

# Memo

Leicester City Council  
Resources, Access and  
Diversity Department  
Financial Services

To: Cabinet Members  
Education Scrutiny Members  
cc: Andrew Cozens

From: Mark Noble  
Chief Finance Officer  
Directorate, B4

Extn: 7401  
Fax: 2561843  
Email: mark.noble@leicester.gov.uk  
Ref: 9062MNDP  
Date: 8 July 2005

Cabinet, 11 July 2005  
Lifelong Learning - Balancing the Budget

I attach consultation responses from NATFHE and Unison.

I will summarise all consultation responses received, and send Cabinet members a note prior to the weekend.

However, I felt it appropriate to let you have these as soon as possible. They have also been lodged in the members' area. Members are asked to note that the responses deal with the original 42 options discussed in early June, which will not all be implemented if the recommendations in the report are accepted.

An officer response to points made will be included in the report to Cabinet.



Mark Noble  
Chief Finance Officer



## Leicester City Branch

Pilot House, 41 King Street, Leicester LE1 6RN  
Tel: 0116 2993101 Fax: 0116 2248733  
Email: [Unison.Leachester@Virgin.Net](mailto:Unison.Leachester@Virgin.Net)

Andrew Cozens  
Corporate Director Social Care & Health/Deputy Chief Executive  
Leicester City Council  
New Walk Centre (B6)

6<sup>th</sup> July 2005

Dear Mr Cozens

### **LLCD RECOVERY PLAN.**

On behalf of UNISON I would like to thank you and Mark Noble for the understanding shown and the way in which the consultation on the above has been handled in what have been extremely difficult circumstances.

However UNISON are only too aware the impact that major change can have on staff and with the support services review, the onset of children's and adult services divisions we must ensure consultation is meaningful and transparent on both sides.

I enclose UNISON'S response to elected members, which I sincerely hope they will consider so we can carry on working together for the good of all staff in the division and build bridges that have been damaged during the Divisional Organisational Review and subsequent investigation.

Yours sincerely

Gary Garner  
Branch Secretary

Cc:  
Mark Noble – Chief Finance Officer.  
Joint Trade Union Branch Secretaries.  
Mike Brown – UNISON Regional Organiser.  
UNISON Leicester City Branch Executive Committee  
Leicester City Council Elected Members.



### **Leicester City Branch**

Pilot House, 41 King Street, Leicester LE1 6RN

Tel: 0116 2995101 Fax: 0116 2248733

Email: [Unison.LeicesterCity@Virgin.Net](mailto:Unison.LeicesterCity@Virgin.Net)

## **UNISON'S RESPONSE TO THE LIFELONG LEARNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT RECOVERY PLAN**

UNISON has many concerns with the recovery plan the main one is that elected members are being expected to make decisions that will affect front line services and our members livelihoods, with only half the picture in front of them. What is missing from the paper that went to Education Scrutiny and Cabinet is the overall structure of the Division, as such you are being asked to consider options without knowing how any of these options have been selected or how they will impact on staff and services.

We would suggest that you have insufficient information to make such choices and would remind you that it was the lack of information in respect of the Divisional Organisation Review and the consequent budgetary position that has led to this very situation. UNISON is of the view that Leicester City Council should ensure funds are made available to avoid service reductions and job losses are avoided at all costs.

UNISON'S Public Services Manifesto includes six principles, which are:

- > **Democratic Accountability**
- > **Effective Delivery**
- > **Adequate Funding**
- > **Equality of Access**
- > **Fairness at Work**
- > **Partnership at Work**

We insist that these principles are used during any consultation process. The report that was published states;

**5. Legal Implications** to be lawful consultation must be meaningful and this involves providing sufficient information to, and adequate time for, the unions to consider and respond to the proposals.

UNISON has sat through meeting after meeting and had to endure what we believe to be a dismissive attitude to the arguments that were put forward, a culture within the Education Department that if not careful will spread through Leicester City Council. However the consultation during the current process has been improved under the stewardship of Andrew Cozens and Mark Noble.

