

# Report of the Director of Human Resources to the meeting of Executive to be held on 09 February 2016

---

**AW**

**Subject:**

Interim Trade Union feedback on the Council's budget proposals for the 2016/17 and 2017/18 Council budget.

**Summary statement:**

This report and appendices provide interim feedback from the Council's Trade Unions on the Council's budget proposals for the 2016/17 and 2017/18 Council Budget for consideration by Executive.

---

Suzanne Dunkley  
HR Director

**Portfolio: Leader of Council and Strategic  
Regeneration**

Report Contact: Michelle Moverley  
Head of Strategic, Human Resources  
Phone: (01274) 437883  
E-mail: [michelle.moverley@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:michelle.moverley@bradford.gov.uk)

**Overview & Scrutiny Area:**  
**Corporate**



## 1. SUMMARY

This report and appendices provide interim feedback from the Council's Trade Unions on the Council's budget proposals for the 2016-17 and 2017-18 Council budget for consideration by Executive.

## 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On 24 November 2014 the Council issued a letter under Section 188 Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 ("TULRCA") notifying the Trade Unions about the potential impact on the workforce because of the need to achieve additional savings in the financial year 2015-16 from those approved by Budget Council in February 2014. This potential impact also included staffing reduction proposals for 2016-17 where they related to a 2015-16 staffing reduction proposal. This commenced a period of consultation under TULRCA. Consultation on some of these proposals is ongoing.
- 2.2 On 23 November 2015 the Council issued a further letter under the Section 188 TULRCA notifying the Trade unions about the potential impact on the workforce in 2016-17 and 2017-18 because of the need to achieve additional savings in those years. The issuing of the Section 188 letter on 23 November 2015 commenced a statutory minimum 45 day consultation period with the Council's Trade Unions which includes consultation about ways of avoiding dismissals, reducing the numbers of employees to be dismissed and mitigating the consequences of the dismissals. This includes considering feedback received from the Trade Unions and any alternative proposals they may have to try and minimise the impact of the proposed budget reductions on the workforce. Consultation with the Trade Unions will continue beyond the minimum 45 day period where necessary particularly focusing on the impact of any proposed budget reductions on the workforce with a view to seeking ways to avoid and/or reduce the potential number of job losses and minimise any adverse impact in terms of job losses.
- 2.3 Consultation has been taking place with the relevant Trade Unions since 23 November 2015 on the proposals, in order for final proposals to be prepared for Budget Council on 25 February 2016.
- 2.4 The Trade Unions were notified of the following key issues within the S188 letter on 23 November 2015:-
- The Report of the Director of Finance to the meeting of the Executive on the 1 December 2015 provided the financial context for budget proposals for 2016-17 and 2017-18.
  - The Council estimates that the total number of employees within the Council that are potentially at risk of redundancy as a consequence of the proposals detailed in the letter dated 23 November 2015 is 335 Full Time Equivalents (FTE's) in 2016-17 and 139 FTE's in 2017/18.
  - These proposed reductions of 335 Full Time Equivalents (FTE's) in 2016-17 and 139 FTE's in 2017/18 are in addition to those proposals currently subject to separate consultation processes under Section 188 TULRCA 1992 which commenced on 24 November 2014 relating to the proposed 167 FTE reductions for 2016-17.
  - That the Council will look at every aspect of its operation to make the savings. In relation to employees, if savings can be suggested which mean that there will be

fewer or no redundancies then the Council will carefully consider such possibilities.

- That the Council will continue to examine the current terms and conditions of employment to see if savings can be made there, but regrettably it does look likely that dismissals by reason of redundancy may have to be made. Where possible these will be considered on a voluntary basis.

### **3. THE PROCESS**

- 3.1** Following the issuing of the S188 letter on 23 November 2015 consultation has taken place with the Council's Trade Unions.
- 3.2** The following Trade Unions are being consulted on the Council's proposals through the S188 process: UNISON, GMB, UNITE, UCATT, NUT, NASUWT, ATL, NAHT, ASCL, ASPECT / PROSPECT / NAYCEO, AEP, VOICE, BECTU, COMMUNITY, RCN, RCM, BMA, Society of Radiographers and Society of Physiotherapists.
- 3.3** Consultation meetings have been held at a Corporate and Departmental level with Unison, GMB, UNITE and UCATT.
- 3.4** Consultation has also taken place with Teachers/ Education Trade Unions at Corporate and Departmental level. Other Trade Unions have been consulted on a Departmental basis where appropriate.
- 3.5** Trade Union consultation meetings on the potential workforce implications of the budget proposals have taken place at a corporate level on the following dates: 26 November, 10 December 2015 and 07 January 2016. A further Corporate Trade Union consultation meeting is scheduled to take place on 18 February 2016, prior to the Executive Meeting on 23 February 2016. Consultation will continue up to the Full Council meeting on 25 February 2016 and subsequently in relation to any impacts on the workforce following budget decisions being made.
- 3.6** Departmental Trade Union meetings have also taken place to discuss the proposals in more detail.
- 3.7** A weekly corporate overview meeting has also been held with the Regional Officers of the Trade Unions, Corporate Representatives and HR to look at "hotspot" areas and issues as they have arisen.
- 3.8** The feedback and the management responses given in this report are interim and consultation with the Trade Unions continues.

The Council is currently consulting with the Trade Unions on:

- The financial position of the Council.
- Possible strategies for making savings and the projected implications for workforce reductions if such strategies, following consultation, are implemented.
- Potential impact of proposed changes to certain local terms and conditions of employment.
- The continuation of strategies to minimise the impact of workforce reductions (voluntary expressions of interest, bumped redundancies, vacancy control, controlling agency spend and maximising non workforce savings etc).
- Potential reduction of services in some areas of the Council
- Potential opportunities for working in partnership and increasing income generation.

**3.9** The Trade Unions have raised concerns regarding ‘meaningful consultation’ and the views of the Trade Unions are stated in Section 8.6 of this Report.

In response to the Trade Unions concerns a further corporate consultation meeting has taken place on 14 January 2016 to ensure all concerns were captured and responded to.

The main areas of concern for the Trade Unions are:

- Lack of information on detailed proposals for implementation specifically relating to 2017/18.
- Inadequate information from some Departments in relation to vacancies, number and post titles, agency workers (numbers) and what posts are been covered by agency workers.
- Equality Impact Assessments on the proposals that have workforce implications.
- Use of Agency, Consultants, Temporary Workers and Casuals and cessation of the use of these immediately.

**3.10** All Strategic Directors were advised of the areas of concern for their Departments. HR have collated all the information and responses from the departments and these have been provided to the Trade Unions. The issues raised will be discussed at Level 2 meetings in departments and it is anticipated that this will address the trade unions’ concerns about the gaps in the information provided. The Trade Unions’ feedback, having received this additional information, will be incorporated in an addendum to the report on the day of the Executive meeting, in order that Executive can take it into account.

The Trade Unions have been advised to continue to raise issues and concerns should they continue directly with the Strategic Director of the Department and the Director of HR so that these can be addressed speedily.

**3.11** In terms of consultation:

- The size of cuts that the Council is facing, creates very considerable demands on the Council and its resources
- The Council is consulting and will continue to consult about ways of avoiding any dismissals, reducing the numbers of employees to be dismissed, and mitigating the consequences of the dismissals, and will be doing so with a view to reaching agreement.
- The Council serves the S188 letter at an early stage of a very lengthy and complex process, which undergoes a number of adjustments and changes as it goes forward through consultation and Executive approval
- The Council consults over a far longer period than the minimum required by S188.
- The Council values the contribution of the Trade Unions in this process of consultation.

**3.12** At the Trade Union consultation meeting on 14 January 2016 the Council confirmed the following position with the Trade Unions:

- Each year, we consult, widely, on budget proposals. This gives people a chance to have their say.
- Some proposals are more developed than others, and the process of consulting on the detail continues through the further development and implementation stage.

This is particularly so for changes affecting staff, where well-established arrangements for discussing in detail structures, roles and assimilations, in line with agreed procedures exist

- This year the Executive will propose a 2 year financial plan to Council – a firm 2016/17 budget, elements of a 2017/18 budget, but with some work still do before a firm 2017/18 budget (and an indicative 2018/19 budget) is finalised in February 2017. This is good practice in terms of financial planning, and allows TUs to participate as an effective partner in that longer term planning
- In previous years, we have made a firm differentiation between a phase of consultation up to the setting of the Council budget; and a subsequent phase of consultation at the implementation stage. This year, we have attempted to start earlier discussions where detail exists, in terms of the proposed thinking for implementation if the budget decision is agreed.
- The HR Director also confirmed at 14 January 2016 meeting that a recruitment freeze was to be commenced with immediate effect on all future external adverts. Any adverts that Strategic Directors wish to go through externally will be via a business case to the Chief Executive. If approved by the Chief Executive the Director of HR will notify the Trade Unions of any vacancies that will go to external advert.

**3.13** Additional feedback received from the Trade Unions following this report being circulated will be tabled at Executive on the day of the meeting as an Addendum to the report.

**3.14** The industrial relations implications will become clearer once detailed discussion about implementation of the decisions begins following any budget decision. Much will depend on the number of vacancies and voluntary redundancies agreed, together with the opportunities for redeployment which will all help to mitigate against the overall FTE reductions and the potential number of compulsory redundancies.

## **4. KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM THE TRADE UNION FEEDBACK ON THE COUNCIL'S BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR 2016-17 AND 2017-18**

### **4.1 Trade Unions Generic Comments**

Generic comments made by the Trade Unions at corporate consultation are captured in Appendix 9.

### **4.2 Feedback on the Departmental Budget Proposals**

The Trade Unions' feedback received to date in relation to the Council's budget proposals for 2016-17 and 2017-18 together with management's responses to that feedback is outlined in the attached documents on a departmental basis (Appendices 1-8). Workforce implications on the budget proposals are shaded on each departmental appendix.

The feedback documents are lengthy due to the number of budget proposals being considered and to ensure all feedback received from the Trade Unions has been recorded and is considered.

## **5. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL**

**5.1** The Director of Finance's reports to the Executive meetings on 01 December 2015 and

09 February 2016 set out the background to the Council's financial position and the need for expenditure reductions.

## **6. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

- 6.1 All risks in relation to the budget proposals and workforce implications are being managed through the Council's Risk Management Strategy with governance through Council Management Team.

## **7. LEGAL APPRAISAL**

- 7.1 Pursuant to Section 188 Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 (TULRCA 1992) the Council as employer is required to consult the recognised Trade Unions where there is a potential to dismiss by reason of redundancy 20 or more employees. If 100 or more employees are at risk of dismissal by reason of redundancy the consultation period is a minimum of 45 days.

- 7.2 Under Section 195 TULRCA 1992 "dismissal as redundant" is defined as all dismissals "for a reason not related to the individual concerned". As a consequence the Council is also consulting the recognised Trade Unions pursuant to s188 in relation to proposals to change certain terms and conditions of employment.

- 7.3 Such consultation with the Trade Unions is continuing and includes consultation about ways of avoiding dismissals, reducing the numbers of employees to be dismissed and mitigating the consequences of the dismissals.

## **8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

### **8.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY**

A Corporate Staffing Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) has been undertaken on the Council's Budget proposals, Appendix 10. Feedback from the Trade Unions on the Equality Impact Assessment is still to be received. Departmental EIA's, on proposals with all workforce implications have also been circulated to the Trade Unions and feedback will be received through departmental consultation meetings. All EQIA's will be subject to review as proposals are developed and amended as a consequence of continuing consultation.

The equality and diversity issues arising from the Council's budget proposals for 2016-17 and 2017-18 (excluding the Trade Unions feedback) will be the subject of a separate report to the Executive on 09 February 2016.

### **8.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

None

### **8.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS**

None

### **8.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

None

## 8.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

None

## 8.6 TRADE UNION

Consultation with the Trade Unions on the Council's Budget proposals for 2016-17 and 2017-18 is ongoing.

At the time of writing this report the following comments have been received:

### **Statement from Unison and GMB**

Both UNISON and the GMB union have grave concerns with the lack of detail received regarding proposals for cuts to services that has made it impossible to fully and properly consult or consider alternative models to protect services and our member's jobs. The problems are predominately in the larger departments such as Environment, Childrens, Regeneration and Adults.

It is vital that we receive information so Council employees our members, can have their concerns, comments, alternative structures./models etc properly taken into account. Many of the proposals do however cross over into other departments within the council which makes the overall picture much harder to gather, with a lack of information.

The Section 188 letter has been issued to inform the TU's that the expected number of proposed cuts in the budget could affect as many as 335FTE (full time equivalent) in the financial year 2016/17 and 139FTE in 2017/8. With the lack of detail forthcoming as to how savings will be achieved how can we be sure these proposals are correct?

The question has been put to Management as to why we are employing so many agency workers and consultants at what appears to be at a high cost to the authority when massive financial cuts and possible compulsory redundancies are being proposed. As yet no constructive answers have been given.

Whilst Bradford Council have advised they are trying to protect our front line services in order to protect the most vulnerable citizens in the city, It appears a lot of old deleted posts are now being recreated at high salaries whilst the process of strict vacancy control put in place by the previous CX appears to be being ignored. Previously before any advertisements were put out to external recruitment all internal options would be considered this appears to be no longer the case.

This process was primarily to help to redeploy employees our members with a view to Skills matching to reskilling the workforce where needed, we feel this is now no longer being applied.

A lot of job roles appear to be going out externally that should be kept in house so staff have the opportunity to be redeployed and avoid redundancies, this can only happen if we keep the vacancies in house in the first place.

Trade Union consultation Process on Budget Proposals 2015/16 - The purpose of consultation is to examine ways of avoiding dismissals whilst looking at how to reduce the numbers affected and mitigate the consequences of **Compulsory redundancy dismissals**

Consultation on the proposals must be meaningful and must be conducted with an open mind. A willingness to be persuaded and with a view to reaching an agreement on proposals whilst emphasising that this is a consultation process on proposals and that no decisions will be taken until the Full council meeting in February 2016.

Unfortunately information/ detail has not been provided to the TU's in sufficient detail to enable us to have meaningful consultations. It is with deep regret we are reaching a staff side position collectively as TU's to advise the local authority that we are nearing the point of a dispute. Therefore we feel that meaningful consultation has not yet taken place. This needs to be given priority and will mean the council should not set their budget in February and extend the consultation period.

### **Statement on behalf of Unite the Union**

Unite share the concerns of both Unison and the GMB surrounding the lack of detail received regarding proposals for cuts to services making it impossible to fully and properly consult or consider alternative models to protect services and our member's jobs in relation to both 2016/17 and 2017/18 proposals.

It is vital to meaningful consultation that we receive appropriate information so both employees and our members, can have their concerns, comments, alternative structures./models etc properly taken into account.

The Section 188 letter has been issued to inform the Trade Unions that the expected number of proposed cuts in the budget could affect as many as 335FTE (full time equivalent) in the financial year 2016/17 and 139FTE in 2017/8. Through the Council's excessive use of temporary, agency and casual staff have put existing staff at risk of compulsory redundancy.

The question has been put to Management by all trade unions as to why we are employing so many agency workers, temporary staff and consultants at premium cost to the authority when massive financial cuts and possible compulsory redundancies are being proposed. No rationale or workforce planning information has been provided for either year.

Whilst the Council have advised they are trying to protect our front line services in order to protect the most vulnerable citizens in the city, the Council have maintained the level of senior management and ignored both staff and the public's concern over the number of Councillors and the amount of allowances paid to them.

The whole purpose of Trade Union consultation\_is to examine ways of avoiding dismissals whilst looking at how to reduce the numbers affected and mitigate the consequences of Compulsory redundancy dismissals, Unite do not believe this has been achieved.

Consultation on the proposals must be meaningful and must be conducted with an open mind. A willingness to be persuaded and with a view to reaching an agreement on proposals whilst emphasising that this is a consultation process on proposals and that no decisions will be taken until the Full council meeting in February 2016.

Unfortunately the relevant information has not been provided to the Trade Unions in sufficient detail to enable us to have meaningful consultations. Unite support the joint



staff side position which is that we are nearing the point of a dispute. Therefore we feel that meaningful consultation has not yet taken place. This needs to be given priority and will mean the council should not set their budget in February and extend the consultation period.

Unite also raised concerns about the timing of consultations meetings and the amount of facility time allocated to S188 issues which did not get resolved. We have been faced with 3 consultation meetings all scheduled same day same time for the same Trade Union representative, that is not meaningful consultation.

## **8.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS**

None

## **9. NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS**

None

## **10. RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Executive considers and has regard to the interim feedback received from the Council's Trade Unions in relation to the budget proposals when considering its recommendations to Council on the Council's budget for the financial years 2016-17 and 2017-18.

## **11. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1	HR
Appendix 2	Children's Services
Appendix 3	City Solicitor
Appendix 4	Chief Executive's Office
Appendix 5	Environment and Sport
Appendix 6	Finance
Appendix 7	Regeneration and Culture
Appendix 8	Adult and Community Services
Appendix 9	Trade Union Generic Comments
Appendix 10	Corporate Staffing Equality Impact Assessment 2016 /2017

## **12. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

- Section 188 TULCRA 1992 Letter to Trade Unions - 23 November 2015.
- Director of Finance's Budget Update Report for Executive – 01 December 2015

DRAFT PROPOSALS																	
Department of Human Resources																	
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget		Saving		Reduction %	2014 Consultation for 2014/15 Reference	Employees			Likely FTE		VR Required	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response	
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total			FTEs	FTE's	Headcount	2016/17	2017/18				Vacancies
3H1	Human Resources (HR)	<b>Restructure HR Department.</b> The proposal will result in a significantly streamlined service and will involve: Reducing spending on workforce development Staff reductions in workforce development, corporate HR and business support. Combining specialist teams Reducing member Development. Removing vacant posts.	6,889,000	81,000	880,000	961,000	13.9%			190.4	213	19.5	13	21	14	<p><b>Corporate 26/11/15 UNISON</b>                      Asked about when the HR plus service would be reviewed, SD stated it was a 4 year contract with a review after 2 years. Need to bring it back in house. We don't have access to it, there is no face to face support. There is no informal approach from HR plus and no common sense in their approach. They immediately process casework to a formal full hearing.</p> <p>Asked if the 26.5 FTEs included business support and workforce development?</p>	<p><b>Corporate 26/11/15</b>                      Management stated this was counter to the Council's wishes, we would want to use an informal approach where appropriate.</p> <p>Management confirmed this.</p>
															<p><b>Corporate 26/11/15 UNITE</b>                      Agreed with both UNISON and the GMB view that the HR plus service should be brought back in house. We support everything said by the GMB, we have the same issues. We gave you a document about all the changes that were introduced with no consultation. Managing attendance is different on the website. They have published 'guidance', which interprets policies and procedures, this has a detrimental affect on our members. It is like a no win – no fee lawyer, similar to PPI. HR plus ring a manager if they have been on the site, they did so in one case 20 minutes after the manager had been on the site. Asked what the spend was on workforce development? We want to be able to develop staff who are exiting the organisation. The EQIA in the Executive report states "not applicable" under workforce development.</p>	<p><b>Corporate 26/11/15</b>                      Management stated there are cuts across all the department, not just workforce development. The Council had given some additional temporary funding for workforce development that is ring fenced until February 2016 which is so far untouched. There are two normal corporate budgets.</p>	

DRAFT PROPOSALS																		
Department of Human Resources																		
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget				Reduction			Employees				VR Required	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response		
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total	%	2014 Consultation for 2014/15 Reference	FTEs	FTE's	Headcount	Likely FTE 2016/17	Likely FTE 2017/18				Vacancies	
																	<p><b>Corporate 26/11/15 GMB</b>                      Agreed with UNISON's view that the HR plus service should be brought back in house. We have serious concerns and misgivings re HR plus communications. It undermines the spirit of what you, as the Council, and we, as trade unionists, do. Their approach/advice pre-determines the outcome, correspondence is held on files indefinitely. Their actions achieve the opposite of fairness, it is an appalling abuse. So many concerns about abuse, for sickness absence they do not follow the agreed process.</p>	
																	<p><b>Corporate 26/11/15 UNITE</b>                      Asked about Business Support and the impact on services where posts were vacant; professional staff were having to do admin work.                       If management were saying there was no requirement for admin work then they have to be clear about what work has stopped.</p>	<p><b>Corporate 26/11/15</b>                      Management stated it was a challenge in terms of working differently.                       Management said that needed confirming across the board.</p>

DRAFT PROPOSALS																
Department of Human Resources																
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget				Reduction %	2014 Consultation for 2014/15 Reference	Employees			Likely FTE		VR Required	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2015-16	Saving 2016-17	2017-18	Total			Current	FTEs	FTE's	Headcount	2016/17			
															<p>2/12/15</p> <p>GMB: Has there been any form of survey undertaken on what managers think of HRplus? Feedback coming from managers is not positive.</p> <p>Unison: The previous Administration should have looked to utilise the Contact Centre service Joanne provides before going out to contract.</p> <p>Unite: There was little or no rationale put forward for when HRplus contract was bought into the department. This would have helped a great deal had it been done.</p>	<p>2/12/15</p> <p>We would want to make sure we are picking up any issues or concerns so please feedback to us.</p> <p>Principles - There are two issues: the first is the principle of an outsourced service at a time that the Council is making cuts and I note your concerns on this. The second is how the contract is performing and letting us know what feedback you are getting from staff and Managers.</p> <p>Specifics – we need to be made aware of all complaints and specific examples of what they are.</p> <p>We will involve the Unions in the review.</p>
															<p>2/12/15</p> <p>Unite: Rationale is good as it stands but we cannot realistically start the consultation process in the absence of structures, the rationale is a brush stroke of sort. A full consultation starts at the time of tabling structures. This really needs to go hand-in-hand with the proposed structures</p> <p>Unison: Whilst the rationale provides details, it has nothing else to go on, no other details to work from?</p> <p>Unite: HRplus – the 2 year review, how does that effect the cuts? We would like to be involved in the review.</p> <p>GMB: We have issues raised with us, so far we haven't had any statistical information about how they are performing. Managers are calling to say they don't want to contact HRplus.</p>	<p>2/12/15</p> <p>Disagree, the rationale provides general information on the direction of travel however understand this point, but to table structures today would have been premature.</p> <p>The rationale needs to be consulted on first followed by the structure. This gives background to how the cuts are to be made and ensure that what we have left is working at its best, the structure has got to be right to ensure the changes are being made in the correct places</p> <p>Proposed Structure will be tabled at the 11th December meeting, the rationale is what we're consulting on from now to 11th December.</p> <p>Understand and take on board these comments. Can confirm a Survey is scheduled to be undertaken in January 2016.</p>

