

Prepared for the purposes of Budget Consultation only.

ADDITIONAL TRADE UNION FEEDBACK FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE EXECUTIVE MEETING 18 FEBRUARY 2014

POSSIBLE STRATEGIES FOR REDUCING THE 2014-15 & 2015-16 BUDGET AND PROJECTED IMPLICATIONS FOR PRESENT STAFF NUMBERS.

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
CROSS-CUTTING				
Z2	<p>Rationalisation of management arrangements Organisational re-alignment and streamlining of management arrangements to improve efficiencies</p>	<p>FTE's: 160.8 Headcount: 165 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 7 Year 2 = 0</p>	<p>20 Jan 2014 (Level 2) Climate, Housing, Employment and Skills/x-cutting UNISON</p> <p>UNISON said that the feeling of members is that the Climate, Housing, Employment and Skills (CHES) service is a well performing and well lead department and shouldn't be broken up but should be built up on the success that has been achieved and that this should be fed into the Level I process.</p> <p>Unison added that this is not a criticism of management.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT RESPONSE given at Level 2 meeting 20/01/14:</p> <p>Management noted that at level 3 UNISON raised concerns about the budget proposals for CHES. Management also responded that the cross cutting themes made by management endeavours to deliver services more effectively, and is not about cutting services but about how they can be delivered better, e.g. bringing the Homelessness service back into the council in conjunction with Adult Services, and similarly Employment and Skills working along side Children and Young people, it is about bringing together a work area under one leader, which recognises the reduced service lead and avoids duplication, it isn't about poor performance but is about getting a better service with the resources it has.</p> <p>Management also noted this has been through level 3 to level 2 process and should now be fed into Level I.</p> <p>Management again responded this needs to be recorded at level I as part of the consultation process.</p>
				<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 at OJC 1 Additional information: Management gave an overview of the consultation process, which was taking place at 2 levels. As well as the JNC consultations, the proposals were being</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
				<p>discussed at the OJC 1 level as the proposals potentially impact on a number of 4th tier management posts.</p> <p>Management also confirmed that earlier feedback from UNISON (re: Education Development Team) would be included in information sent to members, but added that the paper was more about how the implementation of the proposal would work rather than an alternative proposal.</p>
				<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 at UNITE consultation meeting. Additional information: Management reported that the spreadsheet had been updated and that additional information had been received from UNISON (Educational Development team) which would continue to be discussed at JNC meetings.</p>
			<p>23 Jan 2014 - OJC 1: GMB Re: Other proposals - to combine Transport (fleet) Services with FM. GMB asked if further information on this could be provided before the budget.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 at OJC 1 Response: Management would check what other information was available. Due to timescales a response would be given outside of the meeting.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT - 05 Feb 2014, further management response (by e-mail) Management can confirm that as part of the budget proposals relating to the rationalisation of management arrangements consideration was also being given to Transport (Fleet) Services combining with Facilities Management, discussion took place at the JNC Meeting held on 11 December 2013. (GMB in attendance)</p> <p>Specifically, it was noted that feedback received proposed that this wasn't the ideal way forward. Management confirmed that they would consider any alternative proposals put forward as part of the consultation process.</p>
			<p>06 Feb 2014 - OJC 1 - Z2:</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 06 Feb 2014 at OJC 1</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
			<p>UNISON UNISON said that the age group and nature of the work undertaken by the Employment, Skills and Education team would be better placed if it remained in Childrens.</p>	<p>Response: Management noted this view.</p>
HR - NO UPDATE				
CHILDRENS SERVICES				
C3	<p>Early Childhood Services: Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funded Services Reconfigure the support of Equality and Access service to childcare settings by a reduction in staffing and allocation of grant funding.</p>	<p>FTE's: 6 Headcount: 7 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 0 Year 2 = 1</p>	<p>23 Jan 20-14 - L2 - C3: NUT The TU stressed the allocation of grant funding would have affects on nurseries settings in terms of employing more staff. NUT asked for information on these staff who are grant funded.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 - Response to NUT at L2 – C3 Management stated that this will have an affect on childcare for children who are more vulnerable – the grant largely helps to supply nursery places for children, including helping with transport etc to attend these settings.</p>