Coming to specific issues on the paper we believe you are once again being misled as to the impact of the proposed savings, in fact management have put proposed cuts in four categories some of which officers know you would not consider under any circumstances, to try to mislead elected members into making cuts that are equally as damaging, however disguised. We would ask the question are these measures an attempt to recover the £3.5 million or are they an exercise to save the careers of certain members of the Senior Management Team?

In category A the savings to Community Services/Premises costs will have a direct impact on front line services. Officers are spuriously arguing that reduced opening hours are not Community Centre Closures. UNISON believes that reduction in opening hours will leave certain centres under threat of permanent closure in the future due to lack of use.

We have been copied into detailed correspondence in relation to a number of the proposed cuts these include the deletion of the Procurement Officers post. Leicester City Council can ill afford to lose this post, as they are moving towards Procurement sooner than grant aid, not withstanding the individual in post has vast experience in this field.

The cuts to the awards and grants team need to be looked into in more detail. This is a vital service within the Education Department that was increased to support the implementation of a new system. The recovery plan report presented to cabinet stated that the team was increased to support the implementation of a new system and these reductions will not impact on the service, our members believe this to be totally inaccurate. Officers making these decisions have little experience within this field of the Education Department.

Cuts to Bingo Clubs have been referred to by management, we believe these to be cuts to Luncheon Clubs, Senior Citizens groups, and Religious and cultural activities. Senior Management does not believe these to be core services and therefore are prepared to throw them overboard.

Also there is a proposal to employ "Flying Premises Officers" to go round opening a number of centres. This will have an impact on Health and Safety and security. These proposals will also have repercussions on other services delivered by Leicester City Council such as the Social Care and Health Department and in particular the Learning Disability Division.

Proposals to reduce opening hours of community centres and employ "peripatetic" Premises Officers will have a detrimental impact on the Learning Disability Division in Social Care & Health. As part of the Central Government Agenda large day centres were to be closed and adults with learning disabilities were to receive services within the community. This has happened already in Leicester and many service users now access services in community and neighbourhood centres. To reduce opening hours will serve only to reduce services for these people.

Further it appears that there is a disproportionate impact on adults with learning disabilities as a result of a number of the proposals within the Recovery Plan; (i.e. the deletion of the Senior Adult Learning Co-ordinator post (No 8) the deletion of the 4 part-time posts supporting adults with special needs (No 20), and the deletion of the Inclusive Learning Co-ordinator post (No 23).

UNISON would submit that adults with learning difficulties could legitimately claim they are being discriminated against by Leicester City Council's Education Department. A further concern and one that all elected members should be extremely worried about, is the impact on community cohesion in this city. Resources in Youth Services are stretched and no matter what spin management put on Youth Services, workers in the field are extremely concerned and we would ask that you take a cautious approach to these issues.

UNISON along with our Joint Trade Union colleagues have consistently raised the fact that many of these cuts should they take place will impact on areas of social deprivation. We also consistently criticised the Divisions Organisational Review in respect of the impact on Ethnic Minority staff, this led to the commission for Racial Equality becoming involved. We will of course be pressing for a full equalities impact assessment is carried out prior to the recovery plan being implemented.

Then there are the cuts to Early Years at a time when the Authority is in the process of setting up a Children's Federation. In fact Chief Executive Rodney Green presented a paper "IMPROVING SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE, AND FOR ADULTS" to trade unions at the recent Employees Consultative Forum. The recovery plan will impact on three out of the council's four priorities in the paper, these being Children & Young People, Older People & Health and Cohesive and Stronger Communities.

We also have the review into support services (Gershon) on the agenda and UNISON believes our members could face the possibility of being reviewed and under threat of redundancy on three occasions in a short space of time. It is of concern when a member of the new administration comes out with a statement such as "It is best to get both of these reviews through now while there is turmoil anyway so we can have stability afterwards" this kind of statement shows a clear lack of duty of care to council staff.

One of the cuts in the proposals for Early Years is the Closure of Basketball, Gym and Friday clubs at Southfield's Drive Community Centre; 35 young people in an area of Social Deprivation use these clubs. The paper also states that there is no other provision in that area. These closures will result in a saving of £3500 how ill thought out is that?

