therapeutic service for children who are vulnerable, with Child Protection plans or Looked After. This applies to children across all racial groups It is not anticipated that there will be any negative impact on any racial group. All communities are serviced by this team across the city.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? The staff reduction exercise will only apply to two Team Managers. However, it is anticipated that the displaced Team Manager will be slotted into a Team Manager vacancy within the children’s fieldwork service.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk: There is no impact on any particular area of the city.</b>
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> There is no proposal to reduce the operational role and function of the team. Referrals to the team do not prioritise on the basis of gender. Priorities are based on need. There is no expected impact on any particular gender.
	If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact? N/A

<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> There is no proposal to reduce the operational role and function of the team. Referrals to the team include disabled children and children whose parents/carers are disabled. There no expected impact on disabled people /children.
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> N/A
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> There is no proposal to reduce the operational role and function of the team. All communities are serviced by this team across the city. There is no expected negative impact on community cohesion.



**SOCIAL CARE AND SAFEGUARDING DIVISION  
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Divisional		<b>Proposal No:</b> SCS R7		
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b>				
To safeguard Children and Young People				
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> It is proposed to absorb the loss on mainstreamed Government grants (SCS G2) by prioritising spending and managing the overall resources available to the Division.				
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>				
Efficiency				
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>				
No adverse service implications are envisaged and no EIA is required.				
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>				
				<b>Date:</b> April 2011
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13 £000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14 £000s</u></b>
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>				
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>		
Staff	19,023			
Non Staff Costs	14,944	(150)	(150)	(150)
Income	(555)			
<b>Net Total</b>	<b>33,412</b>	<b>(150)</b>	<b>(150)</b>	<b>(150)</b>
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Current service staffing (FTE)		n/a		
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		n/a		
Current vacancies (FTE)		n/a		
Individuals at risk (FTE)		n/a		

**SOCIAL CARE AND SAFEGUARDING DIVISION  
BASE BUDGET REDUCTION PROPOSAL 2011-12**

<b>SERVICE AREA</b> Divisional		<b>Proposal No:</b> SCS R8			
<b><u>Purpose of Service</u></b>					
To safeguard Children and Young People					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b>            It is proposed to reduce by 10% the spending on Development of the Social Care Workforce previously supported by a separate grant in the Area Based Grant and which is now part of the new Early Intervention Grant.         </td> </tr> </table>					<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> It is proposed to reduce by 10% the spending on Development of the Social Care Workforce previously supported by a separate grant in the Area Based Grant and which is now part of the new Early Intervention Grant.
<b><u>Details of Proposed Reduction:</u></b> It is proposed to reduce by 10% the spending on Development of the Social Care Workforce previously supported by a separate grant in the Area Based Grant and which is now part of the new Early Intervention Grant.					
<b><u>Type of Reduction (delete as appropriate)</u></b>					
Efficiency					
<b><u>Service Implications (including impact on One Leicester) &amp; link to SIEP (service plan)</u></b>					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>No specific implications are envisaged, the reduction will be achieved by prioritising and targeting training and development.</td> </tr> </table>					No specific implications are envisaged, the reduction will be achieved by prioritising and targeting training and development.
No specific implications are envisaged, the reduction will be achieved by prioritising and targeting training and development.					
<b><u>Date of earliest implication/ date of proposed implication</u></b>					
				Date: <input type="text" value="April 2011"/>	
<b><u>Financial Implications of Proposal</u></b>	<b><u>2010-11</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2011-12</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2012-13</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	<b><u>2013-14</u></b> <b><u>£000s</u></b>	
<b>Effects of Changes on budget</b>					
	<b>Existing Budget</b>	<b>Proposed Reduction</b>			
Staff	<b>(ABG)</b>				
Non Staff Costs	140	(14)	(14)	(14)	
Income					
<b>Net Total</b>	140	(14)	(14)	(14)	
<b>Staffing Implications</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	
Current service staffing (FTE)		n/a			
Post(s) deleted (FTE)		n/a			
Current vacancies (FTE)		n/a			
Individuals at risk (FTE)		n/a			

## Budget Equality Impact Assessment

### SCS R8 - reduce funding for Social Care Workforce Development by 10%

<b>Race equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by one/some racial groups and not by other racial groups? Racial groups to consider include White as well as Black Minority Ethnic groups. If yes, which group(s) will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> <b>The proposal is to reduce the Children's Social Care Workforce grant by 10%. This grant is used to support members of the children's workforce to train as qualified social workers. A 10% reduction in the grant will not impact on the number of individuals this grant supports so will not have a negative impact on any specific group of staff.</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> Not applicable – no negative impact anticipated.
	If the proposal impacts on a particular area of the city, are there any race equality implications because of the racial composition of the particular area?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> <b>A 10% reduction in the grant will not impact on the number of individuals this grant supports so will not have a negative impact on any specific group of staff.</b>
<b>Gender equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced more by one gender and not the other gender? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk:</b> <b>This grant is used to support members of the children's workforce to train as qualified social workers. A 10% reduction in the grant will not impact on the number of individuals this grant supports so will not have a negative impact on any specific group of staff.</b>
	<b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b> Not applicable – no negative impact anticipated
<b>Disability equality</b>	Will the proposal result in negative impacts likely to be experienced by disabled people (for any impairment across the range of impairments experienced by disabled people)? If yes, who will be affected and how will they be affected?
	<b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b> <b>This grant is used to support members of the children's workforce to train as qualified social workers. A 10% reduction in the grant will not impact on the number of individuals this grant supports so will not have a negative impact on any specific group of staff.</b>

	<p><b>If there is a negative impact, what can be done to reduce or remove the negative impact?</b></p> <p>Not applicable – no negative impact anticipated</p>
<b>Community Cohesion</b>	<p>Will the proposal negatively impact on community cohesion or exacerbate any of the underlying causes of community division in the city?</p>
	<p><b>Your assessment of impact/risk</b></p> <p>Not applicable – no negative impact anticipated</p>