

SUMMARY OF 2024/25 SAVINGS OPTIONS

APPENDIX 6

Officer's Options	Childrens Services		Place Services		TCC Services		Overall Total	
	£'000	FTE	£'000	FTE	£'000	FTE	£'000	FTE
Approved Savings	-	-	602	1.00	-	-	602	1.00
Operational Savings	1,890	28.40	1,380	5.90	1,663	29.60	4,933	63.90
Savings for Consideration	665	-	50	-	20	-	735	-
	2,555	28.40	2,032	6.90	1,683	29.60	6,270	64.90
Fees & Charges	74	-	2,370	1.00	-	-	2,444	1.00
Total	2,629	28.40	4,402	7.90	1,683	29.60	8,714	65.90

Budget Savings Summary (1 year)

Appendix 7

All Savings options

2024/2025 - All Services - To be considered

				Officers options			
No	Ref	Status	Description	Savings £'000	FTE Impact Vol.	Impact Comp.	EPIA Rating
1	CS131	To be considered	Remove Funding for Police Officers in Schools	65	0.00	0.00	Medium
2	CS140	To be considered	Children & Families Savings	600	0.00	0.00	High
3	PS196	To be considered	Removal of Free Dog Waste Bags	20	0.00	0.00	Low
4	PS206	To be considered	Cessation of Callendar Park Fireworks Display	30	0.00	0.00	Low
5	TCC12	To be considered	Scheme of Assistance - Small Repair and Handy Person Scheme (cessation)	20	0.00	0.00	Low
Total				735	0.00	0.00	

Budget Savings Summary (1 year)
All Savings options
2024/2025 - All Services - To be considered

FTE Analysis		2024/25
Voluntary FTE		0.00
Compulsory FTE		0.00
		0.00

Summary by Service			2024/25
	Saving £'000	FTE Impact	
Children's Services	665	0.00	
Place Services	50	0.00	
Transfrm, Comm and Corp Service	20	0.00	
	735	0.00	

Summary by Status			2024/25
	Saving £'000	FTE Impact	
To be considered	735	0.00	
	735	0.00	

Budget Savings Detail (1 year)
All Savings options
2024/2025 - All Services - To be considered

Service:

Division:

Status:

Children's Services

Service Management

To be considered

Savings Title:	Remove Funding for Police Officers in Schools				
Savings Reference:	CS131				
Estimated	Savings £'000		FTE		
	65		Compulsory	Voluntary	Total
			0.00	0.00	0.00

Commentary:
Removes 4 Police Officers from schools
At present there are 8 Police Officers based across High Schools. The cost for 4 of these posts is paid by the Council (£189k increasing to £200k in 2024/25). The budget currently set aside for this cost is £65k with further funding coming from schools, and a shortfall of c£50k which is met from within the Children's Services budget. These posts are welcomed within schools, who find benefit in having these Officers. If however, the Council were to cease payment for 4 of these officers, Police Scotland has advised that it would stil continue to pay for the remaining 4 Officers who would still work across the High schools, although there may be a requirement on occasion by Police Scotland, to prioritise their work differently.

Summary Provisional EPIA Assessment:	N/A	H	M	L
			✓	
School based police officers are a highly valued resource within the secondary sector. Heads of establishment are cognisant of the budgetary constraints and have previously considered sharing officers across two schools. Support and planning will be required to sustain relationships and trust built over time with young people, families and the community.				

Risk Saving won't be delivered:	R	A	G
			✓
There is no current commitment for funding to Police Scotland beyond March 2024. If Council agrees to cease funding for the 4 Police Officers, Police Scotland will be notified As soon as possible. Police Scotland will then work to redeploy the Officers enabling this saving to be achieved for April 2024.			

Impact on Council Priorities:	R	A	G
			✓
Ceasing this funding does not impact directly on the delivery of the Council's priorities. Clearly having these Officers in schools provides support to schools and young people by assisting with behavioural issues which may occur within schools.			

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00720 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Children's Services Education	Lead Officer Name:	Kenny McNeill
		Team:	Service and School Improvement
		Tel:	07841725254
		Email:	kenny.mcneill@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Remove funding for Police Officers in Schools	Reference No:	

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	Yes
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
12/02/2024	To reduce the provision of 8 full time campus/School Based Police Officers for Falkirk's mainstream secondary schools to 4 officers.

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	Current spend (23/24) - £189 Projected spend (24/25) - £200 Budget consists of: £65 set aside with further funding coming from schools. Shortfall of c£50 is met from elsewhere in Children's Services budget	
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:		
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:	Projected increase - £11	
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:	28/06/2024	
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE

Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)

A - Quantitative Evidence

This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.

Children's Services supports 21,470 children and young people across all of our establishments. In the secondary sector these are as follows:

9690 young people in our High Schools - of which 3998 have an identified additional support need

Number of young people in each Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation SIMD quintile:

Quintile 1: 1518 pupils

Quintile 2: 2058 pupils

Quintile 3: 2361 pupils

Quintile 4: 1596 pupils

Quintile 5: 2047 pupils

Not known: 110 pupils

School/ campus based Police Officers were introduced in session 2007 -2008, initially in Larbert High School and then later in session 2008/2009 within Denny High School .