The increased charges for Crèche and Playgroup provision will we believe result in a downturn in adult learning in some of our poorest communities when the national agenda is return to learn.

The Education Department has become a subject of ridicule within Leicester City Council and, of course, things need to be turned around. I would ask elected members to err on the side of caution and not attack front line staff and communities for the incompetence of management.

The Acting Service Director underestimates the degree to which the current financial difficulties, (which are a direct consequence of the contentious Division Organisational Review), have caused the morale of staff to be at an all time low. We recently received a letter signed by Youth Workers in which they say "we wish to state that morale is possibly the lowest it has been at any time since the Divisional Organisational Review commenced" insisting that we convey the strength of feeling to Elected Members.

---

UNISON genuinely want to work with elected members to resolve this problem therefore we feel it is unhelpful to describe any concerns we raise as mischief making when what we are doing is legitimately scrutinising the process.

We would finally suggest that the cabinet consider using Leicester City Councils reserves to alleviate the affect on front line services.

Yours sincerely

Gary Garner  
Branch Secretary  
**UNISON LEICESTER CITY BRANCH.**

Cc.  
Andrew Cozens – Corporate Director Social Care & Health.  
Tot Brill – Corporate Director Regeneration & Culture.  
Mike Forrester – Corporate Director Housing.  
Steven Andrews – Corporate Director Education & Lifelong Learning.  
Tom Stephenson – Corporate Director Resources Access & Diversity.  
Mark Noble – Chief Finance Officer.  
Joint Trade Union Branch Secretaries.  
Mike Brown – UNISON Regional Organiser.  
UNISON Leicester City Branch Executive Committee

Andrew Cozens  
Acting Director of Education  
Leicester City Council  
New Walk Centre  
Welford Place  
Leicester  
LE1 6ZG

5 July 2005

Dear Mr Cozens

This letter forms part of NATFHE's response to the Recovery Plan and should be read alongside the detailed response and covering letter sent by our branch secretary, Les Price.

This letter deals solely with issues relating to the Equality Impact Assessment carried out as part of the recovery plan.

You will be aware that this was a major issue during the DOR and that I referred the authority to the CRE because of my concerns about the process last time. These concerns were, in effect, accepted in the letter eventually sent by the CRE to Paul Vaughan.

Given all of this it is of great concern to me that the Division has yet to complete the long promised post DOR impact assessment. I have recently written requesting this but am informed that Paul Vaughan has yet to compile all the report.

Andrew Cozens

-2-

5 July 2005

In the light of this it is difficult to see how a division which hasn't yet worked out the impact of its last reorganisation can be clear about the impact of its latest plans.

The Unions have been given a draft copy of the ongoing work. There are two documents, one headed "For Recovery Plan Version 2 Proposals" and the other headed "For Recovery Plan Version 1 for the 42 Options Proposal."

We were only given these yesterday and on a quick reading of them begun to question the adequacy of them. During yesterday's consultation meeting we were told that there were further documents to back up these reports. We requested copies and that copies be made available for members. As yet we have not seen these documents.

Therefore we do not accept that there has been proper consultation over the EIA. This is not an abstract issue as the CRE document on the duty to promote race equality titled "A Guide for Public Authorities" advises that people who are likely to be affected by the policy should be consulted.

NATFHE's concerns about the failure to consult do not just cover the failure to consult with unions. The authority clearly should consult with service users.

Unlike the DOR EIA exercise this time there has been an attempt to consult with service users. However we still do not believe it has been adequate. It is our understanding that all that was sent to individuals and organisations described as "key stakeholders, partners etc." was either the recovery plan itself or just a vaguely worded general letter. The unions were only able to respond during the consultation once detailed information about each proposed cut was provided. We do not believe that this information has been shared with anyone other than the unions. Therefore we think that it is unlikely that many service users or their organisations will have been given sufficient information to respond properly. For instance in regards to proposed cuts in opening hours for centres unless it was clear to community

Andrew Cozens

-3-

5 July 2005

groups what these cuts were they wouldn't be able to assess which particular service users would be affected.

