

Equality and Rights Impact Assessment

2015-2018 Budget Summary Report

What budget option does this ERIA information relate to?

Social Strategy - grants	
Option number	HSC17
Savings proposal	Social Strategy - grants
Division	Chief Social Work Officer
Service area	Social Strategy
Description of savings proposal	
<p>BOLD proposals for 10% reduction over 3 years in Third Party payments applied to grant-supported preventive services to reduce Health Inequalities and improve Social Justice. The proposed funding reductions have been chosen to reduce equalities impacts based on detailed assessment of applications including the annual review of performance against prevention priorities, financial and other information:</p>	
<p><u>Health Inequalities</u>: 30 services are supported, including: money, employment and benefit advice, increasing healthy eating and physical exercise, mental health counselling, community groups offering mutual support. Projected budget for 2015/16 reduces grant value by £62,000 (4%) from total budget of £1.51m which contributes to joint funding estimated at £2.3m.</p>	
<p><u>Social Justice</u>: 15 services under city strategies for health inequality, employability through advice and training; social inclusion of older people by taking part in service assessment and design, publication on social and physical activities; increased community safety such as the SafeZone Bus for vulnerable people during the night which reduces the numbers attending accident and emergency and supports volunteering, and self help for drug users. Proposals for 2015/16 to meet BOLD criteria would reduce the budget of £294,000 by 3.3% or £10,000.</p>	
<p>The health inequality budget will be balanced through reduced awards to some applications on a priority basis, and overall restriction on applications to standstill level. Recommendations are to allocate a slightly increased amount of Social Justice Fund for health inequality compared to 2014/15 and consider two applications under the Fund's social inclusion criteria. Finally, a small (0.8%) levy on all awards is made to balance the budget.</p>	

What are the main impacts of this option on rights?

<p>The health inequalities programme targets groups and individuals at risk of poor health and unequal health outcomes and these include all the recognized equality groups as well as people in low income groups across the city. Reductions in the preventive and mitigation effects on inequality in the city would have limited impact on individual rights to access services and facilities but would mean small reductions in enhanced access arrangements for priority groups.</p>

What are the main impacts of this option on equality?

<p>Rather than reducing existing service levels, these reductions mainly limit further development of facilities for vulnerable groups and communities of interest such as migrants, LGBT, BME, and economically disadvantaged people, and those with physical disabilities. The most noticeable reduction from 2014/15 levels is £15,000 to £10,000 in encouraging physical activity (mainly walking) for vulnerable groups. An estimate based on targets in the application would be that approx 160 fewer walkers benefit from promotion of activities and provision of</p>
--

equipment. This does not mean that fewer groups or individuals would take part in walking activities but that fewer than the estimated 500 people receive promotional contact or use of equipment. For larger grant awards, some reduction of targets may be applied as funding agreements are concluded.

The Social Justice Fund is time limited so there is change in the projects funded each year. 15 services are proposed for support in 2015/16 through relevant partnership strategies, and these have all addressed the proposed 3.3% budget reduction. Some services are able to apply a straightforward small reduction in service numbers, for example a training service with 50 clients might have to reduce the service capacity by two people. However most services indicated that at this reduction level they would seek efficiencies which continue the service level with reduced overhead costs. The effect would be to reduce the range of activities available to people rather reducing the number of people in contact.

What are the main recommendations to address either the positive or negative impacts?

Funding proposals have been selected to minimise the impact and prevent any complete losses of preventive services. Some capacity loss overall will result from the reduced allocations and will be negotiated through adjusted targets in funding agreements in due course. This will reduce capacity but only in relation to the funding reduction of less than 1% for health inequality, and 3.3% for Social Justice Fund.

Sign Off

Paul Hambleton, Health and Social Strategy Manager
 Tel: [0131 469 3867](tel:01314693867); Email: paul.hambleton@edinburgh.gov.uk

Carbon Impact Assessment Template

BUDGET OPTION (number/title/details)		HSC17: Social Strategy - grants		
LEAD OFFICER (name and contact details)		Paul Hambleton, Health and Social Strategy Manager		
To record your assessment put an X in the appropriate columns below.				
COUNCIL CARBON EMISSIONS	IMPACTS			NOTES
	↓	↑	↔	
WASTE to landfill			X	No impacts
BUILDINGS energy usage			X	
INFRASTRUCTURE energy usage			X	
TRANSPORT fuel consumption			X	

- ↓ = *anticipated decrease in emissions*
- ↑ = *anticipated increase in emissions*
- ↔ = *no change anticipated*