On 21st August 2012, Education Committee agreed to extend this provision to a further 3 secondary schools; Braes, Falkirk and Grangemouth, thus providing a Police Officer in 5 secondary schools.

On 29 March 2016 the Children and Young People's Executive Committee agreed to increase the allocation of full time school based police officers by a further 3 posts to provide a full time officer in each of the 8 mainstream secondary schools.

In 2016 the 8 posts were funded as follows:

Police Scotland: 6 officers

Children's Services: 2 officers from Revenue Budget and a contribution from each secondary school devolved budget

Over the last few years, Police Scotland have reduced fully Funded posts from 6 to 4. Children's Services and Secondary Devolved Budget contributions have covered 4 posts to maintain a full time officer in each secondary school

Fiscal challenge and pay settlements have increased costs for both police Scotland and Children's Services. overall, the cost of supporting an allocation of fulltime officers in 8 schools has risen from £84K in 2016 -£189K in 2023/24.

Secondary HTs have continued to contribute to these costs from their devolved budgets. this contribution has increased from £6,125K in 2016 to £12k in 2023/24.

B - Qualitative Evidence

This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.

Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other

This is a budget reduction proposal there are no cases studies.

Best Judgement:

Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	No
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	
What gaps in data / information were identified?	
Is further research necessary?	Yes
If NO, please state why.	

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT**Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place**

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	Yes	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.	Consultation with secondary headteachers and colleagues has been ongoing since the increase to 8 full time officers in 2016. the devolved school management budget contribution from each secondary school is discussed and agreed annually.	
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.		
How was the engagement carried out?		What were the results from the engagement? Please list...
Focus Group	Yes	Previous discussions have noted the high value placed on having a full time officer by all secondary Headteachers, who do however, appreciate the financial pressure of increasing costs and have considered the possibility of sharing posts.
Survey	No	
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	Yes	
Is further engagement recommended?	Yes	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age			✓	Reducing the availability of a full time campus officer in each secondary schools will affect the original objective to build positive and trusting relationships with particular emphasis on improving partnerships between the Police and pupils in secondary schools and associated schools in the community.
Disability	✓			The impact of reduced police officers will need to be assessed in relation to the risk of hate crime/incidents that occur in schools.
Sex	✓			The impact of reduced police officers will need to be assessed in relation to the risk of hate crime/incidents that occur in schools.
Ethnicity	✓			The impact of reduced police officers will need to be assessed in relation to the risk of hate crime/incidents that occur in schools.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief	✓			The impact of reduced police officers will need to be assessed in relation to the risk of hate crime/incidents that occur in schools.
Sexual Orientation	✓			The impact of reduced police officers will need to be assessed in relation to the risk of hate crime/incidents that occur in schools.
Transgender	✓			The impact of reduced police officers will need to be assessed in relation to the risk of hate crime/incidents that occur in schools.
Pregnancy / Maternity	✓			The reduction in the number of full time campus/ school based police officers has n direct impact on this protected characteristic.
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			The reduction in the number of full time campus/ school based police officers has minimal direct impact on this protected characteristic.
Poverty	✓			The reduction in the number of full time campus/ school based police officers has minimal direct impact on this protected characteristic.

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:				
				and as members multi-agency initiatives to improve the learning environment for young people facing challenge and adversity.
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.			✓	Reducing the number of campus based officers will impact the capacity to provide support/ single point of contact for social services, youth justice services and health professionals and partners who work with a secondary school and when needed with the associated primary schools in each locality.
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)	Reduction in full time officers may impact on staff having support with pupils who are distressed or demonstrating inappropriate behaviours.			
		Evidence of Due Regard		
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):		We have established protocols, processes and reporting systems in line with Children and Young People Scotland Act (2014). Adherence to local and national policy and a Service Equalities Framework in line with UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989). However, it is noted that the reduction of police officers may give rise to indirect and/or direct discrimination towards those with protected characteristics. This would include the impact on activities that are performed by school based police officers.		
Advance Equality of Opportunity:		The presence of police officers in schools helps to meet the needs of different groups, as there are many variable factors that can lead to distressed or inappropriate behaviours. The perception of safety also allows for increased participation of diverse young people. These may be at risk, but further engagement and planning will need to take place to mitigate these issues.		
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):		<p>Academic Research (2010 Scottish Government commissioned Ipsos/Mori 'Evaluation of Campus Police officers in Scottish Schools, and Scottish Institute of Policing Research SIPR review in 2013) into School Based Officers has recognised the many benefits of the role in tackling prejudice and promote understanding.</p> <p>In the Falkirk Council Children's Services Equalities Framework: Our vision and aims emphasise the importance of developing positive relationships, equality, acceptance and inclusion at all levels.</p>		