What is most worrying about the EIA documents tabled is that they appear to fail to engage with the real reason for carrying them out. The intention behind such exercises is to enable authorities to assess the likely impact of policies on different ethnic groups and to then be able to adjust proposals in order to ensure that there isn't a disproportionate impact and that the authority meets its duties to promote race equality.

Therefore it is surely necessary to build into the EIA steps to correct any disproportionate impact before the policy is implemented.

These cuts (the policy) will be implemented once they have been agreed by Cabinet on July 11<sup>th</sup> and by any subsequent Council meeting. Yet the final part of the EIA headed "Equality Priorities for Action" clearly has no steps to be taken before the policy is implemented but merely lays out ways to monitor the impact afterwards during August to December 2005.

NATFHE does not accept that this is adequate. In short we do not accept on the basis of the documentation we have seen that the division has properly assessed the impact on staff and service users from different ethnic and racial backgrounds of each proposed cut. Form 2 part B accepts that there is evidence of potential inequality but these are not detailed neither are proposals made to ameliorate the impact.

Whilst we do not decry the value of monitoring afterwards we do not accept that this is adequate given the broad scope of the duty to promote race equality.

NATFHE hoped that the authority would have learnt some lessons from the failures of the DOR. Whilst consultation has been carried out in a much better atmosphere and a far more open and transparent way we still do not accept that the authority has got it right in regards to impact assessments.

Andrew Cozens

-4-

5 July 2005

We will be closely monitoring the decisions made over implementation of the Recovery Plan and cannot at this stage rule out making a further complaint to the CRE.

Yours sincerely

Russ Escritt  
Regional Official

Andrew Cozens  
Deputy Chief Executive  
Leicester City Council

5 July 2005

Dear Andrew

**REF: Lifelong Learning Recovery Plan**

Please find attached our response to the forty-two proposals outlined in the original draft LLCD Recovery Plan. We have taken the view that, as elected members have not yet ruled any of the original proposals out, we should respond to all of them. That said, we are conscious that our recent discussions have hinted at a slightly more considered response to the difficulties in LLCD than a 'pick-n-mix' of cuts from the menu of forty-two. We are in support of this approach.

It should also be noted that we have experienced a better level of meaningful consultation over the Recovery Plan than we ever did throughout the entire DOR process. This has been re-assuring and has gone some small way to rebuild our confidence in management's capacity to act in the larger interest of the service. It is re-assuring too that you have taken on board our concerns that any Recovery Plan should be set within the context of the local authority's strategic direction of travel. The services contained within LLCD are potentially too important within the new strategic context to be treated in a cavalier manner. Any Recovery Plan must go beyond the financial and set firm foundations for the delivery of imaginative, apt services in the challenging years ahead. This will need to include measures to address the low staff morale and destruction of community confidence in the services.

That said, it will come as no surprise to you to learn that we remain fundamentally opposed to any cuts to frontline services and are concerned about the knock-on impact of proposed cuts or freezes that are portrayed as low impact within the new proposals. We would point out that 04/05 was an atypical year in LLCD in terms of financial management and the part-year monitoring of, for example, support budgets, does not give sound data for making extrapolated decisions about the scale of budgets in the future. We have logged our concerns with Mark Noble.

In addition, it is imperative to answer the concerns of staff and ourselves about the use of LSC funds with regard to 'ring-fencing'. There are concerns about the propriety of some of the Adult Learning budgetary changes and concerns that the scale of proposals may have a disproportionate impact

---

upon Adult Learning per se, and particularly its' long term stability. These questions must be honestly and clearly answered in the context of the Recovery Plan.

It is also imperative to ensure that the subsequent strategic review of Adult Learning is set within the context of the LSC's ongoing STAR on Adult Learning (Strategic Area Review) in Leicestershire and has cognisance of the national drivers with regard to the skills strategy. The long-term stability of the Adult Learning service within LCC is at stake and we now need the council to take some clear and consistent decisions about the service and its' articulation with the council's wider strategic goals. Needless to say, the future of the Leicester Adult Education College must be subsumed within that overall context.

