Appendix 2 - A – Productivity

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Productivity Staffing Savings
Reference:	A-01a
Directorate:	Cross Council
Director of Service:	Director of Corporate Resources
Service/Team area:	Strategic Finance
Cabinet portfolio:	Finance and Resources – Cllr De Ryk
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee / Safer Stronger
	Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public	Staff
		Consultation	Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
Not increase service	Yes – in that its more	No	No
staffing budgets	than £500k		

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

This is a cross Council approach affecting all service areas with staffing budgets.

Cuts proposal*

As part of our medium term financial planning, the Council currently incorporates uplifts to staffing budgets year on year to meet the inflation increase of employee costs, typically assumed to be approximately £3M annually across the Council's overall employee budget. In the first round of cuts proposals £3m was offered up via not allocating this inflation to services and that this cut will be delivered by less temporary staff and productivity improvements. Following the significant changes to how staff have had to work during the Covid 19 pandemic, together with the rapid roll out of technology to support flexible and remote working, many staff are working very differently to the way there were doing so before. There is a recognition that this change in working will be more pronounced for office based staff and that some more front line teams may not see the same level of efficiencies through remote and flexible working. Therefore for office based services in addition to no increase to staffing costs there is an expectation of a small reduction to the staffing budgets with suggestions to budget holders and managers on how to implement such ideas to ensure that they remain within budget. In the recent Spending Review it was announced that there would be a public sector pay freeze for all except those earning below £24k full time equivalent. The lower paid staff will receive a minimum of £250 (or 1%). In light of the announcement, it is intended that a further £1m cut is taken from budgets, this will mean that the bulk of the cuts can be found from not awarding budgeted inflation and the additional £1m being achieved through productivity for 2021/22.

This will impact all services across the Council.

3. Description of service area and proposal

Guidance will need to be developed and some managers might require more significant levels of support in order to make the changes. The areas that managers should consider include:

- A reduction in the requirement for office bases with a re-design of working arrangements and work-flows to improve productivity of the service
- Greater use of flexible and remote learning using the technology rolled out during the pandemic and the current changes in how staff work – more staff working from home and more staff working flexibly with hand held devices
- Services across the Council to reduce their dependency on higher cost agency staff
- More pro-active and targeted vacancy management
- Greater use of apprentices
- Improved performance management processes

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

A process to be devised to ensure that those services with staff who will be eligible for the increase receive this. Whilst others are supported to identify other areas of savings to support the approx. 1% decrease in salary budgets. Managers will need to ensure that they identify actions to be undertaken to remain within the allocated staffing budgets.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

monitoring and reporting to EMT.

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff: There is a risk of a reduction in service offer, but this should be mitigated by changes to working practices and improved performance management. If these productivity improvements cannot be captured and reflected then there is the risk that services may need to reduce staffing numbers to deliver this.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken: Some managers may not have the skills to implement changes to staffing arrangements and may overspend on staffing budgets. Support will be required for such services, as well as scrutiny and challenge through the monthly financial

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	131,827	0	131,827	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
£1,000	£1,000	£0	£0	£1,000
Total	1,000	0	0	1,000

Workforce profile:

5. Financial information				
% of Net Budget	0.76%	0%	0%	0.76%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:		N/A	N/A	N/A

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order	r of	DECREASING impact
1. Good governance and operational	Co	prporate priorities
effectiveness - seeks to positively improve this	1.	Open Lewisham
2. All other corporate priorities impacted equally	2.	Tackling the Housing Crisis
	3.	Giving Children and young
3.		people the best start in life
	4.	Building an inclusive local
4.		economy
	5.	Delivering and defending:
5.		health, social care & support
	6.	Making Lewisham greener
6.	7.	Building safer communities
7.	8.	Good governance and
		operational effectiveness
8.		

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	Council wide

Expected impact on ser	vice equalities for	or users – High / Medium / L	.ow or N/A
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil	N/A
		Partnerships:	
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact se mitigations are propose		eas please explain why and	what
No specific proposals are managers to ensure that	being put forward they can increase	d at this stage, other than for s staff productivity by a margin located salary budgets.	
No specific proposals are managers to ensure that 1% to ensure that they re Is a full service equalition	being put forward they can increase main within the al es impact assess	staff productivity by a margin	
No specific proposals are managers to ensure that 1% to ensure that they re	being put forward they can increase main within the al es impact assess mpact	staff productivity by a margin located salary budgets. sment required: Yes / No	of approx.