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	No	
Councils	No	
Education Sector	Yes	Reduction in the number full time officers may impact on current progress and improvements in: Promoting a positive image of Police Scotland with young people in the school and its community through positive partnerships. Educating members of the school community about the consequences of actions, the responsibilities and potential for positive citizenship. Participation in multi-agency initiatives to improve the learning environment within the high schools.
Fire	Yes	Reduction in the number full time officers may impact on effective partnerships between campus officers and the Fire Service in reducing anti-social behaviour and youth crime, including offending within communities.
NHS	No	
Integration Joint Board	No	
Police	Yes	Reduction in the number full time officers has a financial impact on Police Scotland who lose the contribution from Children's Services of the equivalent of 4 full time officer salaries. The reduction may also capacity of Police Scotland to: Continue to build upon the existing positive relationship between Police Scotland and the secondary pupils and their families. Reduce fear of crime amongst pupils, teachers and other members of the school community through effective partnership and communication. Assist in practice of restorative approaches to support and address issues of victimisation, bullying and anti social behaviours within the community.
Third Sector	No	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
Reduction of 8 full time campus/ school based police officer posts to 4.	Mainstream Secondary Schools	In consultation with Police Scotland and secondary headteachers; Plan the redistribution of the equivalence of 4 full time officers across 8 mainstream secondary schools.	Rhona Jay	31/05/2024	Falkirk Plan: Working in Partnership with Communities The Council Plan: Supporting stronger and healthier communities Promoting opportunities and educational attainment and reducing inequalities
Reduced capacity to support multi agency initiatives and interventions.	Mainstream Secondary Schools and Children's Services	Revise the roles and responsibilities of Campus based officers to prioritise support for multi agency interventions. Sustain the positive status of campus officers as a helpful "single point of contact" for: young people, parents and carers, children's services teams, community groups and local businesses.	Kenny McNeill	31/05/2024	Falkirk Plan: Working in Partnership with Communities The Council Plan: Supporting stronger and healthier communities Promoting opportunities and educational attainment and reducing inequalities

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

Are actions being reported to Members?	Yes
If yes when and how ?	As part of the Budget proposal.

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	No	
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	Yes	Whilst there is no change to the roles and responsibilities of campus/ school based police officers, the reduction in the number of posts overall may affect capacity as detailed in sections 5 and 6.
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:		Date:	13/02/2024
------------	--	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA:	Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	No
ASSESSMENT FINDINGS If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA	Engagement with Secondary Headteachers has provided an insight, however, the effects of reduced capacity could be further explored by engaging with school-based Police Officers. It would also be beneficial to understand the effect of having school-based officers, and assessing the impact that would stem from those protections, activities etc being at risk.	
Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	Yes	If YES, please describe: Mitigating actions are recorded in section 7.

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA		
LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	No	
MEDIUM	Yes	There is a risk of being unable to carry out certain functions and activities due to reduced capacity of police officers.
LOW	No	

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:		Date:	14/02/2024

Budget Savings Detail (1 year)
All Savings options
2024/2025 - All Services - To be considered

Service: Children's Services
Division: Children & Families
Status: To be considered

Savings Title:	Children and Families Savings				
Savings Reference:	CS140				
Estimated	Savings £'000	FTE			
	Compulsory	Voluntary	Total		
	600	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Commentary:

Children's Social Work provides a number of statutory and non-statutory services. At present, there is a level of duplication within some of the non-statutory services provided to support families or a young person. These types of services are provided by the Council through its own teams and also through contractual arrangements with 3rd and independent sector providers, at a cost to the Council.

This proposal is to reduce the spend in these areas by £600k. This will be done by streamlining the provision across these service areas. The current areas of spend which would be reviewed if this saving is agreed amount to c£2m in total. Changes would be made to reduce provision, through engagement with employees and providers, to achieve a reduced level of provision amounting to £600k.

Summary Provisional EPIA Assessment:

N/A	H	M	L
	✓		

Although specific information was not available regarding the protected characteristics of children and young people, the EPIA provides information on the impact of reduced services on protected characteristics in general. Reduction of these services in children & families will in turn reduce the work being done to support the health and wellbeing of children, young people and their families, who are and will benefit from this intervention. The saving does not however, remove these services, but instead is aimed at removing duplication and streamlining provision.

Risk Saving won't be delivered:

R	A	G
	✓	

If this saving option is agreed, engagement will take place with employees and our 3rd sector partners to enable the savings to be achieved. Time will be required to engage, but everything possible will be done to ensure the savings are delivered.

Impact on Council Priorities:

R	A	G
✓		

If Members choose to take this saving, this will link directly to work which is non-statutory and will cease. These services do support families and young people, which would be streamlined. In that resepect, the Council will continue to deliver the statutory services it requires, but this may impact on our performance and delivery of such services, due to a reduction in support work to mitigate against the need for these services.

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00718 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Children's Services Children and Families Social Work	Lead Officer Name:	Paul Wilcox
		Team:	Service & School Improvement
		Tel:	01324 506657
		Email:	paul.wilcox@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Children and Families Savings	Reference No:	

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	Yes
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
01/04/2024	Children and Families savings to the value of £600,000.
01/04/2025	Children and Families savings to the value of £600,000.

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	c £2m	
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:	£600K per annum over 2 years	
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:	Nil	
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:		
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE	Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)
--------------------------------	--

A - Quantitative Evidence	This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.
----------------------------------	--

Data received from partner organisations states that direct support has been provided to 700 children and young people over the course of a reporting year. The support always extends and seeks to provide benefits for family members - parents, brothers and sisters, grandparents and relevant others. The benefits extend well beyond those who are the immediate targets and their effects are felt by all sectors of both society and the economy. The number of children/families using these services form the protected characteristics groups in unknown at this time.