Lastly, we must record our ongoing concerns about the need to assess the impact of the Recovery Plan upon the BME communities in our city and upon disadvantaged communities in general. Real efforts must be made to ensure that geographical and community mapping of the impact of individual proposals is carried out and that the intelligence gathered is acted upon in terms of amelioration measures. We remain unconvinced that the existing EIA is adequate under the law and allows the council to fully discharge its' responsibilities under the RRAA. To date, there has, we understand, been little feedback from stakeholders on the proposals. This absence cannot be taken as tacit consent. We continue to draw your attention to the last letter sent by the CRE to Paul Vaughan with regard to the DOR EIA and its' marked deficiencies. I understand my Regional Official, Russ Escritt, may write to you under separate cover with regard to this important matter.

Yours sincerely

Les Price  
NATFHE Branch Secretary

CC: Joint Trade Union side  
LCC Elected Members

## NA TFHE Response to: Lifelong Learning and Community Development Budget – Recovery Plan

### Preliminary

NATFHE is opposed to all cuts in the budget of the Lifelong Learning and Community Development Division.

Regardless of what current investigations reveal about culpability for the present budget crisis one thing is absolutely certain: staff and service users did not create this situation. Yet once again they are being asked to pay for the serious failures of the division's management.

NATFHE believes that Leicester City Council should take responsibility for the current crisis of the Lifelong Learning Division and commit to finding the funds necessary to avoid job losses and cuts to services, particularly in the run up to major service reconfiguration in 2005/06 with regard to the creation of a Children's Services Dept. Indeed such a reconfiguration may hold out more considered opportunities to make savings in the senior management structures of LLCD and therefore protect and consolidate vital frontline services.

We do not feel that it is our role to help councillors and officers identify where the cuts axe should fall and we will not do this. What follows is NATFHE's response to the proposed cuts listed in the recovery plan. These comments should be read in the context of a scrutiny process – the comments are designed to highlight inconsistencies in the proposals or a lack of 'joined-up thinking' in the way the proposals are configured. Some proposals are so sketchily presented and unclear as to be almost impossible to accurately assess in terms of impact and risk management.

We cannot therefore accept that the division of these cuts into Low, Medium and High Impact is done in any serious or scientific way. Thus we would ask councillors not to take these categories at face value but to judge for

themselves what they feel the impact will be, and extrapolate the accumulative effects in the context of the council's emerging strategic goals with regard to the major drivers of ECM, BSF and the national Skills Strategy.

It therefore follows that we don't believe that councillors should merely select two packages from the four on offer. These proposals seem to have been designed in an artificial way to push an observer into thinking that the solution should be to choose package A and package B. This would be an easy solution but would not be in the best interests of the long-term survival of the service or of service users in the city. We ask councillors to judge each proposed cut individually and not just to select packages. However, cuts must also be assessed within a strategic direction of travel and within the overall crisis of low staff morale and community suspicion or apathy that is as real a legacy of the botched DOR as the financial crisis.

It should be noted that we do not accept that just because an item of funding is headed "items which ought not to be included in the budget" that they should automatically be cut. We challenge these definitions for some of these items. Neither do we accept that all cuts labelled, as "Low Impact on Services" really are so.

We have been informed by LLCD senior officers that they fully intend to abide by their duties under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act and that there will be an Equalities Impact Assessment in order to ensure that the authority meets its' duty to promote race equality. However, we cannot see how these proposed cuts could have been drawn up and included in the Recovery Plan before any EIA was carried out. This appears to be inconsistent with any planned, published and responsive EIA strategy. Councillors should be wary of risking bringing the authority into potential disrepute by appearing to play 'fast and loose' again with the RRAA.

It follows, therefore, that every single one of these proposed cuts should have been assessed to see how it would impact on both staff from Black and Minority Ethnic ( BME ) backgrounds and also on service users of black and ethnic minority backgrounds and the resulting climate for community cohesion. In addition, any overall assessment should carefully chart and evaluate any hidden, accumulative effect that might arise from multiple cuts.