DRAFT PROPOSALS																
Department of Human Resources																
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget				Reduction %	2014 Consultation for 2014/15 Reference	Employees			Likely FTE		VR Required	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total			Current	FTEs	Headcount	2016/17	2017/18			
															<p>2/12/15</p> <p>GMB: What is the 'internal redeployment agency' being referred to in the Rationale? The terminology is of concern and will be to staff also</p> <p>Unison: Old Administration had a Temps Register – we could call on the staff on the register, this also ensures we retain skills and talent and utilise them in other areas or specific projects</p>	<p>2/12/15</p> <p>It was for all Council staff – will act as an internal agency. However, take on board your comments and will change it to "team" before circulating to staff following this meeting.</p> <p>We need to make a cultural shift – agree with these comments.</p> <p>We can use redeployees for project work and skill them up.</p>
															<p>2/12/15</p> <p>GMB: Would that stop and start the redeployment process if staff are given small projects to undertake during their time on the redeployment register? We are losing skills and training pathways.</p> <p>Unite / GMB: Concerned people are leaving on VRs and returning to work for Council, some back into same department they left from.</p> <p>Unison:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Review of EHWB – ideas received from staff in the service is that more telephone assessments/appointments could be made instead of face to face meetings.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Top Management Contracts of Employment – ours are permanent, why not have fixed term / short term contracts like others?</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> VRs - When will staff know if their application for VR had been</li> </ul>	<p>2/12/15</p> <p>Good question – we don't know. Will have to check and get back on it</p> <p>Share concern on this issue and confirmed that Departments have been told that this should not be happening. However, there is nothing in law that prevents people returning after a certain period of time.</p> <p>Noted that VR is discretionary however, so we will keep pushing for a period of time during which employees who have left on VR cannot return to work for the Council. Clearly, this would be different if employees are made compulsorily redundant. EHWB – like that idea, need to encourage staff and members to come up with more and share with us.</p>

DRAFT PROPOSALS																
Department of Human Resources																
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget	Saving			Reduction	2014 Consultation for	Employees			Likely FTE		VR Required	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total	%	2014/15 Reference	FTEs	FTE's	Headcount	2016/17	2017/18			
															<p>2/12/15</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Top Management Contracts of Employment – ours are permanent, why not have fixed term / short term contracts like others?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> VRs - When will staff know if their application for VR had been accepted?</p>	<p>2/12/15</p> <p>We are currently looking at an informal resources strategy – definitely something we will look at</p> <p>It depends on how this consultation progresses.</p>
															<p>2/12/15</p> <p>GMB: Do you not have to have the structure in place by 1st April to make the cuts? Other depts have already started, staff leaving already or have dates agreed.</p> <p>GMB: How much have consultants been paid and what are they being paid for in HR? Non staffing costs/expenditure is what we're asking for.</p> <p>GMB: Working Group on Income Generation – this looks to have died a death, not heard anything since the initial meetings many months ago</p>	<p>2/12/15</p> <p>As far as I know it's the timetable we have always had. We cant step out of the corporate timetable.</p> <p>BPS need to pick this up as its still proposal stage and no-one should be leaving at this moment in time, unless these are staff who are leaving as part of last years workforce reduction. We will check.</p> <p>Might be confusing around workforce development side of things. Will confirm.</p> <p>Staff can forward ideas but the issue is that Depts cannot go above certain percentage. HR can only generate 20% of running cost and PACT HR already generate income into this. As the Council is a public body, legally it cannot make a bigger profit. Income target is set by the Department of Finance.</p>
															<p>2/12/15</p> <p>Unite: Reduction in Business Support – they have become an easy target being lower paid. What is automated services mentioned in the rationale? Really hard to go back to staff with this without a structure.</p>	<p>2/12/15</p> <p>This service should change so that Managers do certain aspects of their jobs in other ways thus relieving the assistance of Business Support staff. We will automate processes to stop forms being sent back and forth.</p>

DRAFT PROPOSALS																
Department of Human Resources																
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget	Saving			Reduction	2014 Consultation for	Employees			Likely FTE		VR Required	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total	%	2014/15 Reference	FTEs	FTE's	Headcount	2016/17	2017/18			
															<p>11/12/15</p> <p>GMB: As said at Corporate Consultation, rationale comprehensive and more than other Departments</p> <p>Unite: Re: note that needed structure to start meaningful consultation. Point noted last week but wanted to re-note.</p> <p>Unison: What, apart from staffing, do we spend money on in the budget and could cuts be made from elsewhere?</p>	<p>11/12/15</p> <p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Management agreed to clarify what other budget headers are within HR.</p>
															<p>11/12/16</p> <p>All Unions: Are they any new posts in the structure?</p> <p>GMB: There are less people but more work.</p> <p>GMB: Do you think the team I work in just does management information?</p> <p>Unison: Not got proposed structure for Business Support</p> <p>Unite: How do you know these roles and this structure will make the savings?</p>	<p>11/12/16</p> <p>Yes, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Head of Workforce Development</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> HR Management Support Assistant</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Employee Engagement Officers</li> </ul> <p>Posts identified in yellow are proposed to be not affected. Staffline is the transactional support part of business support which is proposed will come back into core HR structure.</p> <p>No, that is a proposed job title but we can change it.</p> <p>Included in Pack. Need to ensure BH has copy. Admin support to Occupational Health has also been put back into core structure.</p> <p>Our initial calculations indicate that the necessary savings will be made.</p>
															<p>11/12/15</p> <p>Unite: Can we see that scope of where certain roles will fit in terms of grading?</p> <p>Unite: What is the timeline?</p> <p>GMB / Unite: Difficult to say if agree with structure if don't know what the grades are as don't know what impact roles will have on individuals.</p> <p>Unite: Could you send a list of impacts in each team – posts in and posts out.</p>	<p>11/12/15</p> <p>Management have initial thoughts of where some roles may fit in terms of grading but will not be able to verify until posts are graded.</p> <p>The process will follow the timescales in the Procedure for Managing Workforce Change. We need to agree the role profiles first. Will provide early thoughts of role profile content as soon as possible.</p> <p>Understand this position. Structure will be emailed out to staff after this meeting. SD/managers will visit locations and offer opportunities for staff to feedback.</p>
<b>Total (proposal)</b>			<b>6,889,000</b>	<b>81,000</b>	<b>880,000</b>	<b>961,000</b>	<b>13.9%</b>						<b>19.5</b>	<b>13</b>		

DRAFT PROPOSALS																	
Department of Human Resources																	
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget				Reduction %	2014 Consultation for 2014/15 Reference	Employees				Likely FTE		VR Required	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total			Current FTE's	Headcount	2016/17	2017/18	Vacancies				
	SAVINGS CONSULTED ON IN 2014 FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN 2016 / 17																
AH1a	Human Resources	Streamlining of service and staffing efficiencies		650,000		650,000											
AH1b	Human Resources	Transactional Support - Streamlining of service and staffing efficiencies		273,000		273,000											
	<b>Total</b>			<b>1,004,000</b>	<b>880,000</b>	<b>1,884,000</b>											



DRAFT PROPOSALS																	
Department of Children's Services																	
Ref	2014 Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget	Saving			Reduction	2014 Consultation for	Employees				VR Requested	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response	
				2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total	%	2014/15 Reference	FTEs	FTE's	Headcount	2016/17				2017/18]
3C1		Special Education Needs (SEN) Services	<b>Restructure the Special Needs and Educational Disability (SEND) Core Service.</b> The SEND Core Service carries out various statutory duties including coordination of assessments for children with SEND, monitoring childrens' progress and planning to ensure there is enough SEND provision. The proposal will make savings by re-structuring the services to reduce management costs while maintaining statutory functions.	970,100	90,000	0	90,000	9.3%	C5	2	21	23	1	0	4	<p><b>10 December 2016 - Departmental - UNISON</b> raised concerns about the turbulence put upon services when there will be no budgetary saving. The service is due an area inspection and staff want that considered. School placements is a big issue to place children in a high quality provision across the district. Potential for more children to be schooled out of authority at a high cost to the LA. Are the Heads of primary and secondary schools being consulted and parents?</p> <p><b>UNISON</b> noted members do not oppose change just want to ensure there is high quality provision.</p> <p><b>UNISON</b> highlighted the need for a new school.</p>	<p><b>10 December 2015 - Departmental -</b> Management advised the full proposal will detail the consultation to take place. Due to the specialist nature of the teams we are discussing with the Special Heads first. It is an initial conversation.</p> <p>Management advised there would be no detriment to children and young people.</p> <p>Management agreed.</p>
															<p><b>ATL</b> asked if the 2FTE posts were specific posts – need to be clear on what Management are trying to achieve.</p> <p><b>ATL</b> asked if the staff could be identified as soon as possible so that they could talk to their members.</p>	<p>Management are looking at the management structure and will work with the managers to look at how the service needs to be managed and will look at the timing.</p> <p>Management will do this as soon as possible.</p>	
															<p><b>UNISON</b> asked what the cost of SEND services was to the Council.</p>	<p>Management advised it was difficult to advise in terms of impact to members. It is a fundamental change and there will be implications. We need to do this right and will start with the family and child and work forward, ensuring good consultation.</p>	
															<p><b>Raised 17.12.15 - Departmental - UNISON asked the following question by e-mail:</b></p> <p>Potential reduction right across the board in DSG monies. Is this being taken into consideration when looking at this service? I.e. 1.5% reduction would be approx. £82,500. Potential for an area inspection early in 2016. The effect on the teams that this will have as well as the turbulence caused to staff. School placements is a big issue to place children in a high quality provision across the district. Potential for more children to be schooled out of authority at a high cost to the LA. Obviously we need a new school but management are aware of this. Need to consider the SEND reforms when looking at the reorganisation of how this service will look.</p>	<p><b>7 January 2016 - Departmental -</b> School Forum reported that due to unexpected and welcomed additional high needs block funding, the overall reduction in DSG would be 0.42%. This will be factored into any proposals.</p>	
3C2		Special Education Needs (SEN) Services	Recommission the SEND Teaching Services. Development of SEND Centres of Excellence based in schools. Dedicated Schools Grant funded so no revenue saving. Has been added due to S188 and Corporate Services Recharges.	0	0	0	0	0.0%	C14	2	124	150	0	0	38	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Departmental - NASUWT</b> concerned that specialist service would move into hubs when special schools are already requesting to reduce staffing. Centrally employed staff may not have a job to go to &amp; some schools may not have capacity to undertake the work.</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Departmental -</b> Management will advise further following conversations with special schools but first discussions have been positive. We would need to ensure robust QA systems are in place so the funding gets the right outcomes but management noted the concerns. Its important to have discussions and be clear about what is needed. We have expert staff &amp; we dont want to lose that expertise.</p>





															Staff side noted that no Level 3's have been arranged.  <b>UNISON</b> advised more detailed feedback was needed to consult with members and if this was left until February then it would be too late to put in alternative proposals. Suggested longer meetings to enable feedback and receive constructive information. NASUWT also agreed that it was difficult to consult when it was unknown what the model is.	HR noted that the consultation is discussed at Level 2 and following the budget decisions taken at the end of February more detailed conversations will take place at Level 3.
															<b>UNISON</b> asked when the project plan would be available.  <b>UNISON</b> asked about the costings and how the savings would be made	Management noted this was part of the feedback to Special School Heads. MJ has given a clear steer that this work has to be considered in terms of an SEN strategic review and not in isolation. This is a unique approach and is a rethinking of the service. The timeline of September 2016 is ambitious. As part of an SEN review, Management are convening a group of Heads and partners to look at recommissioning the teaching service in that context and to look at realistic timescales. Following the meeting there were no hard facts but the Special School Heads were interested in the proposals and wish to consider this in the context of the SEND Strategic Review. Management are drafting a new SEN Strategy so it is timely to do the review in that context. Feedback will be included in the comms about the meeting on the 15 December. Management will also build up a Q&A document for staff.
																Need to build up speed to get the detail but this needs to be right and not disadvantage children and young people. This is not about removal of service but service transformation in the context of a full SEND Strategy Review. Management advised this was a complex piece of work and more detail should be available early in the new year. The timeline may be extended.
															<b>ATL</b> asked where the DSG fits with this; are Schools Forum the brokers and how much say so they have.	Management are in discussions with Schools Forum. Some modelling of High Needs Block funding and comparisons nationally, this suggests we may be approximately 500 places short. We are also looking at the National Fairer Funding Formula consultation in the new year to see what that will look like for an inner city LA. We know there is pressure but the DSG is there to support children with SEND. Data is coming through slowly so we need to get a sense of what that means.
															<b>NAHT</b> noted that other LA's have more special school resources and Bradford is more inclusive.	Management noted there are more children in mainstream and a funding deficit on specialist places – need to look at whether we have the balance right in terms of placements
															<b>UNISON</b> asked if there would be integration with Adults as part of the SEN Strategy.	Management advised it would include the 0-7 pathway and up to age 25 so would bring in all partners.
															<b>UNISON</b> asked where dyslexia, etc. fit as there are struggles to diagnose.	Management felt this would be part of communication, interaction and learning assessments.
															<b>UNISON</b> asked where academies fit as they had more flexibility.	Management advised academies have to follow the SEND code of practice and do work closely with us so if there were any issues these would be raised with them.

																	<p>ATL asked if this had been clouded by the removal of statementing. Children have been reclassified as not SEN and having behavioural issues – are we missing this as part of the review.</p>	<p>Management advised that the Behaviour Strategy is being reviewed at the same time. EHCP requests have increased. The code covers social, emotional and mental health issues and has taken out behaviour as that is normally appearing through an underlying issue. This whole area is being looked at side by side.</p>
																	<p>ATL asked what the timeline for the behavioural review was.</p>	<p>Management advised this would go to the Behaviour Strategy Board in April.</p>
																	<p>ATL noted members felt unsupported.</p>	<p>Management advised recommendations will be built into the report. School Action and School Action Plus has gone and there is a concern that children and young people are not being put on the register; officers are looking to see what the differences are.</p>
																	<p>ATL noted a number of schools had different approach and Management could look at best practice.</p>	<p>Management noted that SENCO's do look at this in their role.</p>
																	<p><b><u>Raised 17.12.15 - Departmental - UNISON asked the following questions by email:</u></b></p> <p>What will be the cost savings for the local authority by the commissioning of SEND Teaching Services? If there are no cost savings why is this being considered?</p> <p>Will the Commissioning of SEND Teaching Services result in job losses and if so, How Many? Which teams will it impact on? What are the timescales for this?</p> <p>What is the definition of "Teaching Services"? As the Equality and Access Officers are not teachers and only work with Private, Voluntary and Independent Settings.</p> <p>Which types of organisations are being considered to deliver the SEND Teaching Service Functions?</p>	<p>These teams are funded by DSG. There will be no savings for the LA – this is about transformation.</p> <p>Details have yet to be worked up in the context of the SEND Review.</p> <p>The proposal is about the SEND Central Services and includes all staff.</p> <p>This will be determined through the SEND Review.</p>
																	<p>Would these organisations have the capacity to deliver these functions to the Private, Voluntary and Independent Sector, including Private Day Nurseries, Pre Schools, Childminders and schools delivering 2 year early education? This currently involves 645 settings, of which 388 deliver early education (From Sept 15 headcount census). There are indications that this number will increase.</p> <p>Poor choice of word (Cessation) when staff were briefed and the miscommunication that went out and caused a lot of unnecessary upset to staff. Management agreed to put out some further comms. To explain what was meant. How do you see the HI VI Arc working in centres of excellence, if they are to be run by a school, staff do believe they should have TUPE rights, need more discussion if not going to be run by the LA.</p>	<p>This will be considered as part of the SEND Review.</p> <p>Accept that this was an unfortunate choice of words; apologies for this. Other issues will be considered in the SEND Review.</p>
																	<p>Consultation – concerns have been raised that consultation needs to take place not just with the Special School Heads, but with Mainstream Heads across all schools. PVI settings, Families. Also how do support services fit that aren't teachers, i.e. PVI settings, Portage service. Early Intervention Team, Early Years. All work to the Code of Conduct.</p>	<p>This will be considered within the SEND Review.</p> <p><b>7 January 2016 - departmental</b> - management accept that TU colleagues are concerned about lack of detail.</p> <p>Management have reported that 2 days have been set aside to review SEND (18th &amp; 19th Jan). Details will be formulated at this review &amp; fed back to colleagues on 21 January 2016.</p>



																	7 January 2016 - Departmental - UNISON highlighted that management does not acknowledge/address the issues raised in the email. It would have been helpful if an apology had been given to staff where the incorrect word (cessation) had been used. This had caused a significant amount of concern for a number of staff.	7 January 2016 - Departmental - management had circulated updated information to correct this error & agreed to action a further email issuing an apology to those affected by the incorrect information.
3C3		Behaviour and Attendance	<b>Restructure the Educational Social Work (ESWS) and Behaviour Support (BSS) Services.</b> The proposed re-structures will bring BSS and ESSWS together with the New Arrivals and Travellers Childrens Service and Looked After	978,900	250,000	0	250,000	25.5%			23	28	5	0	0	2	26 November 2015 - Departmental - (3C3 & 3C4 are linked) UNISON asked if the funding removed would be given to schools directly.	26.11.15 - Departmental - Management did not know the detail.
																	10 December 2015 - Departmental - UNISON advised some staff have been told they won't have a job; can we have some details please so we can support these staff. TU's not been briefed as to which staff are to go (3 Learning Mentors have been advised there roles are vulnerable).	10 December 2015 - Departmental - There has been no suggestion or discussion about any roles being at risk as no detail has been shared.
																	17.12.15 - Departmental - UNISON asked the following question by e-mail: Restructure some staff have been told they won't have a job. (3 members) can we have some details please so we can support these staff, TU's not been briefed as to which staff are to go. But 3 UNISON members have been advised there roles are vulnerable. (Learning Mentors).	There has been no suggestion or discussion about any roles being at risk as no detail has been shared.
																	7 January 2016 - Departmental - Chair - asked of discussions had been started to work up proposals.?	7 January 2016 - Departmental - Management advised the weekly meetings with managers have been arranged to work on the detail and will circulate key messages from these meetings.
																	Unison - stated that collectively the Trade Unions all feel that they are not receiving the appropriate information that can be shared during the consultation process.	Management advised that detail on 3C3 (restructure the Educational Social Work (ESW) & Behaviour Support (BSS) services & 3C4 (restructure of the Diversity & Cohesion service) will be provided by the 21 January 2016.
3C4		Diversity and Cohesion Service	<b>Restructure the Diversity &amp; Cohesion Service.</b> The Diversity and Cohesion service has a number of functions including supporting supplementary schools, delivering the Government's PREVENT anti-radicalisation agenda and support to the Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education (SACRE). The re-structure will reduce management and align New Communities and Travellers Services with the "Virtual School" (see 3C3) for vulnerable children in order to reduce costs while using Government grants to cover budget reductions and maintain essential aspects of the Service's work.	253,000	100,000	0	100,000	39.5%			19	23	2	0	7	1	2 December 2015 - Departmental - UNISON noted there were 7 vacancies; is there any reason for that?	2 December 2015 - Departmental - Management will clarify but felt these were temporary staff that were brought in for work when needed.
																	UNISON asked if the Prevent programme was still being delivered in accordance with Government expectations.?	Management confirmed this.
																	10 December 2015 - Departmental - UNISON advised staff don't understand what is meant by the virtual school and vision moving forward for vulnerable children not just LAC. Which groups of children, teams etc. Management were asked for clarity where the staff sit in the service.	10 December 2015 - Departmental - The Virtual School is based on the model for LAC. All children & young people remain in their current schools but the Headteacher & staff work with schools to ensure vulnerable children & young people achieve good progress & receive co-ordinated support from services. The Headteacher monitors educational, social, emotional & mental health outcomes for these children and young people.