Early intervention and prevention is an important policy theme within social work service delivery, which aims to take action to avoid problems escalating and requiring more intensive support from services. Prevention can mean that an investment by one sector will lead to a saving in another. The statutory framework for social work services covers many different pieces of legislation. Key legislation places the responsibility for these services with local authorities. Social work services are delivered by local authorities or are commissioned by local authorities from private or third sector organisations. Social and environmental conditions in which we are born, live, grow and age are thought to contribute to around 50% of the unfair differences in health (health inequalities).

B - Qualitative Evidence	This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.
---------------------------------	---

Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other

Mental health/Wellbeing A parent waiting for a mental health referral, reported support and relationships were helping her cope with the issues that triggered her poor health. She cancelled her appointment with her GP as she expressed feeling a benefit from the positive connections and peer support she was receiving. The parent developed strategies to support herself when life was challenging and gained confidence.

Education A parent, was referred by Primary school staff due to breakdown in relationships impacting on the child's attainment. Via consistent engagement with the parent at her home over several weeks, building a trusting relationship, changes were made to engagement with school. The school reported that things had de-escalated and life at school for the child had improved.

Income maximisation Support to families includes support with benefit checks, applications for grants (fuel, charitable) and one organisation's support enhanced income for 48 families totalling £49, 325. 00.

Best Judgement:

Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	Yes
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	Chief Social Work Officer Best judgement based on knowledge of the services, local area demographics, joint strategic needs assessment, knowledge of risk management, local and national policies and extensive professional experience.
What gaps in data / information were identified?	

Is further research necessary?	Yes
If NO, please state why.	

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT**Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place**

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	No	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.		
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.	The proposal is currently not specific. However, if approved, a consultation will be carried out on what will be specifically undertaken. Another EPIA will be created and completed as part of this work.	
How was the engagement carried out?		What were the results from the engagement? Please list...
Focus Group	No	
Survey	No	
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	No	
Is further engagement recommended?	Yes	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age			✓	Children live in families who, in turn, live in communities, and thus are impacted and affected by more than just their experiences of care. Many of our children and young people rely on support from their grandparents or other extended family members. There are myriad social, structural and economic factors that directly contribute to the experiences and outcomes of children and their families. Reduced service provision for young people may also affect the wider family, increasing family stress and so heightening young people's vulnerability through myriad pathways, including parental mental ill health, substance misuse and conflict. With so many diverse factors, a whole family approach is required to tackle issues of poverty and health and wellbeing. Positive impacts on adults around children and the reverse (negative impacts for adults) are inextricably linked to outcomes for any children or young people who are cared for by those adults. Opportunities to utilise the community as an asset and provider of early support are critical for longer term benefits for children. The Promise requires us to ensure that when children and families need additional or intensive support, it will be given in timescales which meet the needs of the child. Primary, secondary and extended care givers are key stakeholders in social work services, whether delivered by the council or third sector partners.
Disability			✓	Disabled children constitute a significant group in the looked after system. There is evidence that they are more likely to be looked after, remain in care for longer and have a higher risk of being placed inappropriately in comparison to non-disabled children. For children with additional needs or disabilities, the proportion of those whose parents also experience poor mental health is significant with one authority quoting figures of three-quarters of the care packages for young people with disabilities containing aspects related to the poor mental health of the parents. The COVID-19 pandemic has added to those pressures.
Sex				

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:				
				who have fled war in other parts of the world and resettlement, additional services are required to be provided. Young people require support with language, health needs (physical, emotional), education and to navigate the asylum process.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief				
Sexual Orientation	✓			Young people benefit from access to supports with regard to their developing identity.
Transgender			✓	For those children who require additional help, we aim to provide this based on the principles of early and effective intervention delivered through a planned and coordinated rights-based approach. Preventative and early intervention supports for children and young people must be provided in a cohesive manner, across disciplines and areas (not all should be school-based), they should be coordinated to make the best use of existing structures and opportunities for young people. Access to services should be available when needed and inclusive.
Pregnancy / Maternity			✓	Early intervention and prevention aims to take action to avoid problems escalating and requiring more intrusive or intensive services. In September 2022, Scottish Government launched a refresh of the GIRFEC guidance at a National level, GIRFEC values and principles which have been strengthened and underpinned by UNCRC ensuring that policy and practice is aligned to fulfil children's rights. We want to promote resilience and work together to improve outcomes for our children.
Marriage / Civil Partnership				
Poverty			✓	Relative poverty has increased across Falkirk annually. The gap between our most and least affluent wards is 14.1% - this is an increase of 3.5% since 2019/2020. Children growing up in poverty are over-represented on the child protection register and are more likely to be removed from their families. Provision of non-term time support for families through low-cost or free activities which may provide nutritional meals to all who take part