9. Human R	lesources imp	act			
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm Vacant	ant	
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

Not known.

This is a further saving of approx 1% across all services and it is for individual service managers to identify the measures to be taken to ensure that staff costs remain within budgets. Staff terms and conditions are not affected by this cut.

11. Summary timetable				
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and				
implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),				
decision, transition w	decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:			
Month	Activity			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers			
	 – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities 			
	assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C			
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing			
December 2020				
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where			
December 2020	required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Cuts implemented			

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Support to leadership
Reference:	A - 09
Directorate:	Chief Executive
Director of Service:	Salena Mulhere – Assistant Chief Executive
Service/Team area:	Policy, Performance, Executive Support Office, Chief Executive's Office, Organisational Development &
	Transformation
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Bonavia
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision* Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution <u>https://lewisham.go</u> <u>v.uk/</u> mayorandcouncil/ aboutthecouncil/	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
	how-council-is-run/ our-constitution		
To refocus resources in the Assistant Chief Executive's Division to support the leadership of the Council	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed: In February 2020, the Chief Executive undertook a restructure of the Senior Leadership Team, including the creation of a Chief Executive's Directorate to deliver the corporate strategy at pace, promoting Lewisham and refreshing our organisational culture, to ensure there is grip and control of priorities and resources to make better decisions based on insight and analysis and to drive forward strategic transformation to improve services and outcomes for residents.

The Assistant Chief Executive is responsible for the Mayor's Office, Communications, Overview and Scrutiny, Executive Support, Policy and Performance, Programme Management, Strategic Transformation and Organisational Development. The proposed restructure focuses on Policy and Performance, Executive Support, Strategic Transformation and Organisational Development.

Cuts proposal*

Looking holistically at the range of support functions that exist in the Assistant Chief Executive division, there is potential to reorganise and streamline the division to better provide timely, insightful, efficient and strategic support to the Council's Senior Leadership Team and thereby the wider organisation. This proposed restructure builds stronger strategic support structures around directorates and directorate management teams, with more practical focus on effective, outcome-focused transformation and delivery. This approach builds a structure that better ensures that the strategic priorities of the organisation drive the culture and approach across the whole organisation. This is done by prioritising strategic transformation based on

3. Description of service area and proposal

insight and engagement with residents, and by linking policy and support to leadership on a daily basis. Together these changes assist with putting organisational culture, development and transformation at the heart of the division.

The Executive Support Office is in scope, with a proposed refresh and modernisation of structure, key roles and responsibilities updated to better suit a more agile leadership style and ways of working, as is the Policy and Performance team, given its role in supporting senior officers make informed decisions, by providing insight, data and policy advice. Clearer opportunities to collaborate and progress are being built in to the structure to give more staff within the division the ability to work collaboratively and see clearer routes of career progression.

Lewisham is poised for a significant period of challenge and transformation. To support our leaders, political and professional, to manage this effectively the organisation must be supported, equipped and ready to change and this proposed restructure will build strategic capacity to better do this. This restructure aims to better support the leadership to ensure the effective and timely delivery of transformation; of the organisational change and priorities set out by the Chief Executive, of the challenges as set out in the MTFS and detailed in this and the previous cuts rounds, and of a council and community reshaped by the need to "recover" from Covid.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff: The direct impact on service users is minimal, but the new structure is designed to build strategic support for the Council's leadership team, achieving greater productivity. The service provided by some of the divisional teams to other Council services will in some instances change in scope and focus, which may result in the need for changed capacity at a service level in some instances, which will be discussed with relevant Directors.

The Assistant Chief Executive's division provides support for the leadership of the Council, both executive and scrutiny Councillors, including the Mayor, and senior officers. Direct support for the political leadership of the organisation - Scrutiny and the Mayor's Office – is not in scope of this restructure, however, by restructuring to better support the Leadership of the organisation it is intended to be better able to provide support and responses to the political leadership too.