																			ATL noted that some schools were under utilised and services could look to locate there.	Management are open to all options. Accommodation costs have to be considered so this would need to be tested out with schools.
																			UNISON asked if touch down points would be retained.	Management confirmed they would and that a list was available on Bradnet.
																			UNISON noted that given the proposal to reduce the number of LAC this would reduce the funding the Council receives for each LAC and as this links to the virtual school the budget will reduce.	Management advised that £1,900 is received for each LAC and this has been guaranteed by the Government for the next 3 years. This will be discussed at Schools Forum but in Bradford this is the responsibility of the Virtual Head but some Councils differ and the schools give £500 per child to the virtual school. This central team undertake intensive work and need to demonstrate outcomes as schools do.
																			<b>Raised 17.12.15 - Departmental - UNISON asked the following question by e-mail:</b>  Staff don't understand what is meant by the virtual school and vision moving forward for vulnerable children not just LAC. Which groups of children, teams etc.	The Virtual School is based on the model for LAC. All children and young people remain in their current schools but the Headteacher and staff work with schools to ensure vulnerable children and young people achieve good progress and receive co-ordinated support from services. The Head monitors educational, social, emotional and mental health outcomes for these children and young people.
3C5		Bradford Achievement Service	<b>Move Delivery of School Improvement to Schools.</b> The District is moving to a "School led" approach to driving school improvement as a result the Council will no longer perform some of the functions it does now and this will mean that there will be a decrease in the number of Council teams required. Funding for School improvement will continue to be made available directly to schools via the Dedicated School Grant.	1,166,100	150,000	150,000	300,000	25.7%											26 November 2015 - Departmental - NUT asked if the £150k saving would come from Section 11 saving from April.	26 November 2015 - Departmental - Management confirmed part of it would.
																			2 December 2015 - Departmental NUT asked re the Achievement Service if there was any further information on how we would make the second part of the savings. If the EMA Team go will this make savings in one go?  NUT asked what function will be in place to monitor the EMA service from schools.?	2 December 2015 - Departmental - Management will advise in response to both
																			10 December 2015 - Departmental - No further comments from TU's on this item.	
																			17 December 2015 - Departmental - No further comments from TU's on this item.	
																			7 January 2016 - Departmental - No further comments from TU's on this item	

3C6		Employment and Skills	<b>Reviewing Work with Young People Who are Not in Employment Education or Training.</b> The proposal is made up of different elements. <b>Connexions.</b> Connexions supports young people on a range of issues including accessing education, training, skills and employment choices. The proposal would reduce the Connexions contract by £450,000 (30%) reducing the Council's capacity to support this work and increasing the risk of growing numbers of young people Not in Employment Education or Training. <b>De-commissioning the Employment and Skills element of the Community Fund</b> to save £250,000. This will impact on a number of Voluntary Sector providers and will further reduce the delivery of employment and skills opportunities in the District. <b>Service re-structure</b> - a review of the service structure to save £26,000.	3,202,000	483,000	243,000	726,000	22.7%	NC22	10	110	124	20	0	4	0	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Departmental - UNISON</b> concerned about the impact corporately on young people in the district; NEET, Youth service &amp; the YOT, all of which support young people that are vulnerable and this proposal could lead to specialist services picking up more issues. We need to give young people focus &amp; keep them off streets; to remove funding will mean fewer activities.</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Departmental -</b> Management noted this as a valid point. Noted that discussions were needed &amp; that any cuts that impact vulnerable young people must be outlined in the EIA. Heather Wilson will note concerns &amp; take away to get the voice of the young people. Heather noted that the Youth Service looks to empower young people &amp; some of these effects can be mitigated by different ways of working &amp; changes could still be made. Management asked Heather to bring feedback in 2 weeks.</p>
																	<p><b>UNISON</b> noted that the virtual school proposal was linked in to this as the government reduces funding for prevention work this will have consequences for social care &amp; other areas.</p>	
																	<p><b>10 December 2015 - Departmental - UNISON</b> queried the savings needed to be made re Connexions.</p>	<p>Management advised the staff figures were unknown – it is staff intensive with the Personal Advisors.</p> <p>Heather Wilson attended the meeting to respond to the points raised from the meeting 2 weeks ago. Confirmation and details were shared in relation to the cumulative impact of proposals on vulnerable young people. Explanation of mitigating factors was given alongside explanation of different working practices. This included confirmation of the removal of the Tier 1 NEET work from the Job descriptions of Youth Work practitioners.</p>
																	<p><b>17 December 2015 - Departmental - ATL</b> asked where questions from staff were being collated.</p>	<p>Management advised that this was being built into a Q&amp;A document. This could be circulated in the new year.</p>
																	<p><b>7 January 2016 - Departmental -</b> Chair asked Assistant Director for an update on the pending Restructure for Skills for Work &amp; Education, Employment &amp; Training.</p>	<p>Management advised progress is being made in the two areas SFW &amp; EET regarding vacancies &amp; redundancies. A saving of £500K has been made over the two financial years and the outline of the further proposal will be shared at the Level 3 meeting. Acknowledgment that outside resources are having an impact. The two teams will look at the functions and a structure will be developed by 21 January. The chair noted the difficulties and the pressures faced by management, however due to the urgency of the timeline assured that more clear information will be submitted by relevant management (Specialist &amp; Client Services) by the deadline of 21 January.</p>

3C7		Specialist Services	<b>Looked After Children - bring children cared for outside of Bradford back into the District.</b> Having more of our children with complex needs living locally will reduce costs associated with the provision of care outside the District which is generally more expensive. This will be achieved by strengthening our local provision and the movement of young people from residential care to highly skilled foster care.	56,412,100	624,000	624,000	1,248,000	2.2%									768	864	0	0	54	n/a	<p><b>2 December 2015 - Departmental - UNISON</b> asked where Management were intending to put the children who are returned to the district. Would management look to recruit, train and retain foster carers? Bradford struggles to recruit foster carers. ?</p> <p><b>UNISON</b> noted that some LAC had been placed out of district for some time and were settled.</p>	<p><b>2 December 2015 - Departmental -</b> Management advised a strategy was in place. This included staff training, therapeutic support, future minds, education provision, etc. to provide a wrap around service. Looking at the cohort to see who could go home.</p> <p>Management advised the cohort and care plans were being considered; need to make sure the support is right for the young person.</p>
																							<p><b>UNISON</b> asked if the costs to foster carers would be looked at to retain their services.?</p>	<p>Management had advised that has been looked at &amp; is underway as part of Journey to Excellence which has been to committee, it has a number of different dimensions/strands which has been costed &amp; is currently underway.</p>
																							<p><b>10 December 2015 - Departmental -</b> No further comments from TU's on this item.</p>	
																							<p><b>17 December 2015 - Departmental - UNISON</b> asked for information about the costings so that this could be taken forward with members.</p>	<p><b>14 January 2016 - Departmental -</b> The savings proposal in 2016/17 and 2016/17 is £624k each year.</p>
																							<p><b>Raised 17.12.15 - Departmental - UNISON asked the following question by e-mail:</b></p> <p>Consideration for Specialist Services proposals 3C7 - 3C10 is to remove duplication</p>	<p>Management to seek further clarification from the Trade Union regarding this question</p>
																							<p>Transformation of services in Specialist services. Signs of Safety / Early Help Journey to Excellence With a view to achieving a reduction in the number of referrals to Children's Social Care (CSC), Children in Need (CIN), Child Protection (CP) and Looked after Children (LAC) cases. Still need to consider current work pressures, services and policy expectations for CIN, CP and LAC cases. Concerns have been raised with management about retention of our experienced staff and reliance on ASYE's</p>	<p>The issue regarding retention of social workers is being addressed at OJC Level 3.</p>
3C8		Specialist Services	<b>Looked After Children - Reduce the Numbers of Looked After Children by 75 Over 2 Years.</b> The numbers of children in Council care will be reduced by improving its Early Help offer to children and families and the fostering and residential care we provide for children once they need to be looked after by the local authority. Earlier and more effective action to address issues affecting families and children along with the use of "Signs of Safety" an approach designed to reduce risks by working in partnership with families is expected to reduce the numbers of children in care by 75 over two years.	56,412,100	815,000	1,630,000	2,445,000	4.3%									768	864	0	0	54	n/a	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Departmental - UNISON</b> noted that there would be a need to ensure the Childrens Centres have enough staff to meet demand &amp; will tie in with Terry's work looking at Admin.</p>	
																							<p><b>UNISON</b> asked if the investment of £400k was for Signs of Safety?.</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Departmental-</b> Management advised this was not all the cost. This is work in progress &amp; proposals will come out as work continues. This is the biggest budget area &amp; decisions are needed on where cuts should be made. Decided to look at prevention services &amp; change the way we work to reduce demand on services.</p>

																		<p><b>UNISON</b> noted the Signs of Safety concept was good but would only work if management look at risk management &amp; reduce calls coming into the contact centre. Prevention is important &amp; has to start at an early age &amp; again links in with the Virtual Head. If this work is done before that is in place there could be an increase in LAC.</p>	<p>Management advises that there wasn't a clear plan but this is now evidenced with partners buying into the work &amp; implementation will be planned. It is a cultural shift &amp; will provide a quality offer where children are seen in the community. The detail will be discussed eventually at Level 3.</p>
																		<p><b>2 December 2015 - Departmental UNISON</b> asked if this would have a knock on effect on the 75 over 3 years.</p> <p><b>UNISON</b> asked if the proposal had been costed. This needed to be acknowledged now as the implications if it doesn't work will have cost implications later.</p>	<p><b>2 December 2015 - Departmental</b> Management advised this was a significant piece of work and the detail would come out as work progressed.</p> <p>Management noted the comments and advised the proposals had been costed during preparing and shaping the proposal.</p>
																		<p><b>10 December 2015 - Departmental</b> - No further comments from TU's on this item.</p>	
																		<p><b>17 December 2015 - Departmental - UNISON</b> asked if there were 31 vacancies. Any ideas where looking for these vacancies, i.e. which teams.</p>	<p><b>14 January 2016 - Departmental</b> - Management advised that through the overall restructure of the service and make up of teams, Management would consider where it would be appropriate and safe to reduce workers posts. Progress on the target will be monitored over 2 years.</p>
																		<p><b>UNISON</b> noted that if some of these vacancies were doing preventative work to reduce these would have a knock on effect at a later date – has this been thought through.</p>	<p>Management advised that the early help proposals would undertake preventative work and should pick up those families; it was felt a specialist team was not needed.</p>
																		<p><b>Raised 17.12.15 - Departmental - UNISON</b> <b>asked the following question by e-mail:</b></p> <p>How will this reduction in capacity help the plans to return children to Bradford?</p> <p>What happens if the LA fails to meet this target?</p> <p>Is consideration been given to those children who currently reside out of our authority, stability, best interests of the child, impact on these children, Safety of the Children (CSE), staff safety Family Group conferences – limited service Timescales to complete. Statutory visits to children. Foster Placements – recruitment of Specialist Foster Carers, training, employment rights, Payments etc. Children's Centres. Human Trafficking &amp; Unaccompanied Children – increasing numbers, use of beds, resources etc. couldn't meet the LAC target.</p>	<p><b>14 January 2016 - Departmental</b> - Management advised that the early help proposals would undertake preventative work and should pick up those families; it was felt a specialist team was not needed.</p> <p>Management advised that all care plans of young people placed out of authority will be reviewed to ensure that they are in the right placement. Where placements can be changed this will be done through the appropriate process. This work is underway. The Fostering Service is developing a recruitment strategy to ensure that there are sufficient placements locally to meet our need. Careful consideration will need to be given on how this is achieved, given the service has to save 415k within the year.</p>
3C9		Specialist Services	<b>Staff Savings in Children's Specialist Services.</b> Bradford's Early Help offer will be improved to develop a clearer focus on outcomes, eliminate duplication and promote integrated working between services. This will contribute to reducing the numbers of looked after children, reduced contacts with children's social care, reduced child protection plans and reductions in associated staffing costs.	56,412,100	0	1,080,000	1,080,000	1.9%			132	148	0	31	14	16		<p><b>26 November 2015 - Departmental - UNISON</b> asked where the 31 posts are coming from; district services?</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Departmental</b> - Management advised this would come out in the proposals going forward.</p>

																	<b>2 December 2015 - Departmental - UNISON</b> noted there were 14 vacancies – were these posts being recruited to?  Is VR being looked at if there are fewer posts than the service needs.?	<b>2 December 2015 - Departmental -</b> Management noted there were vacancies across the service but couldn't comment on where they were in the process.  Management advised this was being worked up.
																	<b>10 December 2015 - Departmental - UNISON</b> - It was asked how much social work capacity there was and how much social workers were paid.	<b>17 December 2015 - Departmental -</b> Management advised this could be discussed at Level 3.
																	<b>17 December 2015 - Departmental</b> - No further comments from TU's on this item.	
3C10		Youth Offending Team	<b>Youth Offending Team - Stop Delivering Pre-Court Crime Prevention Work.</b> "Community Resolutions" helps to divert young people from the criminal justices system by directly communicating with and making amends to people they have subjected to low level crime. There is no statutory duty for the Council to provide this service and the proposal is to end its delivery.	1,148,600	173,000	77,000	250,000	21.8%				44	50	8	0	2	<b>2 December 2015 -Departmental - UNISON</b> asked if this linked with into the Prevent work.  <b>UNISON</b> will consult with member and bring back questions to future meeting.	<b>2 December 2015 - Departmental -</b> Management advised this was non-statutory work in the service.
																	<b>10 December 2015 - Departmental - UNISON</b> noted concerns this could impact on the Youth Service.	<b>10 December 2015 - Departmental -</b> Management advised that an EIA had been completed and would look at pulling in other organisations to provide a prevention model. There are real opportunities at the early intervention stage to work in a restorative justice approach
																	<b>UNISON</b> asked if the EIA's could be shared.	Management agreed to circulate.
																	<b>Raised 17.12.15 - Departmental - UNISON asked the following question(s) by e-mail:</b>  Will the proposed reduction in Pre Court Crime Prevention Work lead to a possible increase future offending rates, which in turn will have a higher financial cost to the wider community?  Implications for Looked After Children (LAC): Research consistently shows that Looked After Children have a higher chance of coming to the attention of the Courts/ Police/ Mental Health or Drug Services than their non LAC counterparts. Various studies undertaken by universities, NHS Foundation Trust and findings by the charity Pause both suggest that LAC children are at more risk of having their children removed at birth. Cameron (2015) has just made a speech criticising Councils within their role as 'parents' when examining Education, Life Outcomes, Health & Employment opportunities for LAC.	<b>14 January 2016 - Departmental</b> Management will be looking closely at the impact of the YOT budget proposals to minimise the impact.  Management will consider the impact on vulnerable groups within this budget process.
																	Various studies undertaken by universities, NHS Foundation Trust and findings by the charity Pause both suggest that LAC children are at more risk of having their children removed at birth. Pause also expressed concern at the lack of follow up service for these mothers who consequently go onto to have further children.	Management will consider the impact on vulnerable groups within this budget process.
																	LAC status - statutory involvement to be increased from 18 to 21 years, possibly 25 years. What will be the cost implications for Bradford MDC & have these been costed/ factored within proposed budget figures?	<b>14 January 2016 - Departmental</b> - at this stage management are not in a position to be able to provide details on this change.

														<b>GENERAL COMMENTS IN RESPECT OF CHILDRENS SERVICE PROPOSALS</b>	
														<p><b>24 November 2015 - Corporate - UNISON -</b> Asked about the cross service transport review with Adults and Environment and Sport, did this go to the Executive?</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Corporate -</b> Management stated that the Executive had completed the review in June 2015 and there had been an update provided to parents. There had been an agreed policy change to save budget. A project board had been established with a Project Management lead officer, work had been scoped and a pilot programme with volunteer parents is being run in the next few weeks. This project is a lengthy piece of work and is seeking to reduce service demand. It is not possible to say what the impact would be until the pilot programme had been completed.</p>
														<p><b>UNISON</b> Asked if an EQIA had been done, they were concerned for parents and youngsters.</p>	<p>Management confirmed an EQIA had been done, there is a statutory obligation to provide travel assistance, the service will continue but may change. There was active engagement and seven focus groups with parents.</p>
														<p><b>UNISON</b> said SMcK had said that due to the slow progression of the children's centre review, this was costing £100k per month and would do so until the review was completed.</p>	<p>Management said this was a corporate review not just Children's Services. The proposal was to accelerate the move. It had been complicated by the property rights in different children's centres which had taken time to work through. It was a one off pressure, Service contracts would be published in January 2016 and the matter was expected to be resolved by June 2016. What was now proposed was the right thing to do. £400k had been proposed last year for impact in 2016/17, no further cuts in that figure were planned.</p>
														<p><b>UNISON -</b> Asked about the impact of the cuts in Adult social care sensory and assessment teams, those staff providing services for VI and HI users and those who required OT support. What was the impact of this for Children's Services?</p> <p><b>UNISON</b> said adaptations would not be funded.</p>	<p>Management said assessment staff looked at aids and adaptations, he would speak with the SD Adult Services and respond.</p>
														<p><b>UNITE -</b> Asked if there would be cross department discussions with Environment and Sport on the proposals concerning the Youth Offending Team (3E27), the PCSO removal (from Environment and Sport), 3C6 (the Connexions cuts of c£450k) and said that the YOT service would disappear. Stated that there were massive cuts, Bradford had the largest youth population in Europe, cross service discussions were needed, and did all the changes have to be made at once.? They stated the Council Leader had said it was a matter of perception.</p>	<p>Management stated that the YOT cuts were a reduction not cessation of the service.</p> <p>Management noted the comments.</p>
														<p><b>UNITE -</b> Asked if EQIAs had been done, some may need to be combined with Environment and Sport (Neighbourhoods). There could be a significant impact on young people if all the proposals across all department are implemented. Also, local representatives will not have the overview, just the knowledge of their own area.</p>	<p>Management noted the comments.</p>







	C20	Early Childhood Services: Children Centres	Cluster the Children Centre Service provision across the District. <i>£564k brought forward from 2016-17 into 2015-16.</i>								128.00	171	28.00	14.00			
	C22	Employment and Skills	Re-structure merged teams working on Employment and Skills.								108.00	122	6.00	10.00		0	

DRAFT PROPOSALS																	
Department of Legal and Democratic Services																	
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget				Reduction %	2014 Consultation for 2016/17		Employees Current		Likely FTE Reductions		VR Required	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response	
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total		2014/15 Reference	FTEs	FTE's	Headcount	2017/17	2017/18				Vacancies
3L1	Legal Services	<b>Staffing Reductions – Legal and democratic Services.</b> Staff reductions would mean that some types of legal service/representation from Legal Services no longer being available and/or severely limited. There may be opportunities to share services with other authorities. There will be implications for Council Departments seeking support from Legal Services	2,237,700	0	300,000	300,000	13.4%			42.5	47	0	8	12	0	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Corporate Meeting - UNISON</b> - Not aware there was an issue in having 3 teams at the last restructure which has just been implemented?</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Corporate</b> - A number of options were considered and concerns were raised about the number of management posts being removed.</p>
															<p><b>UNISON</b> - There a number of vacancies across Legal? Why are you planning on filling them when we have to lose 8 posts?</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Corporate</b> - There are vacancies which are being left open so that we can determine where we need the expertise to be. We recruit internally and support those staff to ensure transferable skills so they have the ability to undertake roles in the areas of expertise that the Council needs to retain to reflect the future needs of the Council.</p>	
															<p><b>UNISON</b> - There are vacancies in Elections are these included?</p>	<p><b>26 November - Corporate</b> - Elections Service is within Democratic Services which is separate to the Legal budget and therefore not part of this proposal</p>	
															<p><b>UNISON</b> - Key implication was the impact of other depts proposals &amp; their impacts on Legal, particularly those involving vulnerable children &amp; adults?</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Corporate</b> - Legal will need to address with client departments what they need beyond 2017 for us to be able to support the area which is likely to be a priority for the Council - vulnerable adults &amp; children.</p>	
															<p><b>UNITE</b> - Member Allowances come from Democratic Services. Why are there no cuts proposed from there? Has this been considered? Was this a political decision?</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Corporate</b> - Members get various allowances from a budget of £2M which sits within Legal Services. Statutory process. Members had been briefed &amp; it is a matter for the Executive to consider. There was a review of members in 2015/16 proposals which may extend to the numbers of members. The allowances for members are set by an independent remuneration council which we refer to which is subject to independent appraisal.</p>	
															<p><b>UNITE</b> - If anyone leaves what about redeployment/exit arrangements for displaced staff - how can the Council offer any progression?</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015 - Corporate</b> - Within Legal services keen to identify transferable skills that staff have &amp; to provide for secondment opportunities (within legal) where appropriate. We offer progression opportunities to allow staff to have a self managed career.</p>	
															<p><b>2 December 2015 - Departmental - UNITE</b> - Requested a copy of the Equality Impact Assessment and an updated version of the spreadsheet of actions from the Level 1 meeting held on 26.11.15</p>	<p><b>2 December 2015 - Departmental</b> - Management agreed to provide asap. Copy of EQIA provided at BCM on 16.12.15. Copy of spreadsheet provided at BCM on 2.12.15</p>	
															<p><b>UNITE</b> - Concern raised that if Social Care Team were to be ring fenced &amp; compulsory redundancies became necessary, people within ring fence would effectively be treated differently &amp; this would cause a concern.</p>	<p><b>2 December 2015</b> - Management will take this into consideration.</p>	



																		UNISON - There may be an impact on Adoption & Fostering when it is regionalised over the coming year. Need to make Legal Mgt aware of this impact if not already.	9 December 2015 - management noted & will have to discuss further with Children's Services.
																		UNITE - emphasise the need to undertake skills transfer from temp before they leave to ensure succession planning. This Locum is costing twice as much to employ a lawyer on the payroll.	9 December 2015 - management acknowledged this & need to progress.
																		UNITE - should cease the use of 5 locums once budget has been agreed in February. Staff will be concerned at the amount spent direct on them given the amount of £300k to be saved.	9 December 2015 - Confirmed that intention to end these after February budget meeting subject to knowledge transfer having taken place.
																		UNITE - succession planning/skills transfer also essential following staff retirement.	9 December 2015 - management agreed.
																		UNISON - asked about formal training being made available to ensure upskilling takes place in addition to working alongside locums.	9 December 2015 - Management acknowledged that training needs falls within the remit of the Service Development Asst post, which is why we intend to fill this post on an interim basis asap to address this issue.
																		UNISON - stated two meetings had been held and specific information relating to the elections team was awaited regarding the costing of the salary progression scheme. They stated that the business support admin staff should return to Legal services and that their had not been previous consultation on the proposed year 2 and year 3 budget cuts for the business support staff.	10 December 2015 - To be addressed in departmental consultations.
																		UNITE stated the proposed reduction of 8 ftes in 2017 was not viable when agency staff were being used. There needed to be a process for skills transfer for in house staff, currently there was no such process for the department to get to the position to accommodate the proposed 2017-2018 budget cuts.	10 December 2015 - To be addressed in departmental consultations.
																		16 December 2015 - Departmental - UNITE - where cuts have to be made by 17/18, then any post that is lost, then the work should disappear. Where business cases require further work to be undertaken, then Locums may need to remain in the run up to 17/18 - work needs to remain in house as much as possible. Childrens Centre work at the moment an example - need to look at on a case by case basis. Some agency/locums are paid significantly higher by agencies, than if we were to employ them directly ourselves.	16 December 2015 - Departmental - Management acknowledged concerns about agency/locums and costs associated with them being more expensive and agreed that over time this would be harder to justify this approach over the longer term.
																		UNITE - asked for confirmation that the posts of 1 FTE Team Leader post & 1.5 FTE Lawyer/Senior Lawyer from a combined general team would be vulnerable.	16 December 2015 - Management advised that we can absorb the 2.5fte within the service by providing development & support into those posts which we have identified as critical within the service & the Council needs to retain going forward.