Given the failings of the Division in this regards during the DOR we are surprised that senior officers in LLCD have not made every effort to abide by the legislation and code of practice this time around.

In the context then, that every proposed cut should have been impact assessed there are immediately obvious potential impacts on staff and service users of BME backgrounds contained in the following proposals: 1, 5, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 30, 34, 35. Listing these as such does not imply that we think that this issue doesn't apply to proposed cuts not listed above, merely that these proposals cause intrinsic alarm.

We are especially opposed to cuts that will hamper the ability of the authority to deliver on its duty to promote Race Equality, so vital in a city as diverse as Leicester.

NATFHE's response to each individual proposed cut below should be read in the light of the comments above about race equality issues and the service reconfiguration about to be embarked upon by the local authority with regard to Children's Services.

#### Individual responses to numbered proposals

1. These are uncharted reductions with a large number of, as yet un-quantified, knock-on effects upon service delivery. There is little real outline of the actual impact upon service delivery. Whilst we have now received a breakdown of the changes in opening hours that would result from this proposal there has been no adequate impact assessment or Health & Safety assessment. The impact upon staff with regard to workload and personal safety issues remain unresolved.
- 2+3. We don't accept that these cuts will not have a serious impact. We are told that, in part, these cuts are needed as this area is running at £70K over budget. We believe that it is likely that the budget was set at too

low a figure and that these cuts will lead to overwork and impact badly on students.

4. We are not convinced that each specialist service will have sufficient staff to ensure that adequate attention is paid to generating external funding. If this is the case then this cut could lead to a loss of income and further problems in the future.
5. This post must be funded beyond October 2005. It is central to the work of examining the role of community governance in HYCC. Without this post HCA would be unable to engage fully and would thus be undermined. We believe funds must be found to continue this post. We do not understand why this post is included as an item "which ought not to be included in the budget." No redundancy costs are included within the proposal.
6. Insufficient detail is provided in order to assess these proposals. No indication is given, for example, of the total budgets from which these figures are to be withdrawn.
7. Little detail is provided about the 'support budgets' from which 10% ( £250K ) is being withdrawn. There does appear to be unclarity about the exact % element of some cuts. This proposal does appear to have a serious impact upon support budgets, particularly funding for study materials for learners. In addition the AL Quality Improvement Plan may be impacted upon. Some of these proposals may have an impact upon tutor workload.
8. The deletion of the Senior Adult Learning Coordinator post will clearly impact upon the ability of the Adult Learning Service to engage with access issues and provide support for Adult Learners. A reduction in the capacity to do this will mean failure to meet LSC targets and this could result in lost income and damage to the service. This post must be retained.

We believe that the loss of 1.5 FTE Curriculum leader posts is wrongly categorised as low risk, and may carry knock-on workload effects on remaining posts.

This work is essential in providing support to part-time tutors and in preparing for inspections. Non-specialist staff that have to pick up this work will (in addition to having workload problems) not be able to deliver with the same level of expertise. This could damage the quality of provision and thus mean a failure to hit LSC targets and a consequent loss of income.

Given that English Language & Communication is a key curriculum area in our diverse city, this proposed cut seems puzzling. The sharing of responsibility with other staff may have workload implications.

The Curriculum Leader sport post should not be deleted in a city with a pronounced health divide, particularly around coronary health. This seems to be a 'cut of convenience'.