			<p>06 Feb 2014 – OJC 2– C3: NUT The TU sought clarity on grant funding into nurseries and the impact this may have on teaching staff that are not centrally employed. Management asked for further detail in writing so that the information requested could be followed up.</p> <p>NUT 07 Feb 2014 - Further information received from NUT NUT informed management that they have received relevant information and will not pursue this further at this time.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 06 Feb 2014 – Response at OJC 2 – C3: Management to follow up when received.</p>
C4	<p>Early Childhood Services: Children Centres Withdraw from seven Phase 3 Children's Centres and reconfigure remaining Children's Centres in the</p>	<p>FTE's: 112.5 Headcount: 144 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 42 Year 2 = 0</p>	<p>23 Jan 2014 - L2 - C4: UNISON UNISON stressed their concerns should more monies need to be found from Early Childhood Services following the proposed cuts so far. If further cuts are to</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 - Response at L2 - C4: Management noted UNISON's comments and would ensure that these were included in the consultation spreadsheet.</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
	District by reducing and consolidating the remaining service into the areas of highest need, subject to statutory consultation. In relation to the reconfiguration of Children's Centres, during statutory consultation any proposals which will have an impact on staffing levels will be identified.		be imposed then it could be detrimental to the development of our early year's children. Early start has shown significant improvement in young children who attend play and educational settings i.e. 2, 3 and 4 year nursery education. The support given to families and parents is paramount, improvements have already been shown and this must continue. Further reductions in the support from various roles within Early Childhood services could have a detrimental impact on the educational attainment of our children moving forward. This in turn will start to affect the educational achievement when these children start school. Education is still a priority for Bradford.	
C5	Early Childhood Services - Early Years Activities Move Early Childhood Services provision from 4 locations to 2. Reconfigure and reshape the delivery of Early Childhood functions in the district, including reductions in response to new OFSTED framework and functions in relation to quality.	FTE's: 63 Headcount: 88 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 26 Year 2 = 0	06 Feb 2014 - L2 - C5: UNISON UNISON are concerned about the impact of changes to phase 3 Children's Centres, and appreciate the £3 million given by Schools Forum to enable the re-shaping of services within these centres to continue and develop without the funding element of the local authority. It is essential that the reshaping of the phase 1 and 2 children's centres doesn't impact on our parents and families and the educational attainment of our children in Bradford. It is important when looking strategically at how to develop the provision moving forward with less money to spend in these centres due to funding being removed by the government.	MANAGEMENT - 06 Feb 2014 – Response at L2 - C5: Management responded that the comments will be noted and taken on board.
C11	14-19 Services Increase traded income from	No staffing reductions	06 Feb 2014 - OJC 1 – C11: UNISON	MANAGEMENT - 06 Feb 2014 at OJC 1 – C11: It was agreed that: This would be discussed in

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
	schools both within district and neighbouring authorities		<p>UNISON added that the income generation (from schools) referred to in this proposal was a concern for staff in relation to any impact on staffing reductions if the increased income target was not achieved.</p> <p>10 Feb 2014 (update) - C11: UNISON informed management that a further OJC meeting would not be required for this item.</p>	<p>more detail at L2 and it would be dependant upon the outcome of those discussions as to whether (or not) a further OJC 1 would be required.</p>
C15	<p>School Organisation and Place Planning Team Review work provided by the service and deliver management efficiencies</p>	<p>FTE's: 55 Headcount: 130 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 2 Year 2 = 0</p>	<p>06 Feb 2014 - OJC 2 – C15: UNISON UNISON said that under C12 and C13 increases in traded services are mentioned but not in C15. If this was done it could cover salary costs and put only one post at risk. UNISON to discuss further with Management as staff were informed of this at a management briefing.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 06 Feb 2014 – Response at OJC 2 – C15: Management advised there was no suggestion to increasing trading in this area. There are two posts affected, one of which is a vacancy and the other a manager post.</p>