															<p><b>UNITE</b> – requested that a structure would be helpful that reflects the proposal &amp; the numbers of VR requests &amp; where they sit within the service.</p> <p><b>UNISON</b> - there is a fine line for employees as they may start to look for other posts if they feel that are risk within their current roles.</p>	<p><b>16 December 2015</b> - Management agreed to look at providing this detail. Acknowledged that we need to undertake some work in preparation based on the proposals of the other depts. to ensure that we have a viable legal service that can support the service depts. in the future. Will provide details of VR requests</p>
															<p><b>UNITE</b> – we need to still consider other forms of income generation to ensure that we retain as many legal posts internally. Also need to consider what other departments spend on external legal provision – this needs to be directed internally to Legal &amp; services depts. recharged to protect internal employees within legal service.</p>	<p><b>16 December 2015</b> - Management noted. Piece of work to be undertaken to identify department spend on external legal provision.</p>
															<p><b>UNITE</b> – given that DP is leaving &amp; ACS post will become vacant a couple of options to consider:            a) Go to 2 teams – with a support person at a lower level to support City Solicitor, then use any remaining savings to retain trainee solicitors.            B) Delete ACS &amp; keep 3 teams – not necessarily viable due to the gap between City Solicitor &amp; 3 Team Leaders – this may not be supportive to the CS.</p>	<p><b>16 December 2015</b> - Management noted &amp; commented that the CS would require support at least at Senior Lawyer level. The ACS post is Spec E (£80K) if a Senior Lawyer appointed then could achieve £30K saving which could contribute to the Trainee Solicitor posts.</p>
															<p><b>UNITE</b> – Where people move from permanent roles to Trainee roles does create vacancies at other levels – this is a risk for some to take this step, but its about career development – self managed careers – there is potential for posts to become available.            UNISON - 1 trainee is better than no trainees, but would prefer 2</p>	<p><b>16 December 2015</b> - Management noted this.</p>
															<p><b>UNITE</b> – Legal feel that they are being unfairly treated in comparison to Democratic Services - L&amp;D is too big – no correlation – Civic Affairs &amp; member support should sit within the Chief Exec's office.</p>	<p><b>16 December 2015</b> - Management noted, but confirmed that movement of functions is subject to CMT decisions.</p>
															<p><b>UNITE</b> – if we are to retain ACS post, then need to consider direct reports &amp; realign to more appropriate places e.g. Coroner should sit within Public Health? Other examples could be considered.</p>	<p><b>16 December 2015</b> - Managements noted but did explain that this would require management capacity somewhere else.</p>
															<p><b>23 December 2015</b> - No further specific discussion at the consultation meeting regarding the proposed Legal Services budget cuts 2017/18.</p>	

																	<p><b>23 December 2015 - Additional Matter Raised</b> - In relation to the Committee Secretariat £70 k budget savings which were deferred from 2015/16 (part of a two year budget) to 2016/17, the school appeals function is being reviewed with proposals to increase admission charges for schools. There are various factors to consider, as if the rates are too high it is feared that schools will start using other alternatives.</p> <p>There has been a recent government consultation whereby it is proposed to make changes to include admission appeals as one of the services that local authorities can charge for to allow more flexibility. DP has e-mailed the Dept of Education querying the intended implementation date and is still awaiting a response.</p> <p>DP will be setting up a meeting with Committee Secretariat Staff and Trade Unions to discuss.</p>
																	<p><b>13 January 2016 - Departmental - UNITE</b> - stated that feedback received by them is that staff are open to the suggestions that the TU's have put forward, but will wait to see what comes forward from this afternoon's meeting.</p> <p><b>13 January 2016 - Departmental -</b> Management have sent out a briefing note to all staff setting out managements proposals together with counter proposals from the TU's. A staff briefing has been arranged for later today for all Legal staff.</p>
																	<p><b>Management</b> sought views in respect of 3 locums have their employment extended to 31.3.16 - they are due to end 31.1.16, but due to DP leaving, an overlap is required.</p> <p><b>UNISON</b> - were reluctant to agree due to the expenditure being incurred and especially felt that this should not go beyond the budget setting meeting in February 16.</p> <p><b>UNITE</b> - agreed that once the budget has been set it is not a sustainable position to be carrying agency staff. some of who have been here for over a year.</p> <p><b>UNISON &amp; UNITE</b> - reluctantly agreed to an extension until 31 March 2016, but UNITE emphasised the importance of ensuring the skills/knowledge transfer takes place prior to then.</p>
																	<p><b>UNISON</b> thanked management for their meaningful consultation.</p>
	Total				5,883,000	0	300,000	300,000	5.10%					0	8		

**DRAFT PROPOSALS**

APPENDIX 4

Department of Chief Executive																
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget	Saving			Reduction	2014 Consultation for	Employees				VR	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response	
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total	%	2014/15 Reference	FTEs	FTE's	Headcount	Likely FTE				2016/17
3X1	Core and Political Group Offices	<b>Staffing Reductions – Core Office and Political Offices.</b> Through restructure and review of grading for staff in Core and Political Group offices delete a further post 2016/17 and other posts in 2017/18 while reducing the cost of the substantive staffing structure the element of this proposal relating to achieving savings in 2017/18 will form part of a process to restructure the whole of the Chief Executives Office including Public Affairs and Communications and Policy Programmes and Change.	676,200	35,000	106,500	141,500	20.9%					1	3.6			<b>Departmental Consultation 10 Dec 15</b> Management advised that proposals were still being developed. There is a meeting scheduled for next week with the CEO to take the CEO restructure forward
																<b>Departmental Consultation 10 Dec 15 - UNISON</b> Unison said there were no proposals about how the savings for 2017/18 will be made.
3X2	Public Affairs and Communications	<b>Reduced Staffing Costs – Public Affairs and Communications.</b> Savings would be delivered through voluntary reductions in working hours and efficiencies in supplies and services budgets. There will be significantly reduced capacity and the Council would have a minim level of service which would adversely affect for example its ability to deal with key service issues like waste management, school performance etc the element of this proposal relating to achieving savings in 2017/18 will form part of a process to restructure the whole of the Chief Executives office including Policy Programmes and Change and the Core Office and Political Group Offices.	1,273,900	75,600	105,000	180,600	14.2%					0	0			<b>Departmental Consultation 10 Dec 15 - UNITE</b> asked if the reduction in hours was a one-off accounting or if it is a year on year saving.
																<b>Management Response 17 Dec 15</b> Management reported that they had spoken with Finance requesting that they confirm what will be the recurrent savings.
																<b>UNITE 17 Dec 15</b> The point made at the last meeting still stands, without proposals for 2017/18, they cannot consult with their members. This was also raised at the Level 1 Consultation meeting earlier today.  Management have stated how their section is going to be for 2016/17 but not for 2017/18 and the Staff side are being asked to agree proposals without knowing what the position will be.
3X3	Policy Programmes and Change	<b>Review of Policy Programmes and Change.</b> Savings will be made through: Staffing efficiencies and reductions – including potentially working more closely with other partners Trading services/income generation. Reducing demand through increased automation and use of open data The proposals will reduce resources at a time where Departments may need additional support relating to significant policy developments and transformational change. This saving will form part of a process to restructure the whole of the Chief Executives Office including Public Affairs and Communications and the Core Office and Political Group Office	2,252,000	0	330,000	330,000	14.7%		y			0	8			<b>Corporate Consultation 26 Nov 15 - Management Information</b> Management stated there were no additional savings in 2016/17, 30% of the budget cost had been removed in the last restructure. It was planned to mitigate the impact of the 2017/18 cut through more traded services. Further automation would be part of the wider reorganisation of the whole of the CX's office.
																<b>Corporate 26 Nov 15 - UNITE</b> Asked if there were any planned VRs  <b>Management Response Corporate 26 Nov 15</b> Management stated tht they were not aware but that they would check
																<b>Departmental Consultation 03 Dec 15 - GMB</b> GMB enquired as to how they get income generation?  <b>Management Response 03 Dec 15</b> Programme Management via other Councils and internally, departments and services ask advice and assistance on projects etc; so we advise them and recharge our service both internally and externally. We have already met our £150k Income Generation for this year.
																<b>Additional Information 10 Dec 15</b> Management advised that as PPC did not have any proposed savings to be made in 2016 / 17 the Interim Assistant Director PPC was not in attendance.

																	<p><b>Departmental Consultation 10 Dec 15</b>  Unison and Unite were in agreement with that but Unite did raise a question about the issue of income generation which was an item on the minutes from 3 December. They asked if PPC have already hit their target of £150k for this year what will be the target for 2017 / 18 as it could help reduce the 2017 / 18 budget reduction.</p>	<p><b>Management Response 17 Dec 15</b>  Management responded that they did not have that information available for this meeting and it is a recurring target.</p> <p>Management responded that that was the aim; however, the savings are deducted from the bottom line. They will bring the information to the next meeting.</p>
	<b>Total</b>		4,202,000	110,600	541,500	652,100	14.65%						1	11.6			<p><b>Departmental Consultation 10 Dec 15 - UNITE</b>  Is the £541k saving just for 2017/18?</p>	<p><b>Management Response 10 Dec 15</b>  Management advised that it is</p>
		<b>Additional Comments</b>															<p><b>Departmental Consultation 07 Jan 16 - UNITE</b>  Unite advised of concerns on how the consultation was taking place for the 2017 / 18 budget – felt it was meaningless and was difficult to consult as they haven't been provided with information – this is a Council-wide issue.</p> <p>Unite advised that this was not acceptable and there was agreement on this view from all the recognised Trade Unions.. They felt it was meaningless consultation. If Executive and Council are to make a decision in April 2017 there may not be time for consultation. They could not support any proposals where they were not able to consult with their members</p>	<p><b>Management Response 07 Jan 16</b>  Management acknowledged that proper meaningful consultation needs to be carried out.</p> <p>Management advised that we are a year ahead of where we usually are and wanted to work with Staff Side.</p>
																	<p><b>Departmental Consultation 07 Jan 16 - GMB</b>  asked how they could approve an issue for 2017 / 18 without any information. They were uncomfortable to make decisions so far in advance.</p>	<p><b>Management Response 07 Jan 16</b>  Management advised they cannot guarantee now what will be proposed for 2017 / 18 – need to look at options now.</p>
																	<p><b>Departmental Consultation 07 Jan 16 - UNITE</b>  Unite advised that they could see where money is wasted. Asked what management was asking Unite to agree to.</p>	<p><b>Management Response 07 Jan 16</b>  management advised that Full Council cannot legally agree the 2017 / 18 budget now – this is merely a direction of travel / early notice of draft proposals.</p>
																	<p><b>Departmental Consultation 07 Jan 16</b>  Unite advised that a change to the way consultation takes place is required as it was not working as they see it.  Unite advised that they could not do anything with proposals for 2017 / 18 until they received further information. GMB and Unison agreed with this</p>	<p><b>Management Response 07 Jan 16</b>  Management advised it was early work on a longer term budget process but the point was received and will be picked up with HR</p>



**ENVIRONMENT AND SPORT: DRAFT PROPOSALS**

Environment and Sport Department													Issue 5 - 21.1.16				
Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget				Reduction %	2014 Consultation Reference	Employees			Likely FTE		Vacancies	VR Requests	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total			Current	Headcount	2016/17	2017/18					
3E1	Waste Minimisation	<p><b>Waste Minimisation – Support and Encourage Recycling; Provide One General Waste Bin and End the Collection of Side Waste.</b> The Council has agreed a Domestic Waste and Recycling Policy that will increase recycling and reduce domestic waste and its associated disposal costs. The current and ongoing costs of disposal of domestic waste are not affordable. Education, information and raising awareness will support increased recycling and a scheme providing community incentives to recycle will be introduced in places where households have little space for separate recycling bins. The Council will work with householders to eliminate the need to leave out side waste and will only collect one general waste bin from each household; households above a certain size can apply for a larger bin.</p>	15,024,900	500,000	200,000	700,000	4.7%					0	0			<p><b>26 November 2015</b> GMB - residual waste reduction. Need an impact assessment on this, how will the Council ensure that waste is not dumped? What had the Council in place what was required to achieve this?</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> This would reduce disposal costs due to lower domestic waste levels. Management stated that community consultations on the New Deal had indicated that people could cope with a 2 weekly collection. There would be some mitigation for larger families, around 90% of local authorities collect residual waste on a two weekly basis. Management stated that there had been a pilot in Keighley and the changes were being implemented in Bradford.</p>
															<p><b>1 December 2015</b> The Waste Collection service has started to implement a programme to minimise the residual waste collected and increase the amount of recycling collected at the kerb side. This programme is at an early stage, but indications from the Keighley area are that it is being generally well received. The savings identified are attributable to the reductions in disposal costs which the programme should achieve.</p>		
															<p><b>1 December 2015</b> Unite asked whether management had taken into account the likely increase in littering and therefore workload for cleansing staff which will result from the no side waste policy.</p>	<p><b>1 December 2015</b> SH said that there had not been an indication that the new policy was causing problems of this nature since implementation in Keighley.</p>	
															<p><b>8 December 2015</b> 3E1 and 3E4 – Unite asked if these budget proposals were related.</p>	<p><b>8 December 2015</b> JM said that savings are being made through 3E1 by increasing the amount of recyclates being collected through the implementation of the bin policy previously agreed by Executive. Further savings will be made if alternate week collection is implemented.</p>	
															<p><b>8 December 2015</b> The Unions confirmed that they could probably agree to this budget proposal.</p>		
3E2	Green Waste	<p><b>Introduce Charges for Green Waste Collection.</b> The Council currently subsidises the collection of green waste in some parts of the District, mainly serving households with larger gardens through its brown bin system. The proposals will introduce a charge of £40 per household for collection of green waste for which householders will receive a specified number of collections a year in turn. Charging for green waste collection is increasingly common among local authorities and will remove the unfairness of the free service only being offered to households in certain parts of the District.</p>	3,147,300	1,100,000	100,000	1,200,000	38.1%			15	15	0	3	3	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> UNISON - concerned about potential increase in fly tipping with a consequent potential increase in the demand for pest control.</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> This will remove the unfairness of a free collection service to around 80/85,000 households, there may be a staffing impact dependent upon take up, possibly one less round may be required.</p>	
															<p><b>1 December 2015</b> This budget proposal is for the introduction of a charge for the currently free garden waste collection service. The service is not available across the district, and is currently used by between 80,000 and 90,000 properties. The Council is consulting on the proposal to introduce a charge of £40 per year. It was noted that approx. 40% of other authorities across the country already make a charge for this service. It is anticipated that the take up following the introduction of a charge would be around 30% of current usage if the charge were £40. There may also be potential for increasing the frequency of collection to two-weekly for those households who signed up to the service. The savings are predicated on this figure; if the take up is higher the number of rounds required would be revised and that would impact on the staff savings required. A charged for service may also be able to offer collection to households currently not on the scheme. Potential staff</p>		
															<p><b>1 December 2015</b> Unite highlighted the likely loss of 3 posts whilst at the same time the service is carrying 3 vacancies.</p>	<p><b>1 December 2015</b> SH confirmed that the vacancies would not be filled whilst colleagues were potentially at risk. This would mean that the number of casual/agency workers would increase, but in principle he is happy to do this.</p>	

																1 December 2015 Unite asked for the EIAs for all budget proposals.	1 December 2015 SH said he was unable to provide printed copies at the meeting, but would provide copies either via access to a shared folder area or via email. SH said that management would try to maintain jobs wherever possible and would use a managed programme of casual/agency staff to achieve this.
																12/01/2016 -John Major stated that tonnages show that there is an increase in Recycling. Two focus Groups have been established to look at charging for Green Waste.	12/01/2016 -SH stated that the survey was created internally and that, once received, the results would be shared with the TU's.
																12/01/2016 -Unite stated that the Questionnaire regarding payment for Green Waste was not a valid survey..	
3E3	Trade Waste	<b>Trade Waste – revise charging and payment and improve efficiency.</b> Increasing trade waste charges will generate additional income while a move to cashless payment systems will improve efficiency and reduce costs to the Council. "Pay as you go" arrangements will eliminate building up bad debt and other operational efficiencies will contribute to the overall savings.	(2,935,000)	100,000	200,000	300,000	-10.2%					0	0			26 November 2015 UNISON - concerned about potential increase in fly tipping with a consequent potential increase in the demand for pest control.	26 November 2015 Efficiency saving
																	1 December 2015 The Trade Waste service is currently operating at about break even including on-costs. A recent review of the service has identified savings which can be made in terms of efficiencies around payments and increases in charges. It is a service which has competitors, but management believe that some increases in charges could be made without a loss of business.
3E4	Waste Collection	<b>Alternate week Waste Collections.</b> The proposal will mean alternate weekly collections of household waste and recycling. The current and ongoing costs of disposal of domestic waste are not affordable. The proposal will reduce the total number of collections per year for each household but maintain weekly visits.	5,072,200	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	19.7%			197	265	0	40	3	13	26 November 2015 UNISON - concerned about potential increase in fly tipping with a consequent potential increase in the demand for pest control. GMB - reduction in waste collection to be covered by 50% in cost by increased household recycling, can this be achieved? UNITE - Expressed concern as to whether the reductions in household waste collection could be achieved. Do not want to see fly tipping or increase in vermin. What is the make up of the 40 FTE reduction in 2017/18, is it one or more crews or one or more areas? Asked if contractors would be used in the city centre for litter picking purposes? <del>Would rounds increase from</del> A full breakdown of casual workers was requested due to spend on casuals of £1.2m and £70k on agency. There should not be any reductions in Council staff while casual staff and agency workers were being used by the Council. Management noted this. UNITE - is this set in stone or available for consultation? Management stated all proposals were subject to consultation, nothing had been decided upon at this stage.	26 November 2015 There are staffing implications due to the reduced number of collections, however these will be mitigated by the number of VR requests which are expected to increase. Management stated that the reduction in collection generated the saving. Management will consider this.
																What was plan B if the savings were not achieved? did the Council think that a steward could identify savings of £1m? Management stated that options may emerge from the consultations and that the Executive Report (2.1.2) gave the parameters of what may be possible.	1 December 2015 The proposal is to introduce alternate week collections, as is the case in over 70% of English authorities. Management believe that if recycling increases significantly alternate week collections will be easier to implement. This would result in a saving through reducing the number of collection rounds. It is accepted that this will not be a popular proposal in some areas, but there have also been a number of positive comments through New Deal; comments overall have been balanced. The savings identified for 2017-18 will potentially be added to in 2018-19. Management accept that there is a big impact on jobs in 2017-18 and plans will be put in place to address this in the best way possible.