Care Experienced			✓	Scotland's children and families in and on the edge of care had already been shown by the Care Review to experience a series of disadvantages and pressures which led to poorer than average experiences and outcomes. A review of the available evidence on the impact of lockdown and COVID-19 showed increased pressure and significant negative impact across family finances, children's education, family health and wellbeing, safety and security and children's rights. The Promise wider structural and social inequalities that impact families' abilities to stay together and to thrive will be tackled so that no child or family in Scotland is left behind. Children, young people and their families will be listened to, respected, involved and heard in every decision that affects them. Where children and families need additional or intensive support, it will be given in timescales which meet the needs of the child. The workforce will be supported to provide the support children and their families need to flourish. Care will be re-orientated and (the 'system') decluttered to create a sustainable approach, that upholds and cherishes relationships
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.			✓	In Falkirk re committed to continued focus on improving the mental health and wellbeing of all our children and young people as a key priority. We aim to achieve this through supporting children to thrive and become resilient. We know from our data within the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment that there is a growing trend of substance and alcohol use within our teenage population which can impact on mental health and wellbeing, and that this is a current issue for the partnership to address. The impact of the effect on mental health and wellbeing has been further compounded by the pandemic. To successfully invest in preventative practice and early intervention to support resilience in mental health, a range of services are required. Alongside social work support we require a multi-disciplinary approach; investing in partner agencies who work with on our priorities and have the skills to identify and respond promptly to health and wellbeing issues as they arise.
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)				
	Evidence of Due Regard			
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):				

Advance Equality of Opportunity:	Through work with our partners, work will be undertaken to minimise the impact of these proposals on the specific groups identified as being negatively impacted.
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	We will ensure that we communicate clearly with all identified groups on the limitations of the service and what this will mean for them moving forward.

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	No	
Councils	Yes	This proposal will have an impact on longer term health and wellbeing outcomes and will impact on other service areas i.e. housing, community justice, ETU.
Education Sector	Yes	This proposal will have an impact on educational outcomes and educational staff-early, years, school and further/higher education. Coordinated preventative services for children and their families works to motivate children to learn, attend and thrive in the social benefits of school.
Fire	No	
NHS	Yes	This proposal will have an impact on longer term health and wellbeing outcomes. Coordinated preventative services for children work together to support engagement with various health services,, including - pre birth planning/intervention, mental health supports, speech and language provision and for children with complex disabilities.
Integration Joint Board	No	
Police	Yes	Coordinated preventative services for children work together to support to promote citizenship and positive behaviour in the community. The services work to divert children and young people from the criminal justice system. The services work with Police Scotland partners to divert children from risk taking behaviours.
Third Sector	Yes	This proposal will have direct impact on third sector organisations working in our area. There are risks to sustainability of these services which are working with us to meet our joined priorities.
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
Age	All ages	Work with all partners to minimise impact. New arrangements will be required. Service limitations will be communicated to all agencies, partners and families.	S Lacey	01/04/2024	Integrated Children's Services Plan 23-26 Child Protection Committee Business Plan Council Plan Falkirk Plan
Disability	Babies, children and adults with disability or those caring for someone with a disability.	Work with all partners to minimise impact. New arrangements will be required. Service limitations will be communicated to all agencies, partners and families.	S Lacey	01/04/2024	Integrated Children's Services Plan 23-26 Child Protection Committee Business Plan Council Plan Falkirk Plan
Transgender	Children, young people, adults.	Work with all partners to minimise impact. New arrangements will be required. Service limitations will be communicated to all agencies, partners and families.	S Lacey	01/04/2024	Integrated Children's Services Plan 23-26 Child Protection Committee Business Plan Council Plan Falkirk Plan
Pregnancy/Maternity	Babies, children, young people, adults.	Work with all partners to minimise impact. New arrangements will be required. Service limitations will be communicated to all agencies, partners and families.	S Lacey	01/04/2024	Integrated Children's Services Plan 23-26 Child Protection Committee Business Plan Council Plan Falkirk Plan

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
Poverty	Babies, children, young people, adults.	Work with all partners to minimise impact. New arrangements will be required. Service limitations will be communicated to all agencies, partners and families.	S Lacey	01/04/2024	Integrated Children's Services Plan 23-26 Child Protection Committee Business Plan Council Plan Falkirk Plan
Care Experienced	Babies, children, young people, adults.	Work with all partners to minimise impact. New arrangements will be required. Service limitations will be communicated to all agencies, partners and families.	S Lacey	01/04/2024	Integrated Children's Services Plan 23-26 Child Protection Committee Business Plan Council Plan Falkirk Plan

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

Are actions being reported to Members?	Yes
If yes when and how ?	Budget process.

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	No	
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	Yes	The proposal in it's current form will leave babies, children, young people and families with very limited support out with statutory social work service provision. Statutory services are already stretched as a consequence of increased demand, recruitment and retention issues and without coordinated preventative services providing support, services to families will be critical/substantial level only. A wider piece of work will be undertaken with partners to collect data relating to protected characteristics of people accessing services in order for suitable mitigating actions to be developed.
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	No	
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:		Date:	12/02/2024
------------	--	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA:	Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	Yes
ASSESSMENT FINDINGS If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA	Although specific information was not available regarding the protected characteristics of children and young people, section 5 provides evidence of the impact of reduced services on protected characteristics in general.	
Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	No	If YES, please describe: Section 8 indicates that the proposal will need to be adjusted to mitigate impact on diverse communities. These actions are mentioned in section 7.

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA		
LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes	Reduction of this service will have a detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of children, young people and their families, who are and will benefit from this intervention.
MEDIUM	No	
LOW	No	

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:		Date:	14/02/2024

Budget Savings Detail (1 year)
All Savings options
2024/2025 - All Services - To be considered

Service:

Division:

Status:

Place Services

Environment and Operations

To be considered

Savings Title:	Removal of Free Dog Waste Bags				
Savings Reference:	PS196				
Estimated	Savings £'000	FTE			
	20	Compulsory	Voluntary	Total	
		0.00	0.00	0.00	

Commentary:
The proposal would cease the provision of free dog waste bags currently on offer within library buildings. However, the current stock would enable provision to continue for a further 6 months until depleted.