All staff impacts will look to mitigation via redeployment as first route where possible. Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken: No risks associated with proposal.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
			5,173	
HRA	n/a	n/a		
DSG	n/a	n/a		
Health	n/a	n/a		
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	

5. Financial information				
Support to leadership restructure	105			105
Total	105			105
% of Net Budget				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No	Yes	No	No	No
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order	of DECREASING impact
1. Nil impact:	Corporate priorities
Tackling the Housing Crisis	1. Open Lewisham
Giving Children and young people the best	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
start in life	3. Giving Children and young
Building an inclusive local economy	people the best start in life
Delivering and defending: health, social care	4. Building an inclusive local
& support	economy
Making Lewisham greener	5. Delivering and defending:
Building safer communities	health, social care & support
2. Positive impact:	6. Making Lewisham greener
Open Lewisham	7. Building safer communities
Good governance and operational	8. Good governance and
effectiveness	operational effectiveness

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

Ethnicity:	n/a	Pregnancy / Maternity:	n/a
Gender:	n/a	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	n/a
\ge:	n/a	Sexual orientation:	n/a
			2/2
)isability:	n/a	Gender reassignment:	n/a
Disability: Religion / Belief:	n/a	Overall:	
Religion / Belief:	n/a ervice equality ar		

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No Yes					
Workforce p	Workforce profile:				
Posts FTE Vacant					

9. Human Re	sources imp	act			
		in post		Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2	0				
Scale 3 – 5	0				
Sc 6 – SO2	6				
PO1 – PO5	11				
PO6 – PO8	11				
SMG 1 – 3	2				
JNC					
Total	30				
Gender	Female	Male			
	21	9			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
	13	15	0	2	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not	
orientation	Heterosex	Lesbian		disclosed	
	17	1		11	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

11. Summary timetable Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and

	roposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), work (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:
Month	Activity
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers
	 – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities
	assessment and initial HR considerations)
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2020	
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where
December 2020	required) prepared
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget
March 2021	Cuts implemented

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Elections Services
Reference:	A-10
Directorate:	Legal, Governance and HR
Director of Service:	Suki Binjal
Service/Team area:	Electoral Services
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Bonavia
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the Constitution	Statutory vs informal	Statutory vs informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
1. Rolling register - to	No	No	No
reduce printing and			
posting costs due to			
completing more actions			
online and use of hybrid			
mail			
2. Changes will be made	No	No	No
to the canvass (enabled			
by canvass reform).			
Fewer forms to be printed			
and posted			
3. To reduce the door	No	No	No
knocking requirement			
during the canvass,			
halving the cost.			

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed: Electoral services manage the publication of the electoral register. This involves a monthly process of adding and removing electors, and publishing the updates. It includes an annual canvass of the borough whereby we have statutory requirements to contact all properties in the borough and identify changes to the register. The team also manages the administration of elections which involves significant project planning work in a condensed period of time.

Cuts proposal*

Electoral services already conducts as much comms as possible 'online' and via email but we can improve this. We have identified more email addresses from other council databases to enable this change. Use of hybrid mail rather than our internal print and post room functions almost halves the cost of sending forms (e.g. evidence requests,

3. Description of service area and proposal

query forms, change of name applications, rolling reg applications, household enquiry forms, special category renewals, review and deletion letters) in the post.

The statutory annual canvass was reformed in 2020. It changes the 'route' for properties dependent on the national and local data match status. In Lewisham, around 60% of properties had a complete match of all electors after the data matching stage, meaning those properties no longer require a door-knock, and instead follow a much simpler route. Of the remaining properties, we can now use email and telephone contacts, on top of the forms sent by post so as to reduce the number of properties requiring a door knock. Due to lockdown, we weren't able to make maximum use of the changes. We can make further savings in the 2021-22 budget. There will be fewer forms to print, reduced postage costs, and increased traffic via email and 'no change' properties. We will be able to send more forms via email and completions via telephone.

The number of properties requiring a door-knock has dropped. We can employ fewer canvassers and target them more deliberately. Outside of election time whilst we continue to be busy we are able to spread this work amongst the team which enables a reduction in numbers for outside of the live election period.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff: There will be minimal impact. Many changes to the service have to be made regardless as they are a requirement of canvass reform (see 4 above).