C26	<p>Residential Homes Review terms and conditions of waking night staff in residential units</p>	<p>FTE's: 36 Headcount: 36 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 14 Year 2 = 0</p>	<p>Original Additional feedback received 14 Jan 2014 C26: UNISON UNISON concerns are about the proposed changes in terms and conditions of waking night staff. UNISON concerns are based on Working Time Regulations and the removal of 1 waking night person. To have the day residential workers working 2 shifts with a sleep in the middle, so they are out of their home environment for more than 24 hours, a sleep duty is currently paid with a sleep in allowance (approx £30). Case law now states that an hourly rate has to be paid. Therefore the current proposal will not make the budget savings.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 14 Jan 2014: Management Response - C26: Management noted the feedback and will review the case law. 03 Feb 2014 C26: Response: Management note Unison's concerns regarding the proposal to reduce the number of Waking Night Staff by 50% and introducing "Sleeping In" staff to replace them.</p> <p>This proposal is still subject to further discussion regarding the clarification of payments to waking night staff. This issue has been raised by a number of other Local Authorities and further advice is being taken with regard to the impact of emerging case law on this matter.</p>
			<p>23 Jan 2014 - OJC 1 - C26: UNISON</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 at OJC 1 - C26: Response: Management said that these</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
			UNISON asked management to confirm that feedback on Waking Night staff had been received. They had concerns that the sleep-ins were being implemented in advance of Budget decisions.	<p>matters would be covered at the L2 meeting scheduled for this afternoon (Thursday, 23 Jan 2014). All feedback received from TU's would be forwarded for Budget consideration.</p> <p>It was agreed that: the UNISON concerns would be raised at the L2 meeting.</p>
			<p>06 Feb 2014 – OJC 2 –C26: UNISON UNISON raised concerns re the figures provided in relation to sleep in allowances. The figures provided do not appear to make the savings indicated and these need to be broken down further.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 06 Feb 2014 at OJC 2 – Response – C26: Management felt there were two issues; the legal interpretation of these figures and the level of savings identified and discussions will continue.</p>
			<p>06 Feb 2014 – OJC 2 – C26: UNISON UNISON raised concerns in relation to safeguarding if only one member of staff was on sleep in. This leaves children in a potentially vulnerable situation with only one member of staff on duty.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 06 Feb 2014 at OJC 2 – Response – C26: Management noted the concerns and advised that rigorous safer recruitment processes were in place along with Warner checks in residential homes and no child would be placed at risk.</p>
C27	<p>Youth Service Youth Services delivery to be reduced within the District. The reduced service will be delivered through two locations in Keighley and Bradford and two youth workers per constituency to deliver priority work. A central commissioner will assist Area Committees in delivering local priorities.</p>	<p>FTE's: 86 Headcount: 162 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 25 Year 2 = 50</p>	<p>14 Jan 2014 - C27: UNITE The Council should consult with the schools forum and use the balances available to support a joint agenda. Therefore we propose no cuts for the next 2 years, but allow staff to leave through Voluntary redundancy and or natural wastage.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 24 Jan 2014 - C27 - Response: The Schools Forum was approached in respect of the budget reductions in education Services and whether support could be given from the Dedicated Schools Grant. Funding, subject to Secretary of State approval was given for Early Years services for one year only. No financial support has been sought or granted for the Youth Service.</p>
			<p>23 Jan 2014 - C27: UNITE Unite said that they had received feedback from members asking whether the Year 1 and Year 2 budget proposals had changed?</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 - C27 - Response: Management confirmed that the budget proposal for Year 1 and Year 2 were unchanged. Management added that Unite's proposal on the Youth Service would now go to elected members. Management have made</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
				comments on Unite's Youth Service proposal in response to the Executive's proposal but these comments are neither a recommendation nor a rejection of Unite's proposal. Any decision on the budget would be a political decision not an officer decision.
			<p>23 Jan 2014 – L2 - C27: ATL The TU asked about Management's response to the Unite proposal on the Youth Service.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 at L2 – C27: Response: Management confirmed that they had responded to the proposals regarding the specific service issues only.</p>
			<p>24 Jan 2014 – Aspect/NAYCEO tabled a further paper (Appendix 1A). This provided further clarification on their alternative proposals for the Youth Service. The Trade Union also provided further feedback in relation to implementation of the Councils initial budget proposals for the Youth Service, should this be approved at Full Council.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - Response: Management noted their clarification and their detailed response is contained in Appendix 1A. MANAGEMENT - Response: Management noted the comments made in respect of implementation; this will be considered once a budget decision is made in relation to the Youth Service Proposals.</p>