																			<p><b>1 December 2015</b> Unite asked for full details of this proposal, including number of crews, drivers, rounds affected and whether the proposal includes increasing the size of rounds.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> SH confirmed that further detail would be provided and noted that there is a natural growth in the number of properties in the district each year which are taken into rounds as and where required.</p> <p><b>8 December 2015</b> JM said that he had advised colleagues in Waste, through a Level 3 meeting, of the budget proposals as they related to Alternate Week Collections. He advised the meeting that management would do all that they could to protect the current workforce. The staff side said that they were not in favour of temporary staff.</p> <p><b>8 December 2015</b> Unite said that all consultation on the budget proposals for 2016-18 should take place at Level 2 and not be discussed at Level 3 as this may lead to confusion.  Unite said that this was a difficult issue which needed more thought.</p> <p><b>8 December 2015</b> SH confirmed that the Department would not consult at Level 3 until after the budget had been agreed in February. He reiterated that management's position was that they did not want to take anyone on a permanent basis who may accrue employment rights in areas where there may be redundancies. He asked the Unions how they would want to fill posts which are essential to service delivery. He suggested that each situation be reviewed as it came up.</p> <p><b>8 December 2015</b> Unison asked what the age of the workforce is in Waste Services.</p> <p><b>8 December 2015</b> JM confirmed that the workforce has an older profile and a number of VRs have been received. These are 2 x Manager; 5 x HGV Driver and 6 x Collector. Management also anticipate that a further 4 members of staff are likely to leave before the end of January.</p> <p><b>8 December 2015</b> GMB raised a concern that a number of their members had in relation to a rumour which suggests that the wages of Waste Services staff are to be cut.</p> <p><b>8 December 2015</b> SH said that this is not a budget proposal and asked GMB to clarify the position with members.</p> <p><b>17 December 2015</b> JM said that he was working with managers in Waste to address staffing issues which will arise as a result of this budget proposal, both in the short and long term. This will include looking to train back-up drivers. Proposals will be taken to Level 3 in the New Year with a view to filling the 9 vacancies which the Service is currently holding.</p> <p><b>17 December 2015</b> GMB raised a concern about the recruitment of staff on short term contracts and particularly questioned the work ethic of such staff. There is a need for the Service to be fully staffed and it was proposed that this be done through a recruitment process for permanent staff.</p> <p><b>17 December 2015</b> SH reiterated that management's position was that they did not want to take anyone on a permanent basis who may accrue employment rights in areas where there may be redundancies in order to protect the employment rights of current employees.</p> <p><b>17 December 2015</b> GMB expressed their concern that a number of employees are working when unwell and/or have requested VR which has not been approved.</p> <p><b>17 December 2015</b> JM confirmed that VRs could not be agreed at a time when vacancies are being held in the Service other than on a bumped basis.</p> <p><b>17 December 2015</b> Unions proposed an internal recruitment agency, run on similar lines to the redeployment process, which may better address the issue of short term</p> <p><b>17 December 2015</b> SH said that recruitment to this Service area will be a balancing act between the numbers required and the need to protect existing employees.</p> <p><b>12 January 2016</b> Cross Cutting Transport Issues Unite asked if SEN/Drivers in PTS could be trained into other roles, as Refuse Collection Drivers</p> <p><b>12 January 2016</b> - JM stated that this suggestion could be considered but that the PTS staff would be transferring into Temp roles.</p>
3E5	Play service	<b>Merge and Restructure Play Service.</b> It has already been agreed that the Council's Community Play and Activity Service should merge with the Early year's Childhood team and this will deliver an ongoing saving.	549,800	25,000	0	25,000	4.5%			4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Merger with childrens, no staffing impact</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> The merger of the two services has already taken place in terms of the staffing and there were no staff implications for E&amp;S. The savings now being sought are from efficiencies in the service.</p>
3E6	School Swimming	<b>Increase Charges for School Swimming by £5 per Pupil.</b> The increased charges for Key Stage 2 School Swimming lessons will bring the Council into line with other providers of KS2 school swimming. Over 135 schools across the District currently buy our KS2 swimming.	1,227,400	30,000	30,000	60,000	4.9%				0	0							<p><b>26 November 2015</b> The increased pupil charge is in line with other providers.</p>



3E13	Community/Sports Club/Parish Council ownership of playing pitches/ hub facilities	<b>Transfer ownership of playing pitches and facilities to sports clubs, Parish Councils and community organisations.</b> Some sports pitch management and maintenance including changing facilities would transfer to clubs, parishes and community groups to operate as community assets. This may require the consolidation of multiple clubs onto a single site to reduce the current dependency on pitches used only by one team and to provide more cost effective opportunities for club or community management. Club or community management will increase the potential for access to sponsorship, fund raising activity and grant funding.	2,706,200	0	80,000	80,000	3.0%			76	99	0	2	0	2	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Transfer to club/community management will increase potential for alternative funding streams, no staffing impact.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> Management will consult with sports clubs along similar lines to the proposal put to bowling clubs in the current financial year with a view to clubs taking on responsibility for ground maintenance and thereby reducing staffing costs to the Council. It may be, as was the case with the bowling clubs, the clubs would prefer to pay more and the Council continue to provide the service. Noted that this will only apply to some sports clubs and not all across the District.</p>
3E14	Car parking charges at selected parks and woodlands	<b>Parking Charges at Some Parks and Woodlands.</b> Parking charges will be introduced at specific parks and woodlands e.g. St Ives, Lister Park, Ilkley Lido, Cliffe Castle .	2,706,200	20,000	40,000	60,000	2.2%					0	0			<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Parking charges were generally more effective where there are also other attractions.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> Proposal to introduce charges for parking at some parks and woodland facilities. This is done in other Authorities and would be suitable for some of the Council's facilities, but not all. Management would be mindful of ensuring that new charges would minimise displacement of cars onto the road network to park.</p>
3E15	Identify external funding for Christmas trees or cease provision	<b>Find external funding for Christmas Trees or cease provision.</b> The Council currently buys, installs and removes 9 Christmas trees at city and town centres and key facilities. The proposal is to identify alternative funding for these activities through sponsorship.	2,706,200	5,000	10,000	15,000	0.6%					0	0			<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Believed that alternative funding has been identified for Christmas tree sponsorship.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> Management will look to raise sponsorship for some of the District's Christmas trees. There has been some interest, but it is accepted that it may not be possible to get sponsorship for all the trees.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> Unite asked that Westfield are approached to sponsor a tree.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> PB noted this suggestion.</p>
3E16	Bereavement	<b>Increase Bereavement Services charges above inflation.</b> The increases will bring the Council's charges broadly into line with other West Yorkshire authorities in particular Bradford Council's charges for graves are relatively low. The proposed increase would be an average of 5% above inflation in each of the next two years.	(2,926,000)	110,000	110,000	220,000	7.5%					0	0			<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Proposed above inflation increase to bring it in line with other authorities.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> Proposal to increase charges for bereavement services. Bradford has lower charges than some neighbouring authorities. There are no staffing implications.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> Unison expressed some concerns about the efficiency of the debt recovery system in the Bereavement Service.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> PB said he believed it was a robust and efficient service. Agreed to consider the issue outside of the meeting.</p>
3E17	Culture - Libraries	<b>Libraries - Operational Efficiencies Including Review of Opening Hours and Reductions to the Materials Fund.</b> The proposal would reduce the Materials Fund and spending on casual staff resulting in reductions in resources for library materials across the district and risks of temporary library closures due to a lack of casual staff cover.	3,245,900	86,676	46,000	132,676	4.1%					0	0			<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Reduced library resources and impact on casual workers.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> proposal to reduce costs with no staff implications.</p> <p><b>12 Jan 2016</b> -Phil Barker stated that management had looked at the question of accrued rights for casual workers based on the criteria used in 2014. The issue was raised by an individual casual worker and using the 2014 the worker would not have permanent rights. However, management will monitor the use of casuals.</p> <p><b>12 Jan 2016</b> Unison stated that they wanted to avoid a situation where casuals accrued employment rights as this would have a negative impact on their members</p> <p><b>12 Jan 2016</b> PB agreed that this should be avoided if possible</p>
3E18	Culture - Libraries <b>Ongoing budget to be removed and replaced with transitional funding. (Figures quoted are cumulative) 2015-16 = £150k 2016-17 = £150k</b>	<b>Libraries - Increase the Numbers of Libraries Managed by Local Communities.</b> A number of branch libraries are already being successfully run by local community groups and volunteers. This proposal would seek to move all 23 remaining branch libraries into community management over time. If a community managed solution cannot be found then the Council would look to close them. The proposal would retain Bradford Central Library, Shipley, Keighley, Bingley, Ilkley, Ecclehill and Manningham under direct Council Management.	3,245,900	0	205,371	205,371	6.3%			85	123	0	20	2	3	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> UNISON - The Council should regenerate its own stock in its own libraries.</p> <p><b>26 November 2015</b> Transfer 23 branch libraries into community management, retain 7 core libraries, hoping to mitigate the 2017/18 staffing impact due to 15 vacancies currently held.</p>



3E22	Tourism <b>BUDGET DECISION: Approved. In response to the consultation the saving in 2015-16 has been reduced by £50k and an additional £50k has been allocated in the transitional reserve for two years to support the transformation of the service</b>	<b>Review of Tourism Budget.</b> Over £120,000 of the current budget for tourism is short-term transitional funding to underpin services while a review of its future configuration is carried out. The review will have to deliver savings equivalent to that funding and this proposal requires an extra £69,000 to be saved. Savings can be made in 2016-17 by reducing opening hours or closing Visitor Information Centres. Balancing the budget beyond 2016-17 would require the closure of more or all Visitor Information Centres. The impact of any potential closures could be reduced through the development of online and digital alternatives.	554,200	19,189	50,000	69,189	12.5%			14	18	2	9	1	0	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> UNISON - not helpful to close VICs.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> A review of the visitor economy has been undertaken, the results of which have not yet been published. It was noted that this may result in the closure of one or more Tourist Information Centres, with staffing effects in 2017-18.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> Unite said that they could not consult on this proposal until the Review, at a cost of £10,000, and the outcomes were available.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> PB said he was expecting to receive the report soon. SH said it was clear that more detail was needed on this proposal and hoped that by inviting TT to the next meeting this would be available.</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Proposal requires an additional £69k funding on top of transitional funding to cover current service review, may have to reduce hours/close visitor information centres and use online/digital alternatives. Staffing impact. Check FTE figures as felt these could be headcount.</p>
																<p><b>12 January 2016</b> Management Update Management stated that there was no further information on this.</p> <p><b>12 January 2016</b> Unite asked if the proposal had gone out to public consultation riod</p> <p><b>12 January 2016</b> Unite stated that if, as a result of the consultation there were further proposals in relation to staffing there would need to be a further consultation period</p>	<p><b>12 January 2016</b> PB confirmed that it had</p> <p><b>12 January 2016</b> SH noted the comment. Any future proposals would be subject to the normal consultation process.</p>
3E23	Safer & Stronger Communities	<b>Remove Council Funding for Police Community Support Officers.</b> The Council will remove its financial contribution to Police Community Support Officers (PCSO's) over two years and work with West Yorkshire Police to develop a new approach to neighbourhood policing within the context of reduced funding. The Council currently part funds 120 PCSO's who are employed by the Police and provide a visible uniformed presence. To reduce the negative impact of this proposal the Council and Police will work together to promote and increase the numbers of Special Constables and to move to multi-disciplinary local neighbourhood teams that work together and focus on preventing harm to vulnerable people. The Council would retain its Wardens Service.	770,000	385,000	385,000	770,000	100.0%					0	0			<p><b>26 November 2015</b> UNISON - reduction in funding of PCSOs could result in community wardens doing that work, not their role and they are not paid to do that work.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> This proposal to reduce the Council's funding to PCSOs has no direct impact on Council staff and would be managed by the Police.</p> <p><b>8 December 2015</b> ID said that a report on the new model for policing in the district has been considered at Area Committees and Scrutiny and has been broadly welcomed. The Council currently funds the equivalent of 24 PCSO posts and reductions in the current establishment will be managed by the Police. The Police do not foresee that there will be any redundancies as a result of this budget proposal. ID confirmed that the dependencies between PCSOs and the Youth Service budget proposal are being considered by a small group and a composite EIA will be produced.</p> <p><b>8 December 2015</b> The Unions concluded by confirming that they could probably agree to this budget proposal.</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Remove PCSO funding.</p>
3E24	Safer & Stronger Communities	<b>Community Development – Reduce Devolved Area Committee Budgets.</b> Several organisations in different parts of the District are commissioned by the Council to deliver community development. The proposal would mean that funding would reduce by a significant amount after current arrangements end.	403,000	0	300,000	300,000	74.4%					0	0			<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Funding reduced by 75%, need to consult voluntary organisations.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> Management committees of organisations delivering community development work across the district are aware that the current funding agreements come to an end in March 2017 and that the Council are proposing to reduce the level of funding available to the sector.</p>	
3E25	Neighbourhoods	<b>Parking – Introduce New and Increased Charges.</b> Proposals include changes in Bradford City Centre as follows: Off street evening charges – introduce £1.00 charge. Off street Sunday charges – flat rate of £1.00 On Street daily charges – extend from 8am to 6pm (currently 10am to 4.30pm) On street Sunday charges – extend pay and display on-street to cover Sundays. Other proposals: Implement already agreed tariffs Remove free parking at Westgate 2pm – 4pm Pay and Display around Bingley Arts Centre & Railway Road and Wharfe View Car Parks, Ilkley New on street areas of pay and display Remove initial free parking at car parks Amend and extend charges at some other car parks Parking would continue to be cheaper than neighbouring authorities.	(1,922,700)	50,000	319,000	369,000	-19.2%					0	0			<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Increased parking charges, revitalised city centre with increased demand, parking will remain cheaper than neighbouring authorities, no staffing impact.</p> <p><b>1 December 2015</b> Proposal to increase parking charges and introduce fees in new areas. There are no staffing implications.</p>	

																	<p><b>8 December 2015</b> The Unions concluded by confirming that they could probably agree to this budget proposal.</p>	
3E26	Neighbourhood Services	<b>Street Cleaning – Changing Working arrangements for new staff; using technology to improve efficiency.</b> As staff retire or leave the service all new staff will work to a 30 hour week, the use of technology to plan routes and more effective litter bins requiring less frequent emptying will ensure that this is at no detrimental impact to service delivery.	4,543,000	50,000	50,000	100,000	2.2%				90	90	0	0	20		<p><b>26 November 2015</b> UNITE - 2E4 and 3E26 were linked, there was a cut in working hours from 39.5 to 30.</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> New staff to work a 30 hour week, more efficient operation due to increased technology and smart bins. Management stated that a significant resource of £4m was being retained, £200k was proposed to be removed.</p>
																	<p><b>1 December 2015</b> Proposal to move the street cleansing service onto one of 30 hour contracts. There will be no impact on current staff and contracts will only be changed as and when there is recruitment.</p>	
																	<p><b>1 December 2015</b> Unite linked this proposal to that of E4 in the current financial year and noted that the change in contracted hours would take years to implement. They were unable to agree to this proposal when the service is carrying vacancies.</p>	<p><b>1 December 2015</b> ID said that the proposal includes consultation on the shift to a 30 hour working week.</p>
																	<p><b>8 December 2015</b> Unite asked about the technology being used for planning cleansing routes, and particularly asked about the parameters being used.</p>	<p><b>8 December 2015</b> ID confirmed that the technology is that which is used by the Waste Service and that he would confirm the parameters and assumptions being made. He clarified that this technology is being used for mechanical sweeping routes.</p>
																	<p><b>8 December 2015</b> Unite said that the Cleansing Service responds to specific requests for cleansing and that the routing technology would not allow for this.</p>	<p><b>8 December 2015</b> ID said that the service may have to become more prescriptive about where and when work is done rather than fire-fighting.</p>
3E27	Neighbourhood Services	<b>Youth Provision.</b> The proposal will re-design the Youth Service to deliver cost reductions while promoting the active involvement of communities in delivering a District wide "youth offer".	2,156,100	190,000	430,000	620,000	28.8%				100	172	19.5	0	1.5		<p><b>26 November 2015</b> UNISON - potential impact on increase in petty crime, very concerned. UNITE - management should look at the removal of the PCSO funding and the fact that youth provision was not a statutory service. There would be a potential increase in petty crime and no-one to deal with it. Both these points should be looked at together.</p>	<p><b>26 November 2015</b> Continued redesign of youth service delivery and changing work activity, staffing impact some of which may be casual workers.</p>
																	<p><b>1 December 2015</b> ID outlined the proposals which management have put forward which impact on the Youth Service. He knows that colleagues in the service are considering counter-proposals. Management's proposals include - Moving Youth Workers away from Tier 1 NEET work and transferring responsibility for that to Children's Services - The proposed reduction in the Senior Youth Worker posts can be achieved through the transfer of the NEET work and the associated loss of co-ordination of the programme. There is also much less need for co-ordination relating to building work as the number of permanent bases for the Service decreases. - A proposed reduction in front facing youth work would also align Youth Workers with the areas of highest youth population. - The proposal also identifies the removal of the volunteering post in the Service, with the duties taken on by all Youth Workers. - The Duke of Edinburgh (DoE) scheme will be revised to be cost neutral, or will be stopped - The closure of the Youth Information Centre - The proposal to subsume the finance work - A proposal to reduce and reallocate the activities budget would also align Youth Workers with the areas of highest youth population. - A reduction in the activities budget would also align Youth Workers with the areas of highest youth population. A reconfiguration of the Youth Service work</p>	







Department of Finance

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget 2015-16	Saving 2016-17	2017-18	Total	Reduction %	Employees				Vac.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
								Current		Likely FTE					
								FTE's	Head count	2016/17	2017/18				
3F1	Commissioning and Procurement	<b>Restructure Commissioning and Procurement.</b> The proposal will further reduce management costs and create a new Commercial and Procurement service allowing greater sharing of knowledge and more focussed activity.	1,539,200	55,000	35,000	90,000	5.8%	38	42	3	0	0	1	<p><b>26/11/15 - Corporate</b> Unite - how can it be identified how much commissioning/procurement save and what they produced ?</p>	<p><b>26/11/15 - Corporate</b> Management replied that they support departments to make better buying decisions, what is bought and how. Gauging what is actually saved is more difficult, it's a question of what might have been spent if the commissioning/procurement service was not available. There was some room to review practice and compliance to ensure that departments obtain the best deals when making buying decisions. Management to provide an example of where commissioning / procurement decisions have led to cost reductions.</p>
														<p><b>02/12/15 - Departmental</b> Unite – according to the proposals there are 4 posts to be deleted and 1 VR request. What work will be lost as a result of this VR?</p>	<p><b>02/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management advised that the term 'contract management' is a misnomer – the service does not manage the Council contracts. It is proposed to reduce the 4<sup>th</sup> Tier Managers from 3 to 2 and then realign the services underneath.</p>
														<p>Unison – why are we deleting 4 posts when there are 3 people under threat?</p>	<p>Management confirmed that the 4 posts proposed for deletion are currently vacant. There is no one in the service at threat of redundancy roles at 4<sup>th</sup> Tier level will change as the teams which sit beneath them will change.</p>
														<p>Unite – there is talk of realigning the teams under the 4<sup>th</sup> Tier managers – will staff be at risk of being downgraded?</p>	<p>Management confirmed that some posts may be downgraded as a result of the proposed changes.</p>
														<p>Unite – will there be a full restructure in Commissioning and Procurement or will it just affect certain areas?</p>	<p>Management confirmed there will be a full restructure.</p>
														<p>Unite – when do you intend to implement the new structure to maximise the savings?</p>	<p>Management advised that the aim is to have the new structure in place as soon as possible after 1 April 2016.</p>
														<p>Unite – would it be possible to see the rationale for the current structure v the new structure.</p>	<p>Management to supply a copy.</p>
														<p>Unison – a few years ago this service was completely restructured and some staff were downgraded. Again we are seeing proposals to restructure the whole service and downgrade staff again – it looks as though the remaining staff will have to do more work for less money.</p>	<p>Management stated that unfortunately, some roles may have to be downgraded again in order to make the budget savings.</p>
														<p>Unite – on the budget proposals spread sheet, it states that the service needs to make £90k savings. This will still mean a reshuffle but will avoid staff roles being downgraded.</p>	<p>Management explained that contributed to savings agreed by Council in February 2015 for 2016/17. It was agreed that the spread sheet tabled at this meeting should be only in relation to new proposals (as the 2015 ones have already been consulted upon).</p>
														<p>Unison – this schedule is very confusing and is not helpful to the trade unions as all the information is required in relation to what hasn't been realised from 2015-16 budget in addition to what savings need to be made from 16-17 and 17-18 budgets.</p>	<p>Management explained that Appendix C in the report to yesterday's Executive contains details of all the cuts agreed at Council in February 2015 which will impact on 2016/17 budgets. For the next meeting, management will update the spread sheet to clearly show the additional savings required for 2016/17 together with the proposals to achieve them.</p>
														<p><b>09/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management confirmed that the 4 vacancies identified on the previous proposal sheet related to savings already agreed for 15/16 and that these should be removed from the spread sheet.</p>	



												<p>Unite – This year’s savings of £84k, are Members aware of this? Management should have made these savings or advise on the reason why not, and not just carry them forward.</p> <p>Unite - The additional amount of £84k is not showing on the spread sheet that has been circulated.</p> <p>Unite agreed.</p> <p>Unite – When KPMG were in consultation in 2010/11 and undertook an audit, they proposed that Commissioning and Contract Management was combined and Matrix Management was required as the Departments did not have the skills to do this.</p>	<p>Management advised that they have not been carried forward. This year’s savings 2015/16 of £284k were made last year and the £84k is an additional amount that has been added late last year on top of the savings required for 2016/17.</p> <p>Management suggested that to move forward in the meeting, that this matter is raised at the Departmental L2 meeting.</p> <p>Management responded that there were still some issues with departments which is why they are proposing to have strategic contract management; strategic commissioning and category procurement. The matrix management element didn't work.</p>
												<p>Unite – When will the new AD be appointed as they may require another restructure?</p> <p>Unite – What alternative saving proposals have you looked at?</p> <p>Unite – What is the service Budget total?</p>	<p>Management stated that they did not know and that this should be raised at the Departmental L2 meeting. Management has been tasked to deliver a saving plan and to align a function.</p> <p>Management stated that they were already deleting vacancies and have one VR proposal; management are open for suggestions.</p> <p>2016-17 £1.7 m including Healthwatch 2017-18. Management confirmed that they need to make a saving of £192k and people costs are £1.7m so around £1.3m.</p>
												<p><b>13/01/16 - Departmental</b></p> <p>Unison – At the corporate consultation meeting held on 10 December 2015 an issue was raised in relation to the former business support staff that are now based in Commissioning and Procurement and have been told that their jobs will be cut.</p> <p>Unison also stated that they are trying to find out when the consultation took place and where decisions were made regarding the pro-rata saving of £55k for a team of 8 people. The trade union is aware of discussions taking place in relation to phasing the return of teams to the departments however there appears to be no documentation available which relates to discussions about budgets as none of the minutes mention figures.</p> <p>Unison advised that they will be picking up the issue of the staff transferring back to the Department of Finance and lack of clarity on the budget to support this at a meeting with Sue Dunkley at the Corporate meeting tomorrow (14/1/16.)</p>	<p><b>13/01/16 - Departmental</b></p> <p>Management commented that the statement is incorrect and staff have not been told this.</p> <p>The central purchasing team and accounts payable team joined Commissioning and Procurement in September 2015 from the former Business Support function. The team came with a budget saving and 2 vacant posts. These 2 vacant posts will be deleted from the structure as part of the Commissioning and Procurement savings proposals. However, these 2 posts are not enough to cover the savings required but there are no plans to cut more than the vacant posts in that team and there are no plans for any compulsory redundancies for the former transactional support staff.</p> <p>In relation to the wider consultation issue, management advised that a discussion had taken place at CMT around the whole centralised model and the fact that it wasn't working as well as it should be and a decision was taken to transfer the transactional support staff back to departments with an agreed proportional share of the budget.</p> <p>Consultation on the future size of transactional support</p>