9. The removal of an ICT replacement fund may seriously impact upon some areas of the city and the service's ability to meet LSC targets.
10. The WEA now has an agreed national contract with the LSC.
11. This proposal will limit any growth in Family Learning - a local and national priority.
12. This may impact upon the scale of use of school premises.
13. There is considerable confusion within management about how much this proposal actually reduces the Inspection Budget. This issue needs firm clarification before the impact of this proposal can be charted.
14. We are not convinced that this cut is low risk. Apparently only 60% of Adult Learners can draw down LSC funding. An (unspecified) further percentage can utilise Surestart funding as they are undertaking childcare courses. This leaves a significant percentage that may well

- drop out or not start courses because of lack of childcare. This will result in a loss of income and may impact on Adult Learning's ability to hit LSC targets both now and in the future. No indication is given of what level of infrastructure will be supported in the future for our city.
15. This could potentially introduce a perverse driver into playgroups - particularly those located in poor areas. Excessive charges for 2-3 year olds could harm recruitment and subsequent take up of NEG funded places.
  16. A funding switch must be engineered before funding is removed - in addition the contractual position of existing school-based staff needs clarification before action is taken.
  17. This proposed cut is not a Low Risk cut. It will clearly lead to the closure of youth work at Belgrave. Cuts to the printing budget will have a deleterious effect on support provided to staff and thus on the quality of the service. Cuts to the ICT budget will clearly damage the quality of work within the Youth Service, particularly around the capacity to capture data. A cut to the marketing budget could reduce take up of Youth Work Activities and Summer Youth Activities thus having a deleterious effect on the service and subsequent effects due to lack of involvement by young people.
  18. The deletion of the Quality Assurance and Staff Development Officer post will harm the ability to meet Ofsted requirements. Spreading the work around amongst other, already overworked staff, is unlikely to be a recipe for quality delivery of these functions which are essential for a service to develop.
  19. The Climbing Wall is under-utilised but there may be other funding/trading options to ensure the survival of a specialist resource
  20. Irrespective of the justification for this proposed cut this work has been funded from the Youth Service Budget. It is a service that should be provided and cutting it may involve Disability Discrimination issues. This work should continue to be funded by the authority.

21. There is a real issue here about the enforced relocating of young people. This is a very sensitive issue with regard to the RRAA and the consequent EIA on this proposal must be transparent and rigorous.
22. This needs a thorough EIA and consultation; there may be a disproportionate, unplanned impact upon identified communities. The closure of some of these activities may have an impact upon the overall viability of some settings.
23. We are opposed to this cut and believe that this work must continue within the division. As it is an area of work the LSC wish to see grow the division should be assisting with this aim.
24. This is supposedly a response to LSC strategy. However, the provision can still fit within the parameters for funding. In a city with serious health divide problems, particularly around coronary health; this proposal may conflict with other agreed objectives with both PCTs.
25. We oppose this cut. The sum of money to be saved is negligible compared to the service provided. These are some of the only facilities for young people of this age group in the area. The cut could be counter-productive if these young people are left with no facilities or Friday Club.
26. This is vital provision in the context of the development of a Children's Centre Network. Provision and staff must be secured within other funding streams before LLCD funds are withdrawn.
27. These posts should have been dealt with under DOR.
28. We are opposed to this cut. Our arguments were put to members in detail during the last budget process - our comments about the total undesirability of this proposal still stand.

29. We believe that this post is essential. It is especially so given some of the possible decisions to be taken over charging fees in future. This post should not be cut merely because it is vacant.
30. A 20% reduction in summer play schemes is most undesirable. This proposal would need a careful impact assessment, including geographical mapping. There may well be Crime & Disorder implications.
31. Given the comments in the section headed "Service Implications" we do not accept that this post can be cut without doing serious damage to the service.
32. This proposal holds out the prospect of an arbitrary, disproportionate impact upon some young people and their communities. Officers admit it would cause random damage and be inherently inequitable.
33. This proposal has serious implications for Crime & Disorder in some already troubled neighbourhoods.
34. This cut cannot be made as it will reduce the service's ability to hit statutory targets for teacher's qualifications and these will have a negative impact on funding.
- 36-42 These proposals are wholly unpalatable and of questionable merit, either on rationality or in terms of the impact made for the cash saved. All of the existing LCC Attainment & Inclusion workers have written to the unions a jointly signed letter expressing their concern that the City's Attainment & Inclusion Strategy & Delivery Plan would collapse completely if the cuts outlined in 37,38 & 39 were made.