			<p>24 Jan 2014 – UNITE tabled a further paper (Appendix 1B). This provided further clarification on their alternative proposals for the Youth Service.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT noted their clarification and their detailed response is contained in Appendix 1B.</p>
			<p>06 Feb 2014 – Dept consultation - C27: UNITE UNITE said that in managements response to Unite's proposals, you state that the move to Neighbourhood Services will be brought forward to take place 'as soon as possible. This would give a half year effect in 2014/15 and full year effect in 2015/16.' What exactly is that timescale and what does this mean in terms of job losses and budget reductions in each year?</p>	<p>13 Feb 2014 – WRITTEN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE to UNITE - C27: To realise the proposed £3.2m reduction by the end of 2015/16 there would have to be full effect in place by 31st March 2015 to make the £2.2m savings. This would require the implementation of the proposal with immediate effect. This is due to the time required to agree a new structure, interview for the remaining jobs, time to hear appeals, redeployment opportunities to be sought, both in children's and corporately. Staff and managers may decide to apply for Voluntary Redundancy reducing capacity to see through</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
				<p>the changes. So the implementation and transfer to the Neighbourhood Service would take place with immediate effect to minimise disruption to the service.</p> <p>All Departments have been asked to front load the savings where possible and bring them forward. It is likely to take 6 months to see the structural changes through giving a part year effect to the savings to be realised from staffing reductions in Year 1.</p>
			<p>06 Feb 2014 – Dept consultation - C27: UNITE UNITE asked - what are the benefits to the Youth Service and to young people of the Youth Service being moved into Neighbourhood Support Services?</p>	<p>13 Feb 2014 – WRITTEN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE to UNITE - C27: Management’s response is that the Executive proposal to move into Neighbourhood Services is based on the following rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Youth Service as part of the Councils devolution agenda is already accountable to Area Committees working closely with Ward Members on local priorities, ward plans and decisions on the Youth Opportunities funding. The move to neighbourhoods will further enhance this joint working arrangement. • The aim is for the Youth Service to be more closely aligned, building relationships with young people, schools and communities to encourage volunteering and income generation. There will be opportunities to develop these areas of work by being based and managed as part of the Neighbourhood Service. • The Youth Workers in each constituency area will be delivering youth work sessions and responding quickly to emerging local need and priorities. • The aim of the proposal is to reduce management and protect front line jobs. There is management capacity in neighbourhoods to

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
				integrate youth work provision. This will make savings from management and sustain more youth workers in the constituencies.
			<p>06 Feb 2014 – Dept consultation - C27: UNITE How will youth workers receive professional supervision in Neighbourhood Services, particularly around youth work methodology and in terms of some of the more complex issues we deal with, e.g. child protection, mental health issues, self harm, CSE.</p>	<p>13 Feb 2014 – WRITTEN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE to UNITE - C27: Each of the youth workers based in the constituency areas will be receive supervision from the Area Co-ordinators. Youth workers will continue to work in partnership with children’s social care around child protection and child sexual exploitation issues, CAHMS and Emotional Wellbeing Services around mental health and self harm. The proposal sets out one post based with the children’s commissioning team that would have responsibility for overseeing the youth work methodology and quality assuring what is delivered in the area constituencies. This will be in respect of delivery by both youth service staff and the voluntary sector.</p>
			<p>06 Feb 2014 – Dept consultation - C27: UNITE We still have concerns around the consultation the Council has conducted with affected groups. What consultation has taken place, who with and what methods have been used?</p>	<p>13 Feb 2014 – WRITTEN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE to UNITE - C27: The Council has conducted a full and open consultation with staff and the trade unions at level 1 and 2 meetings. There have also been specific budget consultation feedback received from focus groups including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and Young People • Low income • Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans-gender • Race and Ethnicity. • Women, pregnancy and maternity <p>Direct feedback has been received throughout the consultation period from young people and their families. Young People addressed Full Council and the Executive Meeting. Specific responses have been given to the trade unions and staff on issues raised and feedback</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
				comments incorporated into the Equalities Impact Assessment.