3F2	Financial Services	<b>Improved efficiency in financial reporting.</b> Better use of technology, standard processes for financial report and more budget holders carrying out routine financial activities will deliver savings.	2,641,900	20,000	70,000	90,000	3.4%	60	64	2	0	0	0	02/12/15 - Departmental Unite – there are 2 VRs listed on the schedule. Have they been approved?	02/12/15 - Departmental Management confirmed that these have not been approved as yet. However, they will be sufficient to deliver the cuts detailed in Appendix C of the Executive report. They have not been formally signed off as Management need to test the 24 month VR rule. If approved, it is likely that the departures will take place in March 2016.
														Unite – have any further VR requests been received?	Management confirmed that to date no other requests have been received. In order to achieve the savings for the new proposals tabled today, a further 2 posts will have to be removed. It has not yet been agreed where these reductions will be made or what the structural options will be, but a restructure may be required.
														09/12/15 - Departmental Unison – with regard to the temps, agency, casuals etc. spread sheet. There is a secondment shown in Financial Services, however it doesn't show where the person is seconded from. Does this mean there is a vacancy in Financial Services which needs to be shown on the spread sheet?	09/12/15 - Departmental Management confirmed that this forms part of the information Unite has requested and that they would clarify the position on whether there is a vacancy or not.
														16/12/15 - Departmental Unison – is it possible for the project briefs for each of the proposals to be tabled at this meeting rather than duplicating paperwork?	16/12/15 - Departmental Management advised that the Project Briefs are fairly general and won't add much to the discussion. Some service project briefs are more detailed than others and it makes more sense for them to be tabled at the service level meetings for discussion rather than this meeting.
														23/12/15 - Departmental Unite – has management come up with the rationale as this was meant to be supplied to the TUs?  Unite will not accept any VR's if the work is not lost and this needs to be clear what work is not going to be done going forward?  Unite does not accept any downgrading of staff as they have already been squeezed previously.  Unite has still not received the full savings as there was a mention that previous budget savings were not made and we need to know what the reasons are as this consultation is only looking at 2016/2017 and 2017/2018. We have yet to receive this clarification?	23/12/15 - Departmental Management advised that responses to questions related to 3F1 will be discussed at the Commissioning and Procurement Service consultation meeting.
															07/01/16 - Service Management stated that in previous budget consultations, it has not been possible to go into details regarding potential structures until after the budget decision is taken. The same principles will apply this year; however Management would like to present some proposals to deliver savings in the next couple of weeks, to which the Trade Unions can respond.  In the recent past, Financial Services has been restructured in response to requests for VR. To date there have been no new requests for VR and the 2 requests that have been lodged already will take the service to the end of the current financial year. If no further VR requests are forthcoming, the service could be in a compulsory redundancy position in order to make the savings required.

													<p>Unison – has Management undertaken any recent trawls for VR?</p> <p>Unison – isn't Bradford already doing some collaboration work?</p>	<p>Management replied that they had not done so recently. All staff will have been reminded of the VR option when the Section 188 letter was issued on 20 November 2015. Management agreed to try another trawl.</p> <p>Management also advised that Bradford Council is working closely with Wakefield Council's Internal Audit service. There is a possibility of some departures in Wakefield which may create opportunities for Bradford Council staff. However, it is not clear as yet whether Wakefield Council will need to include these departures in order to achieve their savings.</p> <p>Yes, it is although so far it has been contained within Internal Audit. However, both Councils are looking at the possibilities of expanding this. Mark St Romaine currently heads up the Audit, Risk and Insurance functions for both Bradford and Wakefield Councils.</p>
													<p>Unison - there has been no joining the dots up. Work has been ongoing with IT and meetings have taken place where staff have asked whether this work is being done in order to reduce staff levels. The answer provided was no. Unison would prefer it if staff could have the joined up story.</p> <p>Unison – automation is still being done in the context of staff reduction although we can see that it is being used to reduce costs and accept that it will relieve pressure on the staff that remain. It would be helpful if a meeting could be arranged with staff as the information on where the cuts could fall in the service has not been shared .</p> <p>Unison - it would be helpful if management could provide some sketchy details at the next meeting which the staff side could take away and ask their members to comment on. The Trade Unions can then come back with suggestions on how things could be done differently.</p>	<p>Management advised that there is no direct look to automation to reduce staff. The service has got to reduce costs and automation will make the job easier for the staff that remain. One is not going to deliver the other.</p> <p>Management agreed to think about a sequence of events and suggested that the next service level consultation meeting be arranged for 2 weeks time.</p> <p>Management also highlighted some feedback from the recent staff survey where staff in Financial Services felt that they weren't being consulted on various issues so a wider discussion meeting may alleviate this.</p> <p>Management agreed to provide a "starter for 10" type document for the next meeting. Management will also update the Project Brief in terms of the timescales.</p>
													<p>7/1/16 service. Unite this years saving are shown as 84k, this is at odds with information we have been given.</p>	<p>13/1/16 service. Mgt responded that last years savings were met, but management advised that £82k savings were identified as needing to be saved in 2016/17, but the detail of how these savings are to be achieved has yet to be consulted on. In addition a further 55k has to be saved in 2016/17, along with a savings target of £55.2 that came with the TSC roles when they transferred back to the service in Sept 2015. Total savings for 2016/17 192.2K. It is proposed that this is met by deleting the 4 vacant posts &amp; approving a VR request . This along with efficiencies from healthwatch will deliver the savings. Management advised that the remaining function could be restructured as roles have not been looked at for a number of years or a lift and shift approach could be taken, union to feedback on this.</p>

3S1	IT	<b>IT Savings.</b> The end of the Council's ICT contract will, by enabling full Council control over IT deliver significant savings and more effective procurement.	19,751,900	2,176,000	1,306,000	3,482,000	17.6%	129	133	12	0	0	13	<b>02/12/15 - Departmental</b> No matters were raised in relation to the ICT proposals.	<b>02/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management confirmed the position that there were 12 FTE posts potentially affected on the S188 list, however 13 VR requests. Management are currently reviewing the business cases for each of the VR requests. The service also has 25 vacancies which will require a significant restructure to align the service and mitigate the losses as a result of the VRs. The VRs won't be considered until the recruitment process has completed.
														<b>16/12/15 - Departmental</b> Unite – there is a vacant post advertised in ICT which has Finance and Procurement in the title. Management of the telephony contract has always sat in Commissioning and Procurement yet this also appears to be included in the duties of this new vacant position.  Unite – in terms of mobile phones, C & P have a team that deals with the admin for this contract.	<b>16/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management explained there has been some confusion over the role and whether it is IT centric. Whether the role profile states management of contract or delivery of contract is open for discussion as telephony covers a broad vein.  Management stated that in ICT there is a team member who deals with EE and Virgin Media on a daily basis and discussions will need to take place on what duties sit where.
														<b>07/01/16 - Departmental</b> Unite - are there were any updates on the Telephony contract issues raised at the previous meeting?	<b>07/01/16 - Departmental</b> Management agreed to provide an update at the next meeting.
															<b>13/01/16 - Departmental</b> Management confirmed that there are no plans to change the status quo in terms of telephony contract management. There are no plans to transfer any responsibilities between the 2 services and the management of contracts will continue as at present.
3F3	Revenues and Benefits	<b>Increase the amount charged for issuing a summons to people who do not pay their Council tax or business rates.</b> The charges would only apply to people summonsed after receiving reminders and taking no action. The charges would increase from £40 to £50 for Council tax and £40 to £60 for business rates.	(254,100)	290,000	0	290,000	-114.1%				0	0		<b>26/11/15 - Corporate</b> Unite - it's ironic that there is no EQIA for this proposal. There would be increased charges for people who cannot pay the current charge which would increase their debt. Is the increased income that was shown in the Executive Report achievable ?  Unite - should the Council not be supporting the most vulnerable?	<b>26/11/15 - Corporate</b> Management said it was ironic, however the principle was that those who do pay should not be penalised by those who do not, this was a policy decision by Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Those who pay should not carry the burden of none payers.  Managment replied that it was a policy choice and there had been extensive discussions.
														<b>02/12/15 - Departmental</b> GMB – are we missing a trick regarding the charges we make for the Council Tax summons? Neighbouring authorities charge more – can we increase our charges?	<b>02/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management agreed that this could be an option members wish to consider.
3F4	Revenues and Benefits	<b>Reduce Expenditure on Support for Business Rates.</b> Remove discretionary rate relief that is provided to a range of not for profit organisations.		0	190,000	190,000					0	0		<b>02/12/15 - Departmental</b> Unison – the proposal in relation to 3F4 (Remove discretionary rate relief that is provided to a range of not for profit organisations) has been tried before. What happens if this proposal is unsuccessful again?	<b>02/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management confirmed that it would be up to Members to decide whether this proposal goes forward or not.
														Unite – in relation to proposal 3F4, if you can't make the £190k saving, what have you got in reserve?  Unite – the Council should be targeting who we take money from. A targeted policy is required and we should take into account the nature of the organisation and the value it provides to the local community.	Management confirmed there is nothing in reserve. It's the Members' call. Some of the organisations affected by this proposal are affected by 1 or 2 other proposals which will affect the income flow to them. Members could say that we need to look at alternatives, which means looking at staffing.  Management also added that there is a long list of organisations potentially affected by the proposal and they range from large community organisations to very small organisations and a targeted approach is a good idea.





													<p>Unite – do you know where a decision has been made on the HB Admin grant and when this will be received?</p>	<p>Management confirmed that they have not had any notification of this as yet. Notification was received quite late on last year. We may hear something around the time of the local government settlement in December but this is not guaranteed.</p> <p>Management also spoke about local welfare funding which was received in February 2015. It was more money than expected but there is no guarantee that this will be replicated this year.</p>
													<p>Unite – the government is proposing that Councils will be able to keep 100% of the business rates it collects. How will this affect us?</p>	<p>Management explained that this is difficult to predict. The proposal is that by the end of this Parliament, Local Government will be able to keep 100% of the business rates they collect. Under the current system, Bradford is classed as having greater needs than other areas, so it receives a grant (around £57m) on top of the business rates we retain, which is 49% , c £70m, of the total we collect. How Bradford will fare in the future is not clear, as there are many factors to be decided in any new business rate system which the Government will consult on. However, it is unlikely to have any impact before 17/18.</p>
													<p><b>09/12/15 - Departmental</b>                  Unison – with reference to the temps, agency, casuals etc. Clarification is required as there are 3 members of staff seconded to Collection and Recovery Specialist roles but there is only one showing on the spread sheet.</p> <p>Unison – it is important that clarity is provided on whether posts are temporary or secondments. With temporary contracts staff have no rights to a particular post, however with secondments staff have a post on the structure to go back to.</p>	<p><b>09/12/15 - Departmental</b>                  Management stated that it had been very difficult to break the vacancies down into the various categories on the spread sheet and these could be discussed in more detail in the service level consultation meeting.</p> <p>Management stated they agreed and understood this fully and were very clear that the agreed structure is the position they will be working from.</p>
													<p><b>10/12/15 - Corporate</b>                  Unite - there is a secondee who was not shown on the spreadsheet (additional information provided at the departmental meetings), nor is the contract shown on the temporary contracts list? Accurate information was required.</p>	<p><b>10/12/15 - Corporate</b>                  HR responded that this should be addressed in departmental consultation meetings.</p>
													<p><b>18/12/15 - Service</b>                  Unison – with regard to getting rid of overtime, how do you anticipate dealing with the work?</p> <p>Unison – in Adult Services we have seen a 100% increase in referrals. Is this reflected in the number of appeals you have had?</p>	<p><b>18/12/15 - Service</b>                  Management responded that they do not envisage seeing the peaks and troughs they have seen over the last five years and they will start to see a reduction due to Universal Credit. Staff are already doing less overtime than ever before and it is expected that this will continue and allow us to make this saving.</p> <p>Management replied no it was quite the opposite. The appeals position is getting better by the month; there has not been an increase. The increase experienced in Adult Services will be people who have been sanctioned by the DWP which doesn't have an impact on the Department.</p>
													<p><b>18/12/15 - Service</b>                  GMB – has Management considered cost generation to minimise the reductions as an alternative to these proposals?</p>	<p><b>18/12/15 - Service</b>                  Management confirmed that they are continuing to work with Wakefield and Craven and will consider further opportunities and that they were not writing off as many costs. They also confirmed that they are not sure when they will get the admin grant details through.</p>
													<p><b>23/12/15 - Departmental</b>                  Unite - we awaiting information about proposed overtime cuts?</p>	<p><b>23/12/15 - Departmental</b>                  Management confirmed that a discussion had taken place at the Revenues, Benefits and Payroll Service consultation meeting last Friday (18th December).</p>

														<p><b>07/01/16 - Departmental</b> The Council has received its HB admin funding for 2016/17 and it is much less than anticipated (£2.257m this year, against last year's total of £2.822m, which means there is a reduction of £565k). One of the reasons Bradford's position is amongst the worst in the country is that our caseload has fallen by more than the average reduction. We still receive more than most, per case. Management are also awaiting the details of the CTR grant from DCLG.</p> <p>Management confirmed that they expect part of the reduction in HB admin funding because the DWP have always made it clear that funding would be reduced year on year due to the deficit reduction programme. We have also lost our fraud funding due to SFIS.</p> <p>The Council made plans for the general reduction in funding by allocating £320k in its medium term financial plan and the RBP service has also lost £199k of staffing resources to SFIS (although most of the staff took up other roles). However, there is still a shortfall of £46k and Management are proposing to address this through vacancy ma</p>	
														<p><b>13/01/16 - Service</b> GMB – can you provide a split of the areas showing the number of the VR requests, numbers accepted etc.</p>	<p><b>13/01/16 - Service</b> Management confirmed that they would provide this information with the minutes.</p>
<b>Total</b>			<b>27,401,000</b>	<b>4,295,000</b>	<b>1,845,000</b>	<b>6,140,000</b>	<b>22.41%</b>			<b>28.5</b>	<b>7</b>				

Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget 2015-16	Saving 2016-17	2017-18	Total	Reduction %	Employees				Vacs.	VR Req.	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response
								Current		Likely FTE					
								FTE's	Head count	2016/17	2017/18				
3R1	Economic Development	<b>Review the Business, Investment and Enterprise team.</b> Changes at the regional Combined Authority to develop strategic inward investment will result in changes in delivery locally. This will reduce the capacity of the service to support business and attract investment to the District. Delete a vacant post for an Investment Officer.	945,000	42,000	61,000	103,000	10.9%	44	48	1	1	1	0	<b>30/11/15 - Departmental</b> Unison - what are the two figures for ie 44 FTE, but there is a 48 headcount.	<b>30/11/15 - Departmental</b> Management responded the 44FTE are full time equivalents but there are 48 members of staff which take into account part time posts.
													<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Unison noted that Economic Development held a work place meeting with staff to discuss the proposals and asked for clarification in relation to the Business and Enterprise team, was the intention to delete the vacant Investment Officer post, and what will happen to the investment function as it moves to transitional funding?	<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management replied transition funding for the BIE team ends at the end of 16/17. Future funding may come from external resources including West Yorkshire Combined Authority and European Funding. The Combined Authority are increasing their role in inward investment and are also looking to grow their team 100% and Bradford will have to look at what will be the respective role here in Bradford with the Combined Authority.	
													Unison - what happens in the mean time?	Management replied it is anticipated the Business Advisors will continue to do this work	
													Unison stated that one post has been identified for deletion, and asked if the second had been identified?	Management responded the other post has not yet been identified.	
3R2	Economic Development	<b>Replace City Park Maintenance Fund with a Reserve.</b> Maintenance works for City Park are currently funded from the Council's ongoing revenue budget. The proposals will replace this funding with a reserve of over £500K which would be sufficient to cover the life time replacement costs for major works.	1,326,000	40,000	0	40,000	3.0%			0	0				
3R3	Economic Development	<b>Replace Budget for the City Centre Growth Zone Rates Rebate Team with a Reserve.</b> The costs of managing contracts for business rate rebates in the City Centre Growth Zone are currently paid for from the Council's ongoing revenue budget. This proposal would replace that funding by using money set aside to fund the Growth Zone's Rates Rebate programme for the duration of the programme to March 2020. The proposal would reduce the money available to support City Centre businesses but because of various other business rates initiatives fewer businesses will qualify to receive a rates rebate than was originally anticipated so the impact will be minimised.	446,000	90,000	0	90,000	20.2%	44	48	2.5	0	0	0		
3R4	Economic Development	<b>Reduce European Strategic Investment Fund (ESIF) and Replace with a Reserve.</b> The ESIF is used to provide match funding for bids for funds from the European Union, this match funding typically helps to secure an additional 50% from the EU. Reducing the fund will reduce the capacity to respond to Leeds City Region requests to deliver EU funded programmes. Leeds City Region is currently calling for an EU funded enterprise support programme under the proposal. This and other similar calls would be funded through reserves.	945,000	200,000	0	200,000	21.2%			0	0			<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Unison - what will happen in 2020 to the posts funded by the reserves?  Unison - are the reserves unallocated?	<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management stated they cannot predict what will happen in 2020, however once the posts have been taken out of revenue base budgets they cannot transfer back.  Management responded that they are not unallocated reserves, they are reserves which have been built up from within the department.

3R5	Climate, Housing & Property	<b>Continue to reduce the Council's Administrative Estate.</b> The Council will continue to reduce the number of buildings it operates from in the City Centre, closing Jacobs Well and moving staff to Britannia House. Some capital investment will be required to deliver the proposal.	3,838,300	0	150,000	150,000	3.9%			0	0			<b>26/11/15 - Corporate</b> Unite - new ways of working (NWOW) require 7:10 desk ratio, now it will be 5:10, staff are being forced into NWOW. The impact on staff moving to Britannia House should be considered prior to the move.  Unite - what about building investment due to the sale of existing buildings?  Unite - our understanding is that the maintenance was funded from the sale?	<b>26/11/15 - Corporate</b> Management stated that the arrangements varied in different teams, 5:10 was a possibility but was not across all areas, the management assessment suggested that all staff could transfer satisfactorily, all options are being considered.  Management stated that the savings from Future House related to the lease costs and ongoing maintenance, £60k pa on the proposals. The financial appraisal was on an invest to save basis.  Management stated that was only backlog maintenance.
														<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Unison noted there has been no feedback from members, as there is insufficient information about the proposals to consult members and that this was raised at OJC Level I this morning, therefore Unison are unable to feed anything back at present.	<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management noted this.
3R6	Climate, Housing & Property	<b>Remove or Reduce Rental Subsidies Provided to Tenants of "Community Facilities"</b> . Tenants of "community facilities" e.g. sports and recreational facilities are granted rental subsidies from the Council based on their ability to pay. The total value of subsidies is £300,000. The proposal would either remove all subsidies or revise the policy to reduce the overall level of subsidy by assessing the tenant's contribution to District wide priorities, their management of the property and the extent to which facilities are made available to the wider community.	-1,148,000	0	300,000	300,000	-26.1%			0	0				
3R7	Climate, Housing & Property	<b>Changes to the delivery of capital schemes.</b> Changes to the Education Client Services and Architectural Services teams.	1,802,000	17,000	17,000	34,000	1.9%	21	21	2	0	2	0	<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Unison - is there a straight swop of the two posts under threat with the two vacancies?  Unison noted that more data cleansing is being carried out on VR's to determine a more accurate reflection of the situation and asked for an update on vacancies.	<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management responded that potentially but advised that there is also a VR request under consideration in the estate team which deal with school properties. Management should be able to provide an update for the next meeting, Work is ongoing on data cleansing for VRs.
														Unison - have the equalities impact assessments been completed?	Management responded these have been carried out and will be sent out electronically.
3R8	Climate, Housing & Property	<b>Reduce Building Maintenance Budgets.</b> The maintenance budget has already reduced by £700,000 in the last four years and the proposal would make a further £1m reduction which would affect the ability to carry out programmes of planned maintenance work.	4,248,900	350,000	650,000	1,000,000	23.5%	259	267	7	13	0	3		
3R9	Climate, Housing & Property	<b>Restructure Environment &amp; Climate Change Service.</b> The team works to reduce energy consumption and expenditure, reduce carbon emissions and promote a reduction in fuel poverty and improve public health outcomes. The proposed re-structure will align functions to other areas of activity such as buildings and estates management and reduce management costs. There will be a reduction in strategic capacity and the delivery of carbon reduction work however this reflects a changing policy context in which there is greater difficulty in delivering schools carbon reduction projects which form a significant part of the work.	524,000	0	186,000	186,000	35.5%	14	14	0	4	1	1		