Residents will receive more direct communication via email which can more easily be stored. We will be able to respond to them quicker than the previous postal reliant method.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken: There is a low risk that the canvassing budget will not be sufficient should the number of properties requiring a door knock increase.

We can mitigate that by undertaking telephone canvassing by the electoral team, which has zero cost, and sending additional emails to these properties where possible. Further data mining as mentioned above would enable us to improve this part of the service.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
1. Rolling registration to Reduce print and post costs	15			15

5. Financial information				
2. Canvass reform. (see part 4 above for explanation.) Will reduce print and post costs.	10			10
 Canvass reform. (See part 4 above for explanation). Halve door-knocking costs 	30			30
Total	55			55
% of Net Budget	12%			12%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No				
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

C Improved on Components invitations list in ander	
6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order	-
1. Good governance and operational	Corporate priorities
effectiveness	1. Open Lewisham
2. Building an inclusive local economy	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
	3. Giving Children and young
3. Delivering and defending health and	people the best start in life
support	4. Building an inclusive local
4. Building safer communities	economy
	5. Delivering and defending:
4. Making Lewisham greener	health, social care & support
	6. Making Lewisham greener
5. Tackling the housing crisis	7. Building safer communities
7. Giving children and young people best	8. Good governance and
start in life	operational effectiveness
8. Making Lewisham Greener	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	Zero
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact					
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A					
Ethnicity:	NA	Pregnancy / Maternity:	NA		
Gender:	NA Marriage & Civil NA NA				
		Partnerships: NA			
Age:	NA	Sexual orientation:	NA		
Disability:	NA	Gender reassignment:	NA		

8. Service equalities impa	act			
Religion / Belief:	NA	Overall:	NA	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what				
mitigations are proposed:				
Is a full service equalities	impact assess	ment required: Yes / No	No	

	lesources imp				
	s proposal hav	e an impact o	n employees:	Yes / No	
Workforce p	rofile:	-			
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not	
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		disclosed	

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

No are no specific legal implications at this time.

11. Summary timetableOutline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and
implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),
decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc..), implementation:MonthActivitySeptember 2020Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers
– e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities
assessment and initial HR considerations)October 2020Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing

11. Summary timetable				
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where			
December 2020	required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Cuts implemented			

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Legal, Governance and Elections service review
Reference:	A-11
Directorate:	Chief Executive
Director of Service:	Suki Binjal
Service/Team area:	Law, Governance, and HR
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Bonavia
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Public Accounts Select Committee

2. Decision Route

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public	Staff
		Consultation	Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
Redesign of legal	No	No	Yes
services, elections and			
committee services			
which will involve a			
restructure.			
The proposal will be to			
combine some			
services/functions/roles			
which will result in			
some posts being			
deleted.			

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed: Legal Services

The directorate comprises of an in-house Legal practice team responsible for corporate governance, robust decision making, professional legal advice and support for the statutory council functions.

Discrete areas of responsibility include social care and health legal support, contracts, education, employment, property services, planning law including regeneration, general litigation, health & safety and information management legal advice.

Electoral services.

3. Description of service area and proposal

The team has the overall responsibility to manage the administration of elections and it also manages the publication of the electoral register. This involves a monthly process of adding and removing electors, and publishing the updates. It also includes an annual canvass of the borough whereby we have statutory requirements to contact all properties in the borough and identify changes to the register.

The Governance team (committee services)

This team supports the effective management of Committee meetings ensuring that public meetings comply with the law and constitutional requirements. The service also maintains the Council's planned calendar of meetings and agenda planning. The team provides support and advice to all Members (in both Executive and non-Executive positions) and is also responsible for managing members' allowances.

Cuts proposal*

Currently, the governance team is managed by a head of business committee (at SMG1) and the election teams is managed by the electoral services manager (PO8).

The proposal is to combine the governance (committee services) and the elections teams to be managed under one head of service.

It is also being proposed to realign legal services in order to reduce the teams from four teams/service areas to two.

Currently, in legal services, there are four service teams

- Commercial, education and employment
- planning property and environment
- social care and health and
- general litigation

Pending formal consultation, it is being proposed to combine the

- Commercial, education and employment and planning property and environment as one team reflecting places and regeneration legal work and
- Social care and health with the general litigation team to reflect our communities/people.

The proposals will create greater resilience and capacity across the teams.