			<p>06 Feb 2014 – Dept consultation - C27: UNITE We note that the Equality Impact Assessment is on BradNet. Could you please tell us who was consulted in order to complete it?</p>	<p>13 Feb 2014 – WRITTEN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE to UNITE - C27: The above named Focus-groups were consulted in order to fully complete the Equality Impact Assessments.</p>
			<p>06 Feb 2014 – Dept consultation - C27: UNITE When did the policy change in terms of promoting the work of the Youth Service in the press? We have been told that there will be no press releases for the Youth Service as it is subject to budget cuts until after the budgets have been finalised.</p>	<p>13 Feb 2014 – WRITTEN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE to UNITE - C27: The Council has to be sensitive to making press releases about services that will be potentially affected when the budget is set this month. However positive stories have continued to be released about the Youth Service, the list covers those released since November 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bradford Council Youth Worker receives award from UCI president – released 13 Nov • Keighley Connexions Centre is a hit with young people – released 27 Nov • Young people launch innovative business hub – released 18 Dec • Young people in Wharfedale celebrate DofE achievement – released 19 Dec • The Information Shop for Young People proves popular with users 27 Jan <p>The food 4 youth project at Culture Fusion was not issued. The information shop story was delayed as other releases were going out pre-Xmas and a story about the ‘Let’s step up Democracy’ programme, has been rescheduled to go out at the end of the month.</p>
			<p>06 Feb 2014 – Dept consultation - C27: UNITE We understand that the final budget proposals will be agreed on 18th February 2014. If this is the case, why did the Telegraph and Argus report last night that</p>	<p>13 Feb 2014 – WRITTEN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE to UNITE - C27: The Schools Forum is a separate, independent body which meets in public. The Director of Childrens Services did a presentation on the budget proposals in December so schools could</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
			<p>there was an additional £3m from the Schools Forum for Children’s Centres?</p>	<p>understand the pressures and see if they could assist. Schools Forum make their own budget decisions. The Forum met on the 8 and 15 January and on the 8th they identified £3m in one off funding. £1m will fund savings in year 1 children’s centre reductions and £2m will fund work to look at different models. The minutes of these meetings are published a week after the Forum. This was acknowledged at Council on the 21 January and Executive on 4 February and those people bringing petitions to the meetings were aware. Schools Forum is quite separate to the Council settings its budget. The Secretary of State has to approve any funding given by the Schools Forum and he has not responded on this yet.</p>
			<p>17 Feb 2014 – Additional feedback -C27 UNITE UNITE submitted additional feedback in connection with the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal. Shown as Appendix 1C, attached to this document.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT – Response (17 Feb 2014) C27: Management noted the points raised in the UNITE paper and managements detailed response is contained in Appendix 1C.</p>
	<p>CHILDREN’S SERVICES – General Comment.</p>		<p>06 Feb 2014 – Dept consultation – General: UNITE What was the reason for the cancellation of the last department meeting with Unite scheduled for 23rd January 2014 when the meeting with the other unions went ahead?</p>	<p>13 Feb 2014 – WRITTEN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE to UNITE We have looked further in to the cancellation of the UNITE meeting which was scheduled to take place on 23rd January 2014 and although there is a 'meeting declined' response from one person, two others had accepted the meeting into their diaries. We can find no definitive reason as to why the meeting with Unite did not take place on 23rd January 2014. However, the confusion may have arisen because of the earlier meeting, on 23rd January 2014 where management had been asked a single question regarding whether, or not the Youth Service Proposal had been changed. Management confirmed that the proposal had not been</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
				<p>changed and that was the only question asked.</p> <p>The Chair of the meeting on 6th February did make it very clear that if this situation arose again, then there would be no issue with any of the stewards contacting management directly to clarify why a meeting had been cancelled.</p> <p>Management also advised the stewards at the meeting that management was and still is happy to have further meetings with them on the issue of the budget consultation to ensure that any questions that they may have receive a management response, prior to the Executive meeting on 18th February 2014.</p>
	<p>CHILDREN'S SERVICES – General Comment.</p>		<p>06 Feb 2014 – Dept consultation – General: UNITE Through the Section 188 process, there is a duty to consult with staff on avoiding redundancies. Where is the evidence of meaningful consultation and what work is happening to avoid staff redundancies?</p>	<p>13 Feb 2014 – WRITTEN MANAGEMENT RESPONSE to UNITE</p> <p>There has been full consultation with all trade unions and with Unite at departmental meetings following the executive proposals. In addition to the departmental meetings, meetings have been held between the staff and managers in the youth service to see how the savings could be made and reduce the number of potential redundancies. This has included suggestions to reduce the supplies and services budget; the spend on assets and buildings, also reducing budgets for positive activities and Youth Opportunities Funding.</p> <p>All options will be considered to protect jobs and reduce the number of redundancies, within the available budget.</p>