Summary Provisional EPIA Assessment:	N/A	H	M	L
				✓
Low impact. Whilst the proposal will likely affect dog owners from low income households the most, the purchase of dog waste bags is a relatively low cost burden associated with dog ownership.				

Risk Saving won't be delivered:	R	A	G
			✓
No risk.			

Impact on Council Priorities:	R	A	G
			✓
Low impact.			

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00175 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Place Services Environment & Operations	Lead Officer Name:	Douglas Gardiner
		Team:	Waste Services
		Tel:	01324590437
		Email:	douglas.gardiner@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Cease provision of free dog waste bags once existing stocks are depleted	Reference No:	

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	No
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	No	Yes	No	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):

12/02/2024	Cease provision of free dog waste bags once existing stocks run out. This is a non-statutory function and the Council does not need to provide dog bags.

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	20	
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:	20	
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:	N/A	
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:	0	
	Expected Annual Income Total:	0	
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:	01/04/2024	
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE	Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)
--------------------------------	--

A - Quantitative Evidence	This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.
<p>No quantitative data is available beyond the commercial cost of dog bags in a retail setting.</p>	

B - Qualitative Evidence	This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.
Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other	
<p>There is no obligation on the Council to provide dog waste bags to residents but it is recognized that dog fouling is a key issue for local residents and every effort should be made to minimize the problem. Dog bags can be obtained at various retail outlets.</p>	

Best Judgement:	
Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	Yes
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	Head of Service & Waste Services Manger. Dog waste bags can be purchased from local outlets for less that £0.01 per bag.
What gaps in data / information were identified?	It is not possible to determine the protected characteristics of potential users.
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	Nature of proposal and degree of impact.

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT

Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	No	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.		
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.	Not required.	
How was the engagement carried out?		What were the results from the engagement? Please list...
Focus Group	No	
Survey	No	
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	No	
Is further engagement recommended?	No	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.
Disability	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.
Sex	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.
Ethnicity	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.
Sexual Orientation	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.
Transgender	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.
Pregnancy / Maternity	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.
Poverty			✓	The proposal is likely to affect dog owners from low income households as they are the most likely to use the service.
Care Experienced	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.	✓			The proposal will not directly impact people from this protected characteristic group.

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	The proposal to withdraw the service will not contribute to the unlawful discrimination of any particular protected characteristic group.
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	Dog waste bags can be purchased via various local commercial outlets for less than £0.01 per bag.
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	The proposal does not offer scope to improve relations between protected characteristic groups.

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	Yes	Additional demand for dog waste bags from commercial outlets.
Councils	No	
Education Sector	No	
Fire	No	
NHS	No	
Integration Joint Board	No	
Police	No	
Third Sector	No	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

Dog waste bags can be purchased at local commercial outlets for less than £0.01 per bag. This is a non-statutory function and the Council does not need to provide dog bags.

Are actions being reported to Members?

Yes

If yes when and how ?

Budget Meeting, February 2024.

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	No	
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	Yes	The proposal is likely to affect those in poverty, however dog bags can be purchased at local commercial outlets for less than £0.01 per bag.
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:		Date:	14/02/2024
------------	--	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA:	Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	No
ASSESSMENT FINDINGS If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA	Data on protected characteristics of potential service users is not available.	
Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	Yes	If YES, please describe: This is a non-statutory function and the Council does not need to provide dog bags. The purchase of dog waste bags is a relatively low cost burden associated with dog ownership.

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA		
LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes / No	
MEDIUM	Yes / No	
LOW	Yes	Low impact. Whilst the proposal will likely affect dog owners from low income households the most, the purchase of dog waste bags is a relatively low cost burden associated with dog ownership.

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:		Date:	16/02/2024

Budget Savings Detail (1 year)
All Savings options
2024/2025 - All Services - To be considered

Service:

Division:

Status:

Place Services

Growth, Planning and Climate

To be considered

Savings Title:	Cessation of Callendar Park Fireworks Display				
Savings Reference:	PS206				
Estimated	Savings £'000	FTE			
	30	Compulsory	Voluntary	Total	
		0.00	0.00	0.00	

Commentary:
The cessation of the annual fireworks display would allow a financial saving to be achieved whilst also supporting other priorities of the Council linked to reducing carbon emissions. Additionally, the annual event attracts mixed views each year with a number of residents submitting complaints to the Council concerning noise and animal welfare. The Scottish Government public consultation on greater controls on the use of fireworks is expected to give an indication of community perceptions of such displays.

Summary Provisional EPIA Assessment:	N/A	H	M	L
				✓
Low impact. Both potential positive and negative impacts have been identified from the evidence available. Whilst there is limited scope to implement mitigations, the impacts identified are relatively minor.				

Risk Saving won't be delivered:	R	A	G
			✓
No risk.			

Impact on Council Priorities:	R	A	G
			✓
No impact.			