From: "Russ Escrib" <Rescrib@natfhe.org.uk>  
To: "Steve Goddard" <Steve.Goddard@leicester.gov.uk>  
Date: Tue, Jul 5, 2005 11:24 pm  
Subject: RE: Recovery Plan EIA

Thanks for these. I guess you ought to send them to the T&G and GMB.

These were sent after I left the office tonight so they arrived after I had written Andrew Cozens with my response to the EIA. I'm afraid I had no choice as I must be on a train to London at 8am tomorrow and won't be back until Thursday night. However I am happy for you to forward this email to Mr Cozens and ask him to append it to my letter as part of our response.

I am afraid that I am working in haste (due to the hour) and from memory as all my files are in the office and I am doing this at home. However I would make the following comments:

These documents are an improvement over the documents so far tabled as the EIA. However I believe that many of my comments made in the letter I wrote earlier today still stand.

In addition I would add that these documents are somewhat patchy in their scope and quality. Some are better than others. The Adult Learning document only relates to the sports and fitness cuts. I can't remember whether this is the only cut proposed in Adult Learning in the revised proposals. If so then perhaps this is slightly more acceptable. However it does mean that Councilors in making decisions will have no guidance on the Equality Impact of any other proposed cuts if they do not go with the revised proposals.

The Community Services documents only relate to Awards and Grants and Community settings. I can't remember if these cover all of the other cuts in Community Services. If they don't then the issue above applies again here.

The Early Years Document only relates to what appear to be the cuts left in the revised paper. Again the comments above apply.

The Youth Service paper purports to cover all of the 42 budget cut options. However it does not do so in sufficient detail. There is nothing in this paper that makes it possible to identify the impact of each individual proposed cut. Therefore the document is of limited value.

Whilst these papers are a step forward I must reiterate my point that none of them propose any measures to ameliorate the negative impact on equalities (where these are identified) until after the proposals have been implemented. We do not accept that this is adequate.

There is no reference in any of these documents to feedback from any of the organisations you claim have been consulted. The absence of any such feedback only amplifies the issues I raised around this in my original letter.

Our concerns about the failures of the EIA process will, no doubt, be less severe if the Cabinet and Council go with the latest, revised proposals. However, due to the limited nature of these EIA documents, should the Cabinet or Council decide against implementing the revised proposals and look at alternative cuts then NATFHE will have no choice but to make a further complaint to the CRE about the Council's breach of statutory duties.

This is not to imply that NATFHE supports the revised package of cuts. Rather it is saying that from an Equalities angle the authority has done some work to assess and possibly react to any adverse impact from the revised package. This is not the case at all with any other cuts that could be chosen from the full list of 42.

I will provide a more detailed response once I am able. However the late provision of this information will prevent any further feedback being part of the consultation response. Whilst I recognise the improved climate that this consultation process has occurred in and welcome the increased detail and openness of the consultation the haste with which this process has occurred has caused problems in terms of our ability to respond. Having said that I accept that it has also placed serious demands on managers in terms of the level of work required in a short period of time.

Russ Escrib  
Regional Official, NATFHE.

---

From: Steve Goddard [mailto:Steve.Goddard@leicester.gov.uk]  
Sent: Tue 05/07/2005 17:14  
To: Gaynor Garner; Gary Garner; Les Price; Russ Escrib; mike.brown@unison.co.uk  
Cc: Mark Noble; Paul Vaughan  
Subject: Recovery Plan EIA

Dear All

Please find attached a full set of the EIAs for the LLCD Recovery Plan.

Please contact me if you have any problems accessing the files.

Could you please advise on whether these are to be e mailed to GMB and T&G?

Gary - could you let Dawn know of the EIAs?

Thanks

Steve

Steve Goddard  
Head of Community Services  
Community Services  
Lifelong Learning & Community Development  
Tel 229 4365  
Fax 229 4365  
e mail steve.goddard@leicester.gov.uk

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

---

This email has been scanned for all viruses by MessageLabs  
NATFHE - The University and College Lecturers' Union  
[www.natfhe.org.uk](http://www.natfhe.org.uk)

---

CC: <les.price@netmatters.co.uk>