	<p>CITY SOLICITOR - NO UPDATE</p>			
	<p>CHIEF EXECUTIVE - NO UPDATE</p>			
	<p>ENVIRONMENT & SPORT</p>			
<p>E4</p>	<p>Waste Disposal - Household</p>	<p>FTE's: 21</p>		<p>MANAGEMENT UPDATE at UNITE</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
	<p>Waste sites The Council operates 8 Household Waste sites which currently open 7 days per week over extended days. Level of visitors is low early mornings and level of visitors during the week is variable dependent on the site. Proposal is to reduce the opening hours by one hour per day and to close all sites two days per week.</p>	<p>Headcount: 21 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 4 Year 2 = 0</p>		<p>consultation meeting - 23 Jan 2014 Management reported that the proposal to reduce the opening hours by one hour per day and close all sites two days per week could result in staff having to vary their working hours to cover the weekends. If agreed this could attract enhanced payments and could potentially mitigate any loss in pay. Some savings could be achieved by reducing overtime and reducing the need for casual workers to cover weekends.</p>
E7	<p>Street Cleaning Reduce staffing on mechanical sweeping to align with machine availability</p>	<p>FTE's: 27 Headcount: 31 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 3 Year 2 = 1</p>	<p>23 Jan 2014 - E7: UNITE Unite noted the proposal to reduce the number of FTE's by 4 and asked how would this be achieved? Unite referred to the discussions in the last budget cycle and again its continual withdrawal from service provision which will impact on highways insurance claims.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 - E7 - Response: Management stated that they are trying to match employees to the number of mechanical sweepers available. In respect of whether this will lead to a higher number of highway insurance claims management would monitor this but the point is noted.</p>
E8	<p>Street Cleaning Reduce the resources of the Ward Clean Teams by reducing working hours to a standard 37 hour week.</p>	<p>No staffing reductions</p>	<p>14 Jan 2014 - E8 Additional feedback: UNITE UNITE said that because of the proposed reduction in working hours from 39.5 to 37 hrs per week, this would result in a loss of pay to all of the staff based at the Household waste sites; therefore we need to enter into discussions to mitigate these losses.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014: Management update/response: Management informed the meeting that the proposed reduction in working hours to a standard 37 hour week within the Ward Clean teams would result in a 9% reduction in wages and a loss of pay of approximately £1,300 pa on average.</p>
				<p>MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 at OJC 1 - E8: Management reported that this had been raised at departmental consultation in respect of the reduction in hours from 39.5 hrs to 37 hours. Management had said that in order to clarify the impact of this proposal an update would be given to the OJC 1.</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
				The 2.5 hours (the difference between 37 hours and 39.5 hours) were currently paid at overtime rates. This would result in a 9% loss, which equated to approximately £1300 p.a. This would affect approximately 90 staff in the ward clean teams.
			23 Jan 2014 - E8: UNITE Unite asked if the staff affected by E8 earned below £21,000 p.a.	MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 - Response - E8: Management stated they did.
			06 Feb 2014 – E8: UNITE Unite concurred that the budget proposal on the Ward Clean teams did have a high impact on the low paid workers.	MANAGEMENT - 06 Feb 2014 - Response – E8: Management noted UNITE’s position
E11	Neighbourhoods Engagement, Safer, Stronger Reduction in the number of ward officers	FTE’s: 20 Headcount: 20 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 5 Year 2 = 0	14 Jan 2014 - Additional feedback – E11: UNITE Unite are concerned that this is not a true redundancy situation posts will be deleted but work still remains.	MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 - Response - E11: Management responded that this proposal would result in fewer staff and confirmed that the volume of work undertaken would reduce.
E14	Warden Services Reductions in the number of council wardens.	FTE’s: 90 Headcount: 90 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 18 Year 2 = 0	14 Jan 2014 - E14 - Additional feedback: UNITE UNITE said that the wardens do a valuable job in deterring crime and assisting the public and are willing to explore other ways of funding these posts.	MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 - E14 - Response: Management noted Unites’ comments and stated they would welcome any views/ideas on alternative funding streams.
FINANCE				
F2	Revenue & Benefits 1. Introduce crisis payments on a loan basis to partially replace the existing grant system. This will recycle funding and allow for assistance to vulnerable residents living in supported accommodation to be	No staffing reductions	14 Jan 2014 - F2 - Additional feedback: UNITE UNITE asked what impact the £0.5m reduction in the DWP grant would have on staffing as no consultation has taken place on any staffing reductions in relation to this issue.	MANAGEMENT - 24 Jan 2014 - F2 - Response: In addition to the information given at earlier meetings, management gave the following update: In November 2013 the DWP released details of the 2014/15 benefits administration grant and Bradford’s share was £0.5m lower than expected. The Trade Unions queried whether this deduction would all be placed against the Revenues & Benefits budget.