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00708 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Place Services Growth, Planning & Climate	Lead Officer Name:	Lesley O'Hare
		Team:	Culture and Helix
		Tel:	07803897925
		Email:	lesley.ohare@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	To cancel the 2024 Fireworks as a budget saving worth £30k.	Reference No:	

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	No
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	No	Yes	No	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
31/01/2024	Achieve budget savings of £30,000 by cancelling the annual fireworks display in Callendar Park

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	30,000	
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:	30,000	
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:	0	
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:	01/04/2024	
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE	Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)
--------------------------------	--

A - Quantitative Evidence	This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.
----------------------------------	--

The 2023 event attracted around 25,000 visitors; as the event is not ticketed, there is no demographic profile of attendees and how this relates to protected characteristic groups.

B - Qualitative Evidence	This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.
---------------------------------	---

Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other

Falkirk has held an annual fireworks event continuously for at least 30 years (only stopping in 2020-21 due to COVID-19 measures). The event can attract up to 30,000 people and is always delivered on 5 November on the basis that it allows the emergency services to have a single plan for both supporting the official event and responding to any unanticipated incidents in the area on Bonfire Night.

The requirements of the Fireworks and Pyrotechnic Articles (Scotland) Act 2022 and associated responsibilities for local authorities could be interpreted as increasing the need / demand / importance of an organised event, as public purchasing will be restricted and organised shows maybe the only option.

Cancelling the event could result in an increase in the misuse of fireworks and unauthorised displays which, in turn, could impact both positively and negatively on people with in protected characteristic groups.

Evidence in Section 5 is taken from [Annex C Draft Equality Impact Assessment Record - Use and sale of fireworks, and tackling the misuse of pyrotechnics: consultation - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](#)

Best Judgement:

Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	Yes
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	Cultural Services Manager
What gaps in data / information were identified?	Information on protected characteristic groups.
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	Difficulty in identifying those in protected characteristic groups and how they might be affected by the cancellation of the event.

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT

Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	No	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.		
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.	Difficulty in identifying those who might be affected due to absence of data.	
How was the engagement carried out?		What were the results from the engagement? Please list...
Focus Group	No	
Survey	No	
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	Yes / No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	Yes / No	
Is further engagement recommended?	Yes / No	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age	✓			Potential negative impact on young people who are more likely to be harmed and/or cause harm through fireworks misuse. Potential increase of misuse of pyrotechnics in public spaces could result in older people being negatively impacted by noise disturbance. Potential positive impact for residents living in the High Flats (older people) cancelling of the event would result in reduced noise disturbance and access issues.
Disability			✓	Cancelling the event could result in increased misuse which could negatively impact on people who have health conditions which make them more sensitive to loud noises and sudden flashes.
Sex			✓	Studies from America, Australia and international reviews find that males are most likely to suffer fireworks related injuries with the largest difference between genders amongst young people.
Ethnicity	✓			No evidence found
Religion / Belief / non-Belief	✓			No evidence found
Sexual Orientation	✓			No evidence found
Transgender	✓			No evidence found
Pregnancy / Maternity			✓	Cancelling the event could result in increased misuse which could negatively impact on pregnant women as the maximum peak sound level limit is set 5 dB lower for this group.
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			Unlikely cancellation would have a positive or negative impact
Poverty			✓	People experiencing poverty are denied access to a free event.
Care Experienced			✓	Care experienced people are denied access to a free event
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.	✓			No evidence found

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	There is no reason to believe that the proposal will lead to any direct or indirect discrimination.
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	There is no reason to believe that the proposal will prevent the advancing of equality of opportunity as it affects the population of the Council area as a whole.
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	There is no reason to believe that the proposal will negatively impact on promoting understanding and reducing prejudice.

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	No	
Councils	No	
Education Sector	No	
Fire	Yes	If cancellation results in an increase in the misuse of fireworks and/or unauthorised displays, there could be a negative impact for Scottish Fire and Rescue Service locally
NHS	Yes	If cancellation results in an increase in the misuse of fireworks and/or unauthorised displays, there could be a negative impact for NHS Forth Valley in respect of fireworks' related injuries.
Integration Joint Board	No	
Police	Yes	If cancellation results in an increase in the misuse of fireworks and/or unauthorised displays, there could be a negative impact for Police Scotland locally
Third Sector	No	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

If the Fireworks event is cancelled there is no way of mitigating against the possibility of the misuse of fireworks or unauthorised displays

Are actions being reported to Members?

Yes

If yes when and how ?

Budget Report February 2024

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	No	
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	Yes	If the Fireworks event is cancelled there is no way of removing the risk of of misuse of fireworks or unauthorised displays and the consequent impact on protected characteristic groups
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:		Date:	31/01/2024
------------	--	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA:	Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	No
ASSESSMENT FINDINGS If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA	There is no demographic profile of attendees and how this relates to protected characteristic groups. However, evidence from the Scottish Government's consultation on the use and sale of fireworks, and tackling the misuse of pyrotechnics has been used to inform the assessment.	
Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	Yes	If YES, please describe: There is no way of mitigating against the possibility of the misuse of fireworks or unauthorised displays, beyond what is already provided for.

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA		
LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes / No	
MEDIUM	Yes / No	
LOW	Yes	Low impact. Both potential positive and negative impacts have been identified from the limited evidence available and there is limited scope to implement mitigations, the impacts identified are relatively minor.