3R10	Climate, Housing & Property	<b>Increase Trading Surplus in Catering Services by Ceasing Loss Making Operations.</b> The proposal would review and change services at loss making venues which include Sports centres and swimming pools and City Hall.	-1,204,400	100,000	0	100,000	-8.3%	57	77	3	0	10	0		
3R11	Climate, Housing & Property	<b>Reduce Office Cleaning to 3 Days a Week.</b> The proposal would reduce levels of cleaning and increase reliance on employees to keep their work areas clean and tidy.	1,914,300	100,000	200,000	300,000	15.7%	107	242	7	13	19	2	<b>26/11/15 - Corporate</b> Unison - there are concerns about the potential impact on part-time workers and we will need to see the EQIA.  Unison - it's difficult to establish the accurate contractual status of hours of employees, whether they are temporary, contractual or non-contractual overtime? TU's and employees need to understand their rights. Cleaners are constantly being asked to do more work in less time.	<b>26/11/15 - Corporate</b> Management agreed to provide clarity on contractual positions and working arrangements.
														<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Unison - how will reducing the office cleaning to three days a week work?  Unison commented that more guidance/information should be received at Corporate Consultation meetings.	<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management replied that this was still being considered.
														<b>10/12/15 - Corporate</b> Unite - the Council could end up using agency staff which could be more expensive. Staff will have to empty bins in City Hall staff had to take recycling rubbish to the recycle point members should not have to clean on the non-cleaning days. We want clarity on what jobs our members would and would not be expected to do.  Unison - we want to know the impact on the working conditions of our members as a result of this proposal.	<b>10/12/15 - Corporate</b> HR responded that this should be addressed in the departmental meetings.
3R12	Climate, Housing & Property	<b>Property Programme – Continue to Rationalise the Council Estate.</b> The continuation of the Property Programme will continue to deliver savings including the closure of Future House, reductions in managed print spend and savings on cleaning and utilities bills.	3,756,000	235,000	650,000	885,000	23.6%	19	20	3.5	0	2	0	<b>30/11/15 - Departmental</b> Unison - catering for sports centres and swimming pools, does this refer to the carry over from last year, and are to be implemented this week?	<b>30/11/15 - Departmental</b> Management confirmed that this is the case and it is carry over from last year.
3R13	Planning Transportation & Highways	<b>CCTV Services.</b> The proposal would seek to generate income through exploring the commercial opportunities for example services to education, other authorities and the private sector.	647,000	0	100,000	100,000	15.5%	15	16	16	0	2	0		
3R14	Planning Transportation & Highways	<b>Street Lighting – Partial Night Switch Off</b> Switching selected street lights off between midnight and 5am will reduce energy costs. Other authorities have adopted this approach. Determining the specific areas subject to the proposals will need surveying, research and consultation to be undertaken. There would be no switch off proposed in areas where; There is a record of traffic collisions during switch off times There is high crime during switch off times There are Roundabouts, complex junctions etc There is CCTV coverage There are pedestrian crossings There is 24 hour use e.g. Hospitals There is sheltered accommodation and housing for vulnerable people Some initial investment would be required to make the technical changes necessary to deliver ongoing savings. Public consultation may also be required in some areas. Additional switch offs could potentially reduce costs by another 20%.	5,728,000	0	100,000	100,000	0			0	0				

3R15	Planning Transportation & Highways	<b>Reduce Winter Gritting Routes.</b> The Council currently affords priority status for gritting to 62% of the local road network – 712 miles. The proposals would reduce this to 42% by 2017-18 with just the main arterial routes and spinal link roads being afforded priority status.	3,782,000	70,000	40,000	110,000	2.9%			0	0				
3R16	Planning Transportation & Highways	<b>Restructure Development Services.</b> Development Services deliver planning and building control services. The proposal reduces staffing levels but by restructuring in the light of changing requirements and already agreed procedures no detrimental effect on planning is anticipated. Building control is moving to a joint arrangement with Kirklees and possibly also Wakefield Councils which should see it maintain and capture market share.	1,380,000	244,000	0	244,000	17.7%	111.79	118	4.6	0	5.6	2	<b>30/11/15 - Departmental</b> Unison - which sections are affected by 3R16 ie118 staff though out Planning?	<b>30/11/15 - Departmental</b> Management responded that the areas affected are Development Control, Building Control, Drainage and Admin Support in each area.
													<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b> Unison noted they have not had any feedback from members in Development Services.  Unison - will the vacancies off-set the reductions?	<b>10/12/15 - Departmental</b>  Management stated that this will be looked at and clarified.	
													Unison - are there any figures on requests for flexible retirement and/or how many people have made an application for planned retirement?	Management responded that there have not been any new planned VRs.  Management/Human Resources informed the meeting that planned redundancy is complicated by the proposed Government Cap of £95,000 on termination costs. Until Central Government provide guidance regarding the cap figure the Authority is unable to make decisions for any planned VR's. Redundancy pension strain costs are borne by the Council.	
3R17	Planning Transportation & Highways	<b>New Charges for Permits for Car Parking, Skips and Scaffolding; Charges for Dropped kerb applications and events on the highway co-ordination.</b> The proposal introduces new charges for residents car parking permits and for skips and scaffolding on the highways. Applications for dropped kerbs will incur a charge as will staff time involved in co-ordinating events and parades. Licence fees will be introduced for cranes and cherry pickers.	1,380,000	51,000	67,000	118,000	8.6%	15.81	16	16	0	0	2		
3R18	Planning Transportation & Highways	<b>Re-Structure Planning Transport &amp; Highways and Transfer Some Functions to the West Yorkshire Combined Authority.</b> The proposal will change administrative support, merge Transport Development and Highways Asset management in to one Team and seek to centralise some functions to the West Yorkshire Combined Authority – these are Highways Design, Traffic control, Highways Structures, Transport Planning and Highways Development Control. Transfer of functions would remove the Council's ability to deliver its own strategic highway improvements without having to use consultants. Review the provisio of Highways inclusion and mobility advise which could reduce effectiveness and impact in this area of work.	1,380,000	150,000	125,000	275,000	19.9%	223.49	229	7	6	28	2	<b>26/11/15 - Corporate</b> Unite - what is the impact on the transfer of services to the WYCA, the interdependencies on other services and how much income would be lost on transfer?	<b>26/11/15 - Corporate</b> Management replied that at this stage it was not clear what the impact would be and that discussions were on-going.

													<p><b>18/12/15 - Departmental</b> Unison - the proposal shows a cut of 19.9% is there any further information on this?</p> <p>Unison - will there be Combined Opportunity opportunities?</p> <p>Unison - when will structures are available?</p> <p>GMB - is there a time issue for consulting on restructures?</p>	<p><b>18/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management responded that at the moment it is impossible to say other than it is a direction of travel and we don't know yet what the implications are of Devolution and a West Yorkshire Combined Authority.</p> <p>Management replied that it might be TUPE or Secondments or transfers, we can't predict it.</p> <p>Management replied that as these are proposals they will consult on structures once the budget is decided.</p> <p>HR clarified that although we cannot pre-empt the Council decision, there is some latitude to do some consultation on structures before the Council meets.</p> <p>Management responded that there are 2 different processes; the budget and then restructures following the budget decision, although it was agreed that it would be helpful if there is some latitude to do some consultation. Management to push on getting structures in draft form.</p>
													<p><b>18/12/15- Departmental</b> Unison - has the settlement figure been announced?</p>	<p><b>18/12/15 - Departmental</b> Management replied that the Finance Director had produced a short initial briefing on the settlement and that it was within £100K of the estimate. However, there is more work to be done on understanding how it impacts on the Care Act and Better Care Fund and New Homes Bonus.</p>
													<p><b>12/01/16 - Departmental</b> The TU's jointly stated that they were unable to consult with their members on any of these proposals as insufficient information has been provided by management to enable them to do so. The TU's confirmed that this issue was raised at the corporate consultation meeting on 7/1/16 and that a formal dispute over a failure to allow meaningful consultation would be lodged against 4 departments namely; Regeneration, Environment and Sport, Childrens Services and Adult Services.</p>	<p><b>12/01/16 - Departmental</b> Management acknowledged the TU position and confirmed that this matter would now need to be addressed corporately.</p>
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>36,725,000</b>	<b>1,689,000</b>	<b>2,646,000</b>	<b>4,335,000</b>	<b>11.80%</b>				<b>69.6</b>	<b>37</b>		



DRAFT PROPOSALS

Department of Adults and Community Services																	
New Ref	2014 Ref	Service	Proposal Definition	Net Budget 2015-16	Saving 2016-17	2017-18	Total	Reduction %	2014 Consultation for 2016/17		Employees		Likely FTE Reducti	VR Requested	TU Feedback	Management Information/Response	
									2014/15 Reference	FTEs	Current FTE's	Headcount					2016/17
3A1			Changes to the Contributions Policy for Adult Social Care People who are able to reasonably afford it will pay more towards the cost of their non-residential care. Bradford's current policy is generous compared to other authorities and treats people with more income more favourably. No service user would pay more than they can reasonably be expected to afford. A significant number of service users out of a total of 3,500 would see an increase of between 2p and £116 per week. People with higher levels of income or savings would be most affected.	5,747,300	466,000	610,900	1,076,900	18.7%					0	0		03.12.15 - Unison - Have costings been used?  10.12.15 Unions had no further issues.  07.01.16 Unison reps have expressed concern about the impact of increased contributions for service users. We feel this has the potential to discourage people from accessing the care they need, which could lead to increased need and problems in the future.	03.12.15 - Management confirmed this is considerable subsidised and is now based on the true cost and ability of service users to pay.
3A2			<b>Changes to Home Care Services</b> - savings will be made by changing the way in which home care services are monitored and delivered and by fully implementing existing policy relating to care plans for people recovering from hospitalisation and accidents. <b>Electronic Monitoring</b> – using technology to monitor and agree care provided by contractors will enable the Council to save money by paying for care that is actually delivered rather than simply planned in advance and providing it with more control over changes to individual care packages and the length of time those changes stay in place. <b>Reducing staff costs by Providing More Equipment in the Home</b> - sometimes peoples' care needs can mean that they need more than one person to provide their care. Investing in equipment such as hoists can reduce the need for more than one carer and cut costs. The proposal includes accessing funding through the Health Service Capital Equipment Fund. <b>Changes to Welfare Visits</b> – some people receive 15 minute home calls to check on their welfare. The proposed changes mean that instead of someone calling at their home the checks would be done over the phone.	23,059,400	500,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	8.7%					0	0		26.11.15 - UNITE expressed concern on the impact on service users when a 15 minute visit would be replaced with a phone call.03.12.15 - Unison expressed concern around changes to welfare visits  10.12.15 Unions had no further issues.  07.01.16 Hopefully the changes will benefit service users with the correct contact time they are assessed to need. Unsure about changes to Welfare visits as these are not carried out were stopped a while ago. Some 15 minute calls are for medication and or emptying commode. Although new technology will help in cutting down the number of calls. Some service users will still need medication calls to ensure medication has been taken. As these medication calls are linked to health would it not be possible to look at health funding these calls	03.12.15 Management advised no service would be changed without a review. Services would be based on need. Some 15 min visits could be replaced by telephone calls.  07.01.16 – Management confirmed all 15 minute visits were to be reviewed.
3A3			<b>Changes to Supported Living for People With Learning Disabilities: Using Technology to Promote Independence and Reduce Contact Time With Staff.</b> Supported living covers different services that help people with learning disabilities to be enabled to live as independently as possible. The Council currently spends over £7.9m on these services and the proposal would save money by requiring contractors to reduce costs by using new technology to promote greater independence and reduce the need for one to one contact with staff. Some people will see their hours of contact time reduce but all individual needs will be reviewed.	7,917,800	500,000	500,000	1,000,000	12.6%					0	0		03.12.15 - Unions had no concerns  10.12.15 Unions had no further issues.  07.06.15 No issues, although new technology may not be suitable for some service users	
3A4			<b>Review and De-Commission Financial and Welfare Advice Services.</b> The review will be undertaken in conjunction with the Council's public health Department which also commissions advice services. The proposal would reduce the overall funding available to providers of advice, reduce face to face contact by providing digital alternatives, eliminate the least effective advice sessions and target provision where there is greatest need.	3,711,000	300,000	700,000	1,000,000	26.9%					0	0		03.12.15 - Unison - Has any cost analysis taken place?  10.12.15 Unions had no further issues.  07.01.16 With the increase in contributions to receiving social care in 3A1 it is important that people are aware of benefits aware that services in this area are at times duplicated however once again face to face contact may still be needed for people unclear with computers and new technology.	03.12.15 - Management confirmed that there needs to be much more control of funding of welfare advice. A much more coordinated and comprehensive service will be in place after the procurement process.

3A5			<b>Restructure Adults and Community Services and Reduce Staff by 80.</b> Savings would be made by undertaking a fundamental re-structure of the whole of Adults and Community Services including options for the delivery of Social Work and Occupational Therapy assessment and support functions. There could however be an impact on frontline services, for example in delayed transfers from hospitals to care and longer waiting times for people to have their needs assessed.	36,429,200	500,000	2,000,000	2,500,000	6.9%			1018.8	1293	80	0	34.88	43	27.11.15 - UNISON Re 3A5, would the Council stop using agency staff?	27.11.15 Management stated the Council position was to recruit to FTE vacancies where possible, however within social care there was temporary demand which had to be met. There were issues regarding how users entered the social care market and it was expected to integrate the process with the health service by 2020. VRs would be used to help achieve the proposed staffing cuts. Raised concern that the figure of 69 agency workers stated in the CX's letter may not be reflective of practice. A list of all agency workers and their roles on a council wide basis was requested. Stated that the Occupational Therapy assessment team could make care more effective, however waiting lists would become longer.
																	There was a 100% rise in referrals due to benefits cuts, there was also an increase in designated mental health cases, users came to OT prior to social worker assessment. Integration had not worked, staff in the same building did not communicate, it was a nice idea but not effective. Adults was always overspent, how did they plan to reduce costs, savings would not be made if staff were reduced because there was more demand, it was a statutory function and had to be delivered.  GMB Asked for the spend on consultants to be identified on a Council wide basis.	





3A9			<b>Closure of Whetley Hill Day Care Centre With Services to be Provided Elsewhere.</b> Closure of Whetley Hill Day Care centre has been agreed with users and families who have worked with the Council to find a solution. The building will close but people will access services at Thompson Court and Norman Lodge.	641,300	0	170,000	170,000	26.5%					22		22	0	3.5	3	26.11.15 3A9, this should not be on the list if previously consultation had taken place  03.12.15 - Unison - please check FTE at 22  10.12.15 Unions requested a breakdown of vacancies and whether these can be deleted.  07.01.16 - No details available of how the closure of Whetley Hill will affect staff or service users. How would the move to Thompson Court and Norman Lodge be implemented, no details of how service will operate. What will happen to the staff at Whetley Hill? 22 potential redundancies. Again no quality impact assessments. Informed to speak to Dean about details	26.11.15 Management concluded by saying that these were cuts not efficiency savings. Service users would have to wait longer, however this was the only way to optimise the budget and staff. The Council could only do this by working with the trade unions and staff to restructure. Working collaboratively is the only way the Council will get near to making the cuts  03.12.15 - Management advised staff will continue to deliver services elsewhere and figures will be checked and no staff were expected to be made compulsorily redundant. The changes will take place in 2017-18.  10.12.15 HR advised there are currently 3.5 vacancies but these will be double checked for the next meeting.  07.01.16 Management advised Unions to coordinate site visits with Dean Roberts.
3A10			<b>Changes to Contracts for Residential and Nursing Care for People With Learning Disabilities to Promote Independence and the Use of Technology.</b> New contracts will enable the re-negotiation of high cost placements with service providers and require them to maximise the use of technology and telemedicine to support people with learning disabilities in the community which will reduce the numbers of care hours including nursing care required. The development of additional extra care housing will also reduce reliance on residential and nursing placements.	18,248,500	500,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	8.2%								0	0		03.12.15 - Unions had no concerns  10.12.15 Unions had no further issues.  07.01.16 No Issues	
3A11	Operational Services		<b>Reduce the Number of Long Term Placements of Older People in the Independent Sector.</b> Although the Council will work to reduce the numbers of older people needing long term residential or nursing care some will still require that level of care. The Council proposes to reduce costs by changing spare beds in Council homes into long term beds reducing the numbers that we need to purchase from the independent sector.	17,373	800,000	200,000	1,000,000	5756.1%								0	0		03.12.15 - Unison queried impact on flexi beds  10.12.15 Unions had no further issues.  07.01.16 - Would this proposal have an effect on available flexi beds which are used to try to help return people to the community? With the failure of the private sector in long term Placements. Over one third of private sector homes failing CQC inspections and increasing in number the need to have more in-house services in this area are clear and does expose that the policy of closing in house care homes has failed.	03.12.15 - Management need to work through the details in conjunction with the 24/7 BEST service
3A12			<b>Mental Health – Review of charging arrangements for people with Mental Health issues.</b> Some people with Mental Health needs don't contribute financially towards their social care. because of their status under the Mental Health Act. The proposal will review their status and anticipates more income from people with mental health needs through payments towards their care and as a consequence bring them into line with other clients for example older people and people with disabilities.	3,051,100	250,000	250,000	500,000	16.4%								0	0		03.12.15 - Unison - Has this been to legal?  10.12.15 Unions had no further issues.  07.01.16 - No issues	03.12.15 - Management confirmed it had. They are operating to agreed policy.
3A13			<b>Reduce Long Term Placements of Older People into Nursing and Residential Care.</b> By supporting more people to live in their own homes or in extra care supported housing the Council can reduce what it spends on long term residential and nursing care. The Council will achieve reductions in the numbers of older people needing long term residential and nursing care by using technology to help them stay independent and working closely with health services to plan and deliver services.	17,373,000	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	5.8%								0	0		03.12.15 - Unison - No issues  10.12.15 Unions had no further issues.  07.01.16 - This proposal links in with proposal 3A11. If we reduce the availability of flexi beds to help return people to the community with their needs being assessed. How will this reduction be achieved?	07.01.16 Refer to 3A11
<b>Total</b>				<b>122,418,000</b>	<b>4,316,000</b>	<b>10,290,900</b>	<b>14,606,900</b>	<b>11.9%</b>								<b>102</b>	<b>0</b>			
<b>SAVINGS CONSULTED ON IN 2014 FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN 2016/17</b>																				
															<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>				

A1	Assessment & Support Older People and Learning Disabilities	Current service improvement programme is under way. Its completion will deliver a 10% saving through increased efficiency, redesign of processes and alignment with related health services. The balance of professionally registered social workers to vocationally qualified social care workers will change to increase the latter.							247.00	280		8.00				
A2	A5	<b>Day Care.</b> The Council will withdraw completely from the direct provision of older people's social day care with the exception of day time respite for people with dementia. All Local Authority Social Day Care centres will over the next 3 years be closed and reduced levels of re-provision will be bought through the independent or voluntary sector.		40.00	42		24.00		40.00	42		24.00				
A10	Older People Residential Care	Existing proposal - In line with existing policy and subject to formal statutory consultation, decrease provision by closing a further two in-house residential homes (inc Harbourne) and reduce the number of older peoples' residential placements in the independent sector through promotion of independent living. Reduce the length of stay for people in Acute Hospitals by increasing the number of NHS funded intermediate care beds in Council managed residential homes.							245.00	379		30.00				

**CORPORATE BUDGET CONSULTATION – TRADE UNION GENERIC COMMENTS (S188) dated 23 November 2015**

TU COMMENT	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
<b>EQIA'S</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. UNITE (26 November 2015) requested a full breakdown of agency and casual workers (cost and location).</li> <li>2. UNITE (26 November 2015) requested that EQIAs be issued and that some may need to be joint where appropriate (3C6? 3C10?)</li> <li>3. UNISON (10 December 2015) EQIAs needed to be up to date.</li> <li>4. UNITE (10 December 2015) EQIAs had been requested prior to this meeting and that the Council was withholding consultation with the information the TUs needed.</li> </ol>	<p>Management have provided this information on a departmental basis.</p> <p>All departments have been asked to provide EQIAs on the workforce proposals.</p> <p>EQIAs were being tabled at departmental meetings.</p> <p>Internal facing EQIAs which would detail any staffing impact to be made available at departmental consultation meetings.</p> <p>(10 December 2015) Management asked all TUs to notify the HR Director which departments had issued EQIAs to TUs and which departments had still to do so.</p> <p>This issue was raised again at the Corporate Consultation Meeting on 14 January 2016, all Departments have now provided EQIA's on proposals that have workforce implications.</p>
<b>VOLUNTARY REDUNDANCY REQUESTS</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. UNISON, GMB, UNITE (10 December 2015) accurate figures were requested for agency workers, VR requests and vacancies on a departmental basis.</li> <li>6. UNISON, GMB, UNITE (10 December 2015) staff who had applied for VR were being told their applications were rejected and the same people were constantly applying.</li> </ol>	<p>This information has been checked and updated and all departments are required to notify trades unions at departmental consultation meetings.</p> <p>Management explained that a cleansing of the VR information was being undertaken to ensure only employees with a realistic chance of VR remained on the list and employees are informed of decisions as soon as possible. Planned VR had been withdrawn. Where there was a <i>continuing</i> requirement for jobs, unless there was a suitable "bump", staff would not be able to leave on VR e.g. Social Workers.</p>

