

COMMUNITY IMPACT – STAGE 1 REVIEW

CIRA Ref	001	
Lead Officer	Name	Dwayne Johnson
	Position	Strategic Director (Adults & Community)
	Contact details	Dwayne.johnson@halton.gov.uk

SECTION 1 –Context & Background

1.0 What is the title of the policy / practice?

Voluntary Sector Core Funding Reductions (2011-2012)

1.1 What is the current status of the policy / practice?

Existing New

1.2 Who are the main stakeholders and who has primary responsibility for delivering the policy / practice?

Members of the public who use the services provided by the following voluntary sector organisations operating in Halton:

Cheshire Asbestos Victims Support
Cheshire Race and Equality Council
Halton Citizens Advice Bureaux
Halton and St Helens VCA
Halton Talking Newspapers
Relate
Vision Support

1.3 Are there any other related policies / practices?

The following services are also voluntary sector organisations operating within Halton:

Cheshire Victim Support
Rape & Sexual Abuse Centre
Runcorn and Frodsham Mencap
Samaritans
Widnes and Runcorn Cancer Support

1.4 Who is the policy / practice intended to affect?

Residents Staff Specific Group(s) (add details below)

This year 2011-2012, HBC has had to make an unavoidable saving of £22,000. This represents an overall reduction in funding of 8.4% on the 2010-2011 budget.

1.5 What are the principal aims and the intended outcomes of the policy

COMMUNITY IMPACT – STAGE 1 REVIEW

practice?

The 8.41% overall budget deficit will be spread over those services which have demonstrated through consultation that they can absorb a small reduction or have the capability to raise funding from other sources.

SECTION 2 – Consideration of Impact

2.1 Is there sufficient evidence to determine, on the balance of probability, that the policy / practice has, or could have, an impact upon each of the equality groups identified below?

Yes ✓

No

2.2 Where further data / intelligence / consultation is required please provide details below.

Information Source / Planned Activity	Timeframe	Lead Officer
Meetings with one or two representatives from each of the voluntary services organisations.	13/01/11 20/01/11 27/01/11 03/02/11	John Hatton, Cllr Eddie Jones Lynda Holland, Cllr Eddie Jones John Hatton, Cllr Eddie Jones John Hatton, Cllr Eddie Jones
Report to the Executive Board of to recommend Voluntary Sector Grant Awards for 2011-12.	03/01/11	Dwayne Johnson

The purpose of the above meetings was to:

- Ask the same questions to each, regardless of the organisation or the level of funding they were currently receiving – additional questions were asked in response to answers
- To highlight the funding cuts that the council were facing from central government
- Explain that there was a likelihood that the grant pot for the Voluntary Sector Core Funding would have to be reduced
- Gain a better understanding of the work of each organisation and its importance in terms of benefits to local service users
- Assess the likely impact that a funding cut would have on their ability to provide the service
- Look at other funding they were likely to receive from other sources

2.3 What were the principal findings / conclusions of this research / consultation?

Two organisations (in bold below) were identified as being able to absorb larger funding cuts than the others. This was based on information provided via Halton's voluntary sector 'application form' and the answers provided during the above consultation. The following funding cut decisions were made:

	Cut
Cheshire Asbestos Victims Support	£5,300
Cheshire Race and Equality Centre	£1,000
Halton Citizens Advice Bureaux	£2,000
Halton and St Helens VCA	£8,400
Relate	£1,000
Vision Support	£1,000
Rape & Sexual Abuse Centre	£3,300 (did not apply for funding in 2011-12)
Cheshire Victim Support	No cut

COMMUNITY IMPACT – STAGE 1 REVIEW

Halton Talking Newspapers	No cut
Runcorn and Frodsham Mencap	No cut
Samaritans	No cut
Widnes and Runcorn Cancer Support	No cut
Total Cut	£22,000 (8.41%) from 2010-11.

The Cheshire Asbestos Victims Support Group has healthy reserves and the ability to raise funding through a referral system to solicitors. They also have the opportunity to request donations from individuals whom they have helped to claim substantial rewards. It was also clear that they could also explore funding opportunities from the PCT (soon to become the GP consortia), as their work meets the Health Agenda.

Similarly Halton and St Helens VCA resulted from a merger in 2010 of Halton Voluntary Action and St Helens CVS. This merger resulted in substantial efficiency savings, particularly in back office expenses and management costs. The organisation doesn't deliver front line services and has a track record of successfully attracting alternative funding through grants and contracts, particularly the PCT and funding ring-fenced for infrastructure organisations.