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:		Date:	13/02/2024

Budget Savings Detail (1 year)
All Savings options
2024/2025 - All Services - To be considered

Service: Transfrm, Comm and Corp Services
Division: Housing and Communities
Status: To be considered

Savings Title:	Scheme of Assistance - Small Repair and Handy Person Scheme (cessation)			
Savings Reference:	TCC12			
Estimated	Savings £'000	FTE		
	20	Compulsory	Voluntary	Total
		0.00	0.00	0.00

Commentary:
Scheme of Assistance - Small Repair & Handy Person Scheme (cessation). Within the Scheme of Assistance people who are disabled or over 65 years old, with no able person in their household can access the Small Repair and Handyperson Service. This allows people to access a tradesperson from the Building Maintenance Division at a rate of £31.20 per hour. Withdrawing this service will save the General Fund circa £20k per annum. Demand for the scheme has reduced and mitigations have been put in place.

Summary Provisional EPIA Assessment:	N/A	H	M	L
				✓

Full EPIA completed. Mitigations are in place including access to trades persons in different ways, by directing to "Buy with Confidence" or "Trusty's" which are free services sharing details of local trades persons/professionals. Information will be available on the Scheme of Assistance webpage.
Training in various venues is part of our Digital Connectivity Agenda and also providing access to devices and wi-fi connectivity.

Risk Saving won't be delivered:	R	A	G
			✓

Low risk to not achieving this saving. No link to any corporate risk.

Impact on Council Priorities:	R	A	G
			✓

Council Plan priority - Supporting Stronger Healthier Communities - no impact.

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00641 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Corporate & Housing Services Housing & Communities	Lead Officer Name:	Gail Lucas
		Team:	Strategy & Performance
		Tel:	01324590823
		Email:	gail.lucas@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Withdrawal and cessation of Small Repair & Handyperson Service within the Scheme of Assistance.	Reference No:	

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	No
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	Yes	Yes	No	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
29/11/2023	Withdrawal and cessation of Small Repair & Handyperson Service within the Scheme of Assistance from 2024.

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	£20,200	
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:	£20,200	
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:		
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:	01/04/2024	
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE	Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)
--------------------------------	--

A - Quantitative Evidence	This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.
----------------------------------	--

Demand for this service is declining. 273 repairs were requested during 2022/23 compared to 464 during 2021/2022.

To be eligible to use the service you must be:

Aged 65 and over, with no able bodied person living in the household.

Disabled, where there is no able bodied person living in the household.

B - Qualitative Evidence	This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.
---------------------------------	---

Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other

Mitigations are in place which include access to trades persons in different ways. By way of an alternative we direct to "Buy with Confidence" or "Trusty's" which are free services sharing details of local trades persons/professionals. This information will be available on the Scheme of Assistance webpage and we shall assist people directly, should they contact us for guidance/assistance.

Housing & Communities are actively delivering training in various venues including community halls via CLD, in libraries as part of our Digital Connectivity Agenda through tenant participation & engagement and are also providing access to devices and wi-fi connectivity to assist people access these services online.

We shall also continue to support people by telephone and other means as required.

Best Judgement:	
Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	Yes
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	The requirement to make savings and with adequate mitigations in place and the decline in service demand.
What gaps in data / information were identified?	N/A
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	Officer recommendation based on information available. Decline in service and alternative approaches available.

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT**Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place**

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	No	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.		
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.	However customer feedback has shown that due to the service only being available one day a week, and due to the cost of £31.20 per hour, customers have opted to source their own independent trade person. In addition as part of the Local Housing Strategy consultation, carried out in 2022/2023, although not specific to the Small Repair & Handyperson Service, the response regarding Scheme of Assistance was particularly low.	
How was the engagement carried out?	What were the results from the engagement? Please list...	
Focus Group	No	
Survey	No	
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	Yes / No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	Yes / No	
Is further engagement recommended?	Yes / No	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age	✓			Alternative provision available.
Disability	✓			Alternative provision available.
Sex	✓			Alternative provision available.
Ethnicity	✓			Alternative provision available.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief	✓			Alternative provision available.
Sexual Orientation	✓			Alternative provision available.
Transgender	✓			Alternative provision available.
Pregnancy / Maternity	✓			Alternative provision available.
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			Alternative provision available.
Poverty	✓			Alternative provision available.
Care Experienced	✓			Alternative provision available.
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.				
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)	N/A			

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have ‘due regard’ to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	No	
Councils	No	
Education Sector	No	
Fire	No	
NHS	No	
Integration Joint Board	No	
Police	No	
Third Sector	No	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
Withdrawal of Council provision of Small Repair & Handyperson Service.	All characteristics.	Alternative provision available.	Gail Lucas	01/04/2025	Council Plan Priority: Enabler - Financial Sustainability. Local Housing Strategy and Housing Contribution Statement.

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

--

Are actions being reported to Members?	Yes
If yes when and how ?	As part of the review of budget savings.

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	Yes	Alternative provision is available.
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	No	
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:		Date:	29/11/2023
------------	--	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA:		Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	Yes
ASSESSMENT FINDINGS		Mitigations are in place which would result in a cheaper service to the customer.	
If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA			
If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA			
Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u> ?		Yes / No	If YES, please describe:

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA		
LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes / No	
MEDIUM	Yes / No	
LOW	Yes	There are mitigations in place which would in the majority of cases result in a cheaper cost to the customer.

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:		Date:	05/12/2023