TU COMMENT	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
<b>CONCERNS RELATING TO 2017 / 2018 PROPOSALS</b>	
<p>7. UNISON (10 December 2015) stated that it was difficult to agree year 2 (2017-2018) proposals due to a lack of detail and due to the 2% Council Tax levy and the impact of the Better Care fund.</p> <p>8. UNITE (10 December 2015) stated that managers ask if the trade union agree to the proposals, however as there are no details they cannot agree and also because the figures relating to FTE staff and vacancies were not accurate. They stated they were consulting in good faith but couldn't do this if the information was not accurate.</p>	<p>Management stated that there should be sufficient information on proposals to facilitate consultation, including how a proposal may be implemented because proposals are still subject to consultation and decisions will be taken at full Council in February. A rationale explaining the thinking for 2017/18 as a minimum needs to be tabled for ongoing consultation. Management stated that, where possible, they are consulting to seek agreement, but accept that where information is limited, until this is available, consultation continues.</p> <p>The Trade Unions were advised at the corporate consultation meeting of 14 January 2016 that the Executive will proposed a 2 year financial plan to Council a firm 2016/17 budget, elements of a 2017/18 budget, but with some work still to do before a firm 2017/18 budget (and an indicative 2018/19 budget) is finalised in 2017.</p>
<b>INFORMATION AVAILABILITY</b>	
<p>9. UNISON, GMB, UNITE (07 January 2016) consultation was not meaningful due to the lack of detailed information which meant they could not properly consult with management.</p> <p>10. UNISON, GMB (07 January 2016) Staff meetings had been held and stewards not invited. Convenors/Stewards had only accepted (management's) cancellation of meetings where management had said they had no further information to share. Management had not been prepared to alter meeting times. Generally no structures and staffing information had been issued. It was not appropriate to discuss 2017/18 proposals due to the lack of detail.</p>	<p>This issue has been raised both in Departmental and Corporate Consultation. Following on from the Corporate Consultation Meeting on 14 January the HR Director wrote out to all Strategic Directors outlining the Trade Unions concerns per Department and information has now been provided in order to facilitate the continuing consultation process and address the Trade Unions concerns.</p>



TU COMMENT	MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
<p>11. UNISON, GMB, UNITE (07 January 2016) regarding Regeneration there had been two meetings, no detail had been provided nor had any structures. The proposed savings and numbers of FTE posts potentially redundant needed to be confirmed.</p>	<p>The HR Director has followed up the trade union concerns with the Strategic Directors and information gaps have now been provided.</p>
<p><b>VACANCY CONTROL</b></p>	
<p>12. UNSION, GMB (07 January 2016) stated the vacancy control process appeared to have slipped.</p>	<p>The current process for Vacancy review is undertaken by the HR Director and the Chief Executive and vacancies are reviewed subject to the needs of service delivery and the ability to recruit to specific roles in certain areas of the Council.</p> <p>To ensure a more robust approach to vacancy management a recruitment freeze on all external adverts has now been implemented with immediate effect.</p>
<p><b>HR1 FORM</b></p>	
<p>13. UNITE (07 January 2016) stated that the HR1 form stated 335 potential redundancies in 2016/17, however redundancies for 2017/18 was not mentioned consequently these could not be agreed in these consultations. Consultations could only be based on the HR1 form.</p>	<p>Management said it was clearly stated in the S188 letter that management were consulting on proposals for both 2016/17 and 2017/18. The HR1 was completed for statutory purposes.</p> <p>Management reiterated that consultation is ongoing in relation to the proposals for 2016/17 and 2017/18.</p>

## Equality Impact Assessment Form

<b>Department</b>	Full Council	<b>Version no</b>	V5
<b>Assessed by</b>	Simon Jenkins	<b>Date created</b>	03/12/15
<b>Approved by</b>		<b>Date approved</b>	
<b>Updated by</b>		<b>Date updated</b>	
<b>Final approval</b>		<b>Date signed off</b>	

### Section 1: What is being assessed?

#### 1.1 Name of proposal to be assessed:

Budget proposals relating to the setting of the Council Budget – potential workforce implications 2016/18.

EQIAs will be undertaken on all proposals where there are workforce implications. These will be used to influence this Council EQIA.

#### 1.2 Describe the proposal under assessment and what change it would result in if implemented:

The effect of budget proposals made as a result of reductions on Council funding mean that the total number of FTE employees at risk of redundancy is 335 for 2016-17 and 139 for 2017-18 from a total of 6,940 (8,958 actual employees) excluding school based staff. These are in addition to the proposed 167 FTE reductions for 2016-17 about which the Council commenced consultation in November 2014 but these were covered by the previous EQIA.

### Section 2: What the impact of the proposal is likely to be

The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to have due regard to the need to-

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- advance equality of opportunity between different groups; and
- foster good relations between different groups

#### 2.1 Will this proposal advance equality of opportunity for people who share a protected characteristic and/or foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those that do not? If yes, please explain further.

The Council will continue to do all it can to make further savings through efficiency, innovation and collaboration with partner organisations, but it is no longer possible to make savings required without affecting frontline services.

The Council will continue to drive greater efficiency and productivity but 'business as usual' is not an option because the Council cannot afford all the services it currently pays for.

The Council will endeavour to keep finding ways of working together to get results with less money. Consideration will be made as to where the resources make the most impact, looking beyond Council services, departments and organisations and thinking about the best way to achieve the collective goals.

Working with local people and communities to help them take more responsibility for securing positive outcomes for themselves will be vital as will finding different ways of providing services to increase their resilience to spending cuts.

Efforts to attract inward investment will continue so that jobs can be created, in local business rates will increase and demand for public services and welfare will reduce.

**2.2 Will this proposal have a positive impact and help to eliminate discrimination and harassment against, or the victimisation of people who share a protected characteristic? If yes, please explain further.**

N/A

**2.3 Will this proposal potentially have a negative or disproportionate impact on people who share a protected characteristic? If yes, please explain further.**

The Council will continue to do everything it can to avoid compulsory redundancies.

The Council is again inviting expressions of interest from employees interested in taking voluntary redundancy, flexible early retirement or other voluntary options such as voluntary reduction in hours.

It is anticipated the impact of reductions in staffing will potentially have implications for staffing with regard to age. It is more likely that those employees who are 55 and over will volunteer for redundancy as at that age they are able to access their pensions. Employees can choose to leave and draw their LGPS pension benefits at any time between age 55 and 75. They do not need the agreement of the Council, they can simply resign.

The proposals may have a minimal effect on the disability profile of the organisation. The incidence of disability tends to increase with age, so the staffing profile relating to disabled staff may be marginally affected by individuals opting to access their pension.

Due to the existing staffing profile, as the Council employs more women than men, it is also likely that, in numerical terms, more women will be affected by these decisions rather than men.

There are a number of proposals that will potentially impact on lower paid workers.

The proposals may have a minimal effect on the ethnicity profile of the organisation. As the majority of the workforce identify themselves as “White British” it is likely that more employees from this ethnic category will be affected by the proposals.

The proposals are unlikely to affect those with a protected characteristic of pregnancy and maternity.

The effect with regard to religious belief and sexual orientation of employees will be difficult to identify. Although the Council has now implemented systems for self-declaration of these protected characteristics, employees tend not to record this information on their personal profiles. However, it is not anticipated that there will be any disproportionate effect within these groups of employees.

Information in regard to gender reassignment of employees is not collected by the Council. However it is not anticipated that there will be any disproportionate effect within this protected characteristic category.

*The impact on low income /low wage shown as high because the Council proportionally employs more individuals from this group. As the Council can no longer guarantee that front line services, the impacted could be greater due to their greater representation in the workforce?*

EQIAs undertaken on individual budget lines will provide more detail and will be used to develop this Corporate EQIA.

**2.4 Please indicate the level of negative impact on each of the protected characteristics?**

(Please indicate high (H), medium (M), low (L), no effect (N) for each)

<b>Protected Characteristics:</b>	<b>Impact (H, M, L, N)</b>
Age	H
Disability	L
Gender reassignment	N
Race	L
Religion/Belief	N
Pregnancy and maternity	N
Sexual Orientation	N
Sex	H

Marriage and civil partnership	N
<b>Additional Consideration:</b>	
Low income/low wage	H

## 2.5 How could the disproportionate negative impacts be mitigated or eliminated?

The Managing Workforce Change and Restructure, Redeployment and Redundancy procedure will be used to move this process forward, in consultation with Trade Unions and staff.

All employees will be supported through redeployment, retraining or redundancy processes irrespective of their protected characteristics and will be treated fairly and consistently.

The Equality Impact Assessment process will be used to carry out ongoing assessment of the impacts of the proposed changes.

Allowing those over 55 to take redundancy wherever possible reduces the effect on other groups of workers although a financial assessment will be made before these requests are approved. Employees who volunteer to take redundancy mitigate the effect of potential compulsory redundancy.

In numerical terms, more women are likely to be affected by the proposals because there are many more women in the workforce than men. However, it is unlikely that this will affect the actual workforce profile in terms of the percentage of women employed in comparison to the percentage of men.

Although more employees identifying themselves as “White British” are likely to be affected by the proposals because of the staffing profile, it is unlikely that this will affect the actual workforce profile.

In respect of certain budget proposals which relate to changes in terms and conditions which potentially may impact on low paid workers, there may be an opportunity in certain cases to mitigate against the impact through, for example, changes to working patterns. The introduction of the Living Wage may also mitigate against these proposals.

EQIAs undertaken on individual budget lines will enable more focussed mitigations to be implemented.

## Section 3: What evidence you have used?

### 3.1 What evidence do you hold to back up this assessment?

The following information gives the workforce profile at June 2015 as this is when the last equality profile information was produced. All figures are excluding school

staff. This will be used as the basis for comparison if and when proposals progress into actions:

- Total headcount 8969
- Full Time Equivalent staff 6953
  
- Males Head count 3107 = 34.64 % of the headcount
- Female Headcount 5862 = 65.36 % of the headcount
- Male Full Time Equivalent 2865 = 41.21% of FTE
- Female Full Time Equivalent 4087 = 58.79% of FTE
  
- Black and Ethnic Minority (BME) = 23.59% of the headcount
- Non-BME staff = 76.41% of the headcount
  
- Black and Ethnic Minority (BME) = 21.6% of FTEs
- Non-BME staff = 78.4% of FTEs
  
- Those under 20 years of age ~ 59 = 0.66% of the headcount
- Those between 20 and 29 years ~ 731 = 8.15 % of the headcount
- Those between 30 and 39 years of age ~ 1759 = 19.61% of the headcount
- Those between 40 and 49 years of age ~ 2597 = 28.96% of the headcount
- Those between 50 and 54 years of age ~ 1611 = 17.96% of the headcount
- Those between 55 and 59 years of age ~ 1357 = 15.13% of the headcount
- Those between 60 and 64 years of age ~ 684 = 7.63% of the headcount
- Those between 65 and 69 years of age ~ 141 = 1.57% of the headcount
- Those 70 and over = 30 = 0.33% of the headcount
- Disabled staff = 4.21% of the headcount
- Disabled staff = 4.79% FTEs

Statistical information relating to the religious belief and sexual orientation of employees is incomplete due to the reduced incidence of self declaration as outlined above.

### **3.2 Do you need further evidence?**

More detailed staffing information on the-proposals will become clearer as the process goes forward following the budget decisions being made in February 2016 at Full Council. These will be incorporated into both the corporate workforce EQIA and departmental or budget line EQIAs.

## **Section 4: Consultation Feedback**

### **4.1 Results from any previous consultations**

The previous Corporate EQIA was consulted on at the Corporate Consultation meetings.

### **4.2 Feedback from current consultation**

The corporate workforce equality impact assessment will be shared with the Trade Unions and reviewed as part of the ongoing consultation process.

**4.3 Response to this feedback – include any changes made to the proposal as a result of the feedback**

N/A

*Addendum to Document AW  
circulated at Executive 9 February 2016*

**ADDENDUM TO THE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES TO THE  
MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE TO BE HELD ON 09 FEBRUARY 2016**

**ADDITIONAL TRADE UNION FEEDBACK ON THE COUNCIL'S BUDGET PROPOSALS  
FOR THE 2016/17 AND 2017/18 COUNCIL BUDGET AS OF 04 FEBRUARY 2016**

<p><b>General Comments</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Weekly departmental consultation meetings have been held.</li> <li>▪ Management have shared the budget line proposals and provided details of what the staffing impact is likely to be together with information on VRs and vacancies and have received some comments and feedback from the TUs and staff.</li> <li>▪ Information on the department's secondments, temporary contracts, honoraria payments, casual workers and consultants has been provided</li> </ul>
<p><b>Regeneration</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The TUs feel that insufficient information has been provided for meaningful consultation but management do not feel that they are able to provide any further details until Top Management posts have been filled.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Finance</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All service areas have provided their views (no structures as yet) as to how the budget reductions may be achieved and have received comments and feedback from the TU's and staff.</li> <li>▪ In Commissioning &amp; Procurement, ICT and Revs &amp; Bens the reductions are expected to be mitigated by vacancies and VRs.</li> <li>▪ In Financial Services there is a proposed reduction of 2 posts over the two years, at the moment there are no VR requests or vacancies but management have already had some constructive discussions with the TUs and staff as to how this could be achieved without the need for CR - although of course this cannot be ruled out.</li> <li>▪ There are no contentious issues in this Department.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Adults</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Unison and GMB are happy that all information that they have requested has been provided by management.</li> <li>▪ There remain concerns about 3A5 – the 80FTE reduction due to the lack of information about which posts will be affected in 2017/18. The TUs state that this means that they are unable to consult their members at this time.</li> <li>▪ A number of queries from UNITE have been received and are in the process of being answered.</li> </ul>



<b>Children's</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 3C1 &amp; 3C2 – Management have provided feedback to the TUs following meetings held with special school heads on the 18/19 Jan. This has resulted in a further 2 days being identified to discuss proposal with HTs in the context of a full SEND review. There is a complete re-commissioning of Core SEND services and how these will be provided in the future.</li> <li>▪ 3C3 &amp; 3C4 &amp; 3C5 – Management have shared how they see the virtual school bringing together a number of functions under one roof which is a new strategy. Further information on how the new virtual school will look &amp; operate is currently being worked up by Management.</li> <li>▪ 3C6 – Management have tabled restructure proposals for the Employment &amp; Skills service. This has been shared with staff at briefings with TUs invited. This information is subject to continuing discussion as part of the consultation process.</li> <li>▪ 3C7 &amp; 3C8 &amp; 3C9 &amp; 3C10 – As agreed Management have tabled initial restructure proposals as part of the Journey to Excellence programme. This has included indicating which likely posts are at risk of deletion. All the information has been circulated to staff within Specialist Services and briefing sessions have been held, to which the TUs have been invited &amp; attended. This information is subject to continuing discussion as part of the consultation process.</li> </ul>
<b>Legal Services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Discussions have focussed on existing vacancies and consultation continues with a view to moving from 3 legal teams to 2, with a corresponding reduction of management posts.</li> <li>▪ There continues to be ongoing discussion regarding the composition of the teams that will exist within legal services given the nature of the changes to the rest of the organisation. Management stated that some legal work will reduce due to the reducing nature of the some of the departments &amp; the council's priorities facing Adults &amp; Children's services. Between now &amp; April 17 there will need to be an element of retraining within legal services as the balance of skills required changes.</li> </ul>
<b>Environment and Sport</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With regard to the vacancies in Waste which had been identified (12) Management have now confirmed with the TUs that they will be moving to appoint back fill on an agency basis. This is with the aim of meeting the requirements of the service and still ensuring that the TUs felt that their current members were being protected in terms of possible job loses at a later date.</li> <li>▪ The TUs are aware that work is progressing to analyse the casual usage, specifically in libraries, with regard to concerns about the excessive use of casuals.</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TUs are still concerned that the information regarding 2017/18 budget proposals in the Chief Executive's office has had no detail provided but the Trade Unions are aware that Management are still formulating plans and will share details as they become available.</li> </ul>
<b>Human Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consultation remains ongoing.</li> <li>▪ Proposed structures have been tabled.</li> <li>▪ No issues outstanding</li> </ul>



**SECOND ADDENDUM TO THE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES  
TO THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE TO BE HELD ON 23 FEBRUARY 2016**

**ADDITIONAL TRADE UNION FEEDBACK ON THE EXECUTIVE'S BUDGET  
PROPOSALS FOR THE 2016/17 AND 2017/18 COUNCIL BUDGET**

<p><b>General Comments</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Weekly departmental consultation meetings have been held.</li> <li>▪ Management have shared the budget line proposals and provided details of what the staffing impact is likely to be together with information on VRs and vacancies and have received some comments and feedback from the TUs and staff.</li> <li>▪ Information on the department's secondments, temporary contracts, honoraria payments, casual workers and consultants has been provided.</li> <li>▪ There was a final consultation meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> February and an overview meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> February.</li> <li>▪ Management acknowledge the trade unions continue to have concerns about the number of agency, temporary and casual workers and consultants and has responded to these general concerns as follows:-</li> <li>▪ The Council has already committed to, and has been actively engaged in, looking at ways to avoid compulsory redundancies, wherever possible and this will continue.</li> <li>▪ We will continue to seek to redeploy staff at risk of redundancy to suitable posts including those covered by agency workers.</li> <li>▪ Controls have been in place for a considerable time on the use of agency workers and the external advertisement of vacancies. All posts are advertised 'internal only' in the first instance.</li> <li>▪ A review of the use of casual workers has commenced.</li> <li>▪ However, TUs will appreciate that the Council cannot and will not:-</li> <li>▪ Breach the statutory rights of temporary and fixed term employees.</li> <li>▪ Terminate with immediate effect all the above arrangements for individuals providing essential work for the Council. Such a decision would result in the enforced closure of services such as children's centres, adult residential homes, recreation centres, Libraries, Theatres etc.</li> <li>▪ Management will continue to consult the trade unions about ways of avoiding redundancies, including on these staffing and resourcing concerns, during the further consultations on implementation of the Council budget decisions.</li> </ul>
--------------------------------	--

<b>Regeneration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The TUs feel that insufficient information has been provided for meaningful consultation but management do not feel that they are able to provide any further details until Top Management posts have been filled.</li> <li>▪ Further Consultation meetings have taken place since the last Executive Committee Addendum where queries raised have been addressed. The position remains the same as in the last Executive Report addendum.</li> </ul>
<b>Finance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All service areas have provided their views (no structures as yet) as to how the budget reductions may be achieved and have received comments and feedback from the TU's and staff.</li> <li>▪ In Commissioning &amp; Procurement, ICT and Revs &amp; Bens the reductions are expected to be mitigated by vacancies and VRs.</li> <li>▪ In Financial Services there is a proposed reduction of 2 posts over the two years, at the moment there are no VR requests or vacancies but management have already had some constructive discussions with the TUs and staff as to how this could be achieved without the need for CR - although of course this cannot be ruled out.</li> <li>▪ The Trade Unions have continued to comment extensively on the proposals in this department since the last Executive Report Addendum. All queries, comments and suggestions have been responded to including alternative suggestions put forward by the trade unions in respect of Financial Services.</li> <li>▪ There are no contentious issues in this Department.</li> </ul>
<b>Adults</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Unison and GMB are happy that all information that they have requested has been provided by management.</li> <li>▪ There remain concerns about 3A5 – the 80FTE reduction due to the lack of information about which posts will be affected in 2017/18. The TUs state that this means that they are unable to consult their members at this time.</li> <li>▪ A number of queries from UNITE have been received and are in the process of being answered.</li> <li>▪ There have been no further Departmental Consultation meetings since the last Executive Report Addendum. This was agreed with the Trade Unions.</li> </ul>
<b>Children's</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 3C1 &amp; 3C2 – Management have provided feedback to the TUs following meetings held with special school heads on the 18/19 Jan. This has resulted in a further 2 days being identified to discuss proposal with HTs in the context of a full SEND review. There is a complete re-commissioning of Core SEND services and how these will be provided in the future.</li> <li>▪ 3C3 &amp; 3C4 &amp; 3C5 – Management have shared how they see the virtual school bringing together a number of functions under one roof which is a new strategy. Further information on how the new virtual school will look &amp; operate is currently being worked up by Management. Given the new appointment of DD (EES) and the need for her to review &amp; reflect this proposal, staff have been advised that</li> </ul>

	<p>any further information will be delayed for up to 2 months to allow this to happen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 3C6 – Management have tabled restructure proposals for the Employment &amp; Skills service. This has been shared with staff at briefings with TUs invited. This information is subject to continuing discussion as part of the consultation process.</li> <li>▪ 3C7 &amp; 3C8 &amp; 3C9 &amp; 3C10 – As agreed Management have tabled initial restructure proposals as part of the Journey to Excellence programme. This has included indicating which likely posts are at risk of deletion. All the information has been circulated to staff within Specialist Services and briefing sessions have been held, to which the TUs have been invited &amp; attended. This information is subject to continuing discussion as part of the consultation process.</li> </ul>
<b>Legal Services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Discussions have focussed on existing vacancies and consultation continues with a view to moving from 3 legal teams to 2, with a corresponding reduction of management posts.</li> <li>▪ There continues to be ongoing discussion regarding the composition of the teams that will exist within legal services given the nature of the changes to the rest of the organisation. Management stated that some legal work will reduce due to the reducing nature of the some of the departments &amp; the council's priorities facing Adults &amp; Children's services. Between now &amp; April 17 there will need to be an element of retraining within legal services as the balance of skills required changes.</li> </ul>
<b>Environment and Sport</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With regard to the vacancies in Waste which had been identified (12) Management have now confirmed with the TUs that they will be moving to appoint back fill on an agency basis. This is with the aim of meeting the requirements of the service and still ensuring that the TUs felt that their current members were being protected in terms of possible job loses at a later date.</li> <li>▪ The TUs are aware that work is progressing to analyse the casual usage, specifically in libraries, with regard to concerns about the excessive use of casuals.</li> </ul>
<b>Chief Executive</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TUs are still concerned that the information regarding 2017/18 budget proposals in the Chief Executive's office has had no detail provided but the Trade Unions are aware that Management are still formulating plans and will share details as they become available.</li> </ul>
<b>Human Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consultation remains ongoing.</li> <li>▪ Proposed structures have been tabled.</li> <li>▪ No issues outstanding</li> </ul>