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
	<p>included.</p> <p>2. Reduce demand for crisis awards and community care grants.</p> <p>3. Remove Council contribution to the discretionary housing payment fund.</p>			<p>The Council wrote to the DWP about this and they have now responded and explained that the figure is correct. The reason it is such a large reduction in Bradford is because of the higher proportion of 'council tax reduction only' case the Council has.</p> <p>Along with other financial changes arising from the provisional local government finance settlement, this reduction will be considered by the Executive and a decision made about how to deal with the overall financial impact across the Authority.</p> <p>The outcome of this decision by Executive may have an impact on posts within Revenues and Benefits, however until a decision is made we are unable to confirm the potential figure which may be affected.</p>
REGENERATION & CULTURE				
R1	<p>Senior Management & Support Reduce operational and technical budgets available to address in year issues across Regeneration</p>	No staffing reductions	<p>Dept 20 Jan 14 – R1: UNISON UNISON asked what was happening with £50,000 management and support</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - Dept 20 Jan 14 – Response - R1: Management responded that this would be picked up across the service areas to pick up outstanding issue/work.</p>
R2	<p>Libraries Cease Mobile Library Service including Home Delivery. Continue with the progress we have made on the co-location of library services so that at the end of Year 1 we will have co-located 6 libraries with other services. In year 2 it is proposed that we seek to transfer 4 libraries to community management.</p>	<p>FTE's: 90 Headcount: 130 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 3 Year 2 = 20</p>	<p>14 Jan 2014 - Additional feedback - R2: UNITE Unite believe sufficient time should be afforded to look at different service delivery models that attain efficiency savings whilst at the same time still providing a service. Use of non council buildings or shared accommodation etc is an option.</p>	<p>MANAGEMENT - 24 Jan 2014 - Response - R2: Different service models are being looked at and indeed have been implemented over the past two years, when 4 libraries were transferred to community management. This proposal continues that course of action, including non-council buildings (e.g. Appleton Academy) and shared accommodation (Cafe West in Allerton).</p>

Ref	Service area/function and proposal for change	Staffing Implications	TRADE UNION FEEDBACK	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
R27	Capital Team Proposals to form a single capital team generating staffing and other cost efficiencies.	No staffing reductions	Dept 20 Jan 2014 - R27: UNISON UNISON asked about the capital works team, and was there any more detail available in relation to the savings.	MANAGEMENT - Dept 20 Jan 14 – Response - R27: Management responded in terms of crossing cutting it is envisaged bringing all capital development together from across the council which will avoid duplication and bring services together, this is because there is a need to narrow the services and have a more concise development team/area of work.
	REGENERATION & CULTURE: General Comments:		23 Jan 2014 - OJC 1: GMB GMB reported that management had spoken to colleagues in Public Health and there was no reason to believe monies would not be available.	MANAGEMENT - 23 Jan 2014 - OJC 1: Response: Management thanked GMB for this update.
ADULTS				
A9	Older People Residential Care In line with existing policy and subject to formal statutory consultation, decrease provision by closing a further two in-house residential homes and reduce the number of older peoples’ residential placements in the independent sector through promotion of independent living.	FTE’s: 276 Headcount: 366 FTE Reductions Year 1 = 30 Year 2 = 30	30 Jan 2014 at L2 – A9: UNISON UNISON reiterated concerns should the decision to close be made.	MANAGEMENT - 30 Jan 2014 at L2 - A9: Response: Management confirmed that the market is continually changing and maintaining a view of the market would be essential during any consultation process.
	ADULTS: General Comments:		30 Jan 2014 OJC 2 General: UNISON UNISON reiterated the need to progress vacancies via redeployment where necessary with regards to Community Care Officer vacancies	MANAGEMENT - 30 Jan 2014 UNISON General - Response: Management noted this.

ADDITIONAL TRADE UNION GENERIC CORPORATE COMMENTS REGARDING S188

TU comment	Management Response
<p>UNISON: <i>The Council carefully considers any sale of art or artefacts to offset overall budget deficits, as the items belong to the people of Bradford and once sold can never be replaced and only serve as a minimum short term stop gap.</i></p> <p>GMB: <i>Would expect that any sale of art or artefacts held by the authority is subject to open and transparent dialogue.</i></p>	<p><i>UNISON & GMB's comments are noted and included in the feedback to the Executive.</i></p> <p>Management response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In relation to specific items, the Council would need to check any conditions of the ownership/holding. ▪ If the value of the asset is above £10,000 the Local Government Act 2003 would restrict the use of any receipt to either the repayment of debt or funding further capital expenditure.
<p>GMB: <i>Welcomed the expression by UNITE to rejoin the joint staff side negotiating machinery, but expressed concern that changes of this type would be detrimental to a process which has protected jobs and worked well in managing the cuts levelled at the authority.</i></p> <p>UNISON: <i>Expressed concern that UNITE felt unable to be part of the joint negotiating machinery and that the proposal from UNITE to reduce the facilities and support offered to Trade Union members to be extremely short sighted, when at a time of uncertainty the more support and representation is needed than ever.</i></p> <p>UNITE: <i>There should only be 1 Convenor from each Trade Union allowed full time release. Any statutory time off for Trade Union Stewards would be additional to this. There should be no facility time for branch officer meetings. This arrangement should be reviewed after 18 months. The savings should be directed to front line services.</i></p> <p>UNITE have submitted the following amended proposal:</p> <p><i>UNITE: There should be a minimum of 1 Convenor from each Trade Union allowed full time release; we must ensure that all employees are able to be fully represented during these difficult times. There must be no impact on the statutory rights for time off to Section 188 or grievance & disciplinary, stewards will still receive 1.5 days per month.</i></p>	<p><i>UNISON & GMB's comments are noted and included in the feedback to the Executive.</i></p> <p>The Council is committed to ensuring meaningful consultation takes place with all its recognised trade unions and grants facility time to each Trade Union to enable this to take place. The Council believes that the current facility time arrangements to progress the S188 consultation processes are appropriate to ensuring that meaningful consultation takes place.</p>
<p>UNITE – note that the HR Team for single status has been in existence since 2005/2006 and single status is still not implemented in Bradford when other councils implemented it 5 years ago. Disband this team and redirect savings to frontline Children and Adult Services.</p>	<p><i>UNITE's comment is noted and included in the feedback to the Executive</i></p> <p><i>The Single Status HR Team was configured in 2008, before that it was part of another Director's remit.</i></p> <p><i>In 2010 the Council successfully negotiated the removal of bonus payments,</i></p>

TU comment	Management Response
	<p><i>followed by a new pay structure up to Scale 6 in 2012. Over the last 2 years the team has reconfigured the pay structure of the staff in the former EB and addressed the key equal pay issues across all the Bradford Schools. This work has been vital in reducing the Council's liability to further secondary claims.</i></p> <p><i>The work is continuing to ensure that the Council is able to complete its work on Single Status for all staff up to Chief Officer Level. In addition the team also ensures that secondary equal pay claims are dealt with efficiently in order to reduce the potential financial liability to the Council.</i></p>
<p><i>UNITE are concerned that the Council appears to be unaware of the number of "casual" workers it employs. Some "casual" workers current work as full time employees whilst some don't. This could result in unite members been made redundant illegally whilst a casual worker remains employed.</i></p>	<p><i>UNITE's comment is noted and included in the feedback to the Executive.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has registers of casual workers who provide cover to maintain services. Some may have worked on a regular basis and may have accrued employment rights. The Council would need to consider this on a case by case basis during any restructuring to reduce staff numbers.</i></p>
<p><i>UNITE – that all Temporary contracts are terminated with immediate effect and staff at risk of redundancy redeployed after proper skills analysis. This is better use of council funds on redundancy payments.</i></p>	<p><i>UNITE's comment is noted and included in the feedback to the Executive.</i></p> <p><i>Management advised that staff on temporary contracts have employment rights and therefore the Council cannot simply terminate all temporary contracts.</i></p>
<p><i>UNITE: Propose that Bradford Council Become a Living Wage Authority and ensure protection of pay to this rate of pay as a minimum standard</i></p>	<p><i>The Council recognises the benefits that the Living Wage would bring to its lowest paid employees and employees of Council contractors.</i></p> <p><i>However the Council notes that introduction of the Living Wage would cost an additional £4 million and that this would create a significant extra financial pressure at a time when, having seen cuts to its funding of over £100 million in the last three years, the Council faces a forecast shortfall of more than £115 million more over the next three years.</i></p> <p><i>The Council will however, continue to work locally with the trade unions to examine how it could introduce the Living Wage on a phased basis over a period of time.</i></p> <p><i>The Council calls on national political parties that support the Living Wage to commit to ensuring that Local Government is funded to an appropriate level to be able to pay it.</i></p>
<p><i>UNITE: that any savings made from the above proposals be realigned to frontline services to save jobs and protect a minimum pay of the living wage.</i></p>	<p><i>UNITE's comment is noted and included in the feedback to the Executive</i></p>