The remaining organisations (10) received small comparative cuts (4) or none at all (5). One (the Rape & Sexual Abuse centre) did not apply for any funding for 2011-12.

The Cheshire Race & Equality Centre has a low take-up of service in Halton. They have had an active role supporting the development of a Black Minority Ethnic (BME) network in Halton funded from the Change Up programme (due to end in March 2011). The BME network is being handed over to HBCs Community Development Team (this will save costs). Cheshire Racial Equality Council (REC) are expecting to take over the management of a new project in Chester which will also reduce overhead costs.

Halton Citizens Advice Bureaux has only received a small comparative cut, even though they receive by far the largest award. This is because the debt work that they carry out among service users in this particular time of recession and hardship is crucial to Halton Residents. Further, Halton CAB is facing significant cuts from other funding sources and is expected to make some redundancies.

Relate have moved premises to Halton Hospital during 2010 and this has resulted significantly lower overhead costs and better accessibility for service users. The consultation made it clear that the service could continue with a small reduction.

Vision Support receive additional funding from HBC Social Services (core grant funding from the Home Visiting Services) and the PCT. They will not be significantly affected by a small cut in funding.

All of the following services (following consultation) were considered unable to sustain even a small cut in funding due to their importance within Halton:

- Cheshire Victim Support
- Runcorn and Frodsham Mencap
- Samaritans
- Widnes and Runcorn Cancer Support

COMMUNITY IMPACT – STAGE 1 REVIEW

2.4 On the basis of evidence has the actual / potential impact of the policy / practice been judged to be positive (+), neutral (=), or negative (-) for each of the equality groups and is the level of impact considered to be high (H), Medium (M) or low (L)?

Policy / practice dimension	Equality Strand	Impact	
		Type	Level
	Age	=	L
	Carers	=	L
	Disability	=	L
	Gender	=	L
	Race / ethnicity	=	L
	Religion / belief	=	L
	Sexual Orientation	=	L
	Socio-economic Disadvantage	=	L

2.3 Are any of these impacts health related?

Yes ✓ No

Advisory Notes:

Where an actual or potential negative impact has been identified, a Stage 2 Assessment will be required - refer to section 3.

In relation to the level of impact, it should be remembered that this relates to the number of people affected as a proportion of the equality group and not as a proportion of the population as a whole. The level of impact should be considered as:-

Low = Marginal short-term impact on small number within the group(s).

Medium = Medium term impact on a moderate number within the group(s).

High = Medium to longer-term impact upon a significant number within the group(s).

Where a positive differential impact has been identified as a result of activity intended to further equality or community cohesion, e.g. where one equality group may be more positively affected than another, or in relation to the general population as a whole, this will need to be justified within the following section.

2.5 N/A

Equality Group(s)	
--------------------------	--

Baseline data and information

Nature of impact and where this is positive justification

COMMUNITY IMPACT – STAGE 1 REVIEW

2.6 How will the impact of the policy / practice be monitored?

All grants in excess of £5k must agree to a service level agreement and provide quarterly monitoring reports. Grants less than £5k provide mid and end-of-year reports.

Review meetings are held with the organisations in receipt of core grant on a quarterly basis.

Mid-year and annual reports are presented to the Corporate Policy and Performance Board and are made available in the Member's Room at Municipal Building.

2.7 Who will be responsible for monitoring and how will this be arranged?

Strategic and Operational Directors, Divisional Managers and nominated officers from the 'Performance and Improvement' team.

2.8 What actions, if any, has this review identified (that do not form part of a stage 2 assessment) to promote equality of opportunity or relations between groups and to support community cohesion? If no actions have been identified please insert 'no further action identified' within first column.

Action & purpose / outcome	Priority	Timeframe	Lead Officer
No further action identified			

2.9 Summary of stakeholders involved in this review

Job Title or Name	Organisation / representative of
Strategic Director (Adults & Community)	HBC

2.10 Stage 1 Review - Completion Statement

**As the identified Lead Officer of this review I confirm that:-
(Please complete only one of the following sections)**

- 1.
2. There is sufficient information available to provide assurance that there will be a positive differential impact for one or more equality groups and that this is justifiable and lawful OR **a neutral impact has been determined and that details of the review and the actions arising from it have been provided to the Directorate Equality Lead Officer for inclusion within the Directorate Register**

Signed	Gary G. Cleland (for Dwayne Johnson)
Dated	04/03/11