It will also go towards eradicating silo working and strive to establish a more collaborative working environment for all of our stakeholders, with a visible approach to the delivery of legal and governance support.

3. Description of service area and proposal

It will also enable the team to be able to swiftly realign its resources, to deliver and support the council Corporate Strategy and to achieve improved outcomes.

This is the first step towards creating a modern legal and agile governance service, which is both responsive and proactive.

As a result, pending formal consultation, it is envisaged that some posts will be realigned and some will be deleted from the current overall structure. The proposal will equate to circa 6 posts from across the three services i.e. elections, legal and committee services.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

Through recent one-to-one discussions with some of the council services that use legal services, it has become apparent that, at times, there is reliance on legal services to provide support when it is not necessary. Legal services in some areas, such as employment/HR advice and support, adult and child care services (this is not an exhaustive list) provide non legal and/or admin support. As we scale back such non legal and admin support (in collaboration with the receiving services) there could potentially be some service disruption, however, the impact should be minimal.

By combining the services, the staff will be able to focus on providing legal support.

There will be a risk of potential redundancies. All staff impacts will look to mitigation via redeployment as first route where possible.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	6,700	(800)	5,900	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Legal, elections and governance	340			340
Total	340			340
% of Net Budget	6%	0%	0%	6%

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken: Set out above

5. Financial information					
Does proposal impact	General	DS	G	HRA	Health
on:	Fund				
Yes / No	Y				
If DSG, HRA, Health					
impact describe:					
				-	
6. Impact on Corporate	priorities: list	in order	of D	ECREASING im	pact
Nil impact:	-		Corp	orate priorities	-
Giving Children and you	ing people the	best	1. C) Den Lewisham	
start in life			2. T	ackling the Hous	ing Crisis
Building an inclusive local economy			3. Giving Children and young		nd young
Delivering and defending: health, social care			p	eople the best st	art in life
& support				Building an inclus	ive local
Making Lewisham green				conomy	

Building safer communities

- 5. Delivering and defending:
- health, social care & support
- 6. Making Lewisham greener

8. Good governance and

7. Building safer communities

operational effectiveness

- Positive impact:
- Open Lewisham
- Good governance and operational effectiveness
- Tackling the Housing Crisis

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A
Gender	N/A	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	N/A
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A
For any High impact se	siville equality a	i cuo picuoc explain willy una i	
For any High impact se mitigations are propos			
mitigations are propos	ed:	ssment required: Yes / No	

9. Human Resources impact

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No

9. Human Resources impact							
Workforce p	Workforce profile: for the legal, governance and elections						
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant		
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered		
Scale 1 – 2							
Scale 3 – 5	6	6.0					
Sc 6 – SO2	5	4.8					
PO1 – PO5	21	20.4		1			
PO6 – PO8	7	6.6		1			
SMG 1 – 3	5	5.0					
JNC							
Total	45	43.8		2			
Gender	Female	Male					
	35	10					
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not disclosed			
	18	25	1	7			
Disability	Yes	No	PNTS	Not disclosed			
	1	24	10	10			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	PNTS	Other		
	25			19	1		

10. Legal implicationsState any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:There are no immediate specific legal implications.

11. Summary timetable

The odminiary time tab					
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and					
	implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),				
decision, transition v	ork (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:				
Month	Activity				
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers				
	– e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities				
	assessment and initial HR considerations)				
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C				
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing				
December 2020					
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where				
December 2020	required) prepared				
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments				
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest				
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget				
March 2021	Cuts implemented				

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Rationalising Central Education Services functions
Reference:	A-12
Directorate:	CYP
Director of Service:	Angela Scattergood
Service/Team area:	School Improvement
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Barnham
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	CYP Select

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
Rationalising Central	No	No	No
Education Services			
functions			

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

Central Education services budget covers a range of services which support the work the Council does to support our schools including Lewisham Learning, a partnership between the Council and schools which leads on school improvement work in Lewisham.

The majority of the service which delivers school improvement support for Lewisham schools is delivered through temporary agency spend on consultants to support specific education projects and school improvement work.

Cuts proposal*

It is proposed that there is a reduction in agency spend including the rationalising of consultancy support for targeted work and projects and to also use a bank of evidence based consultancy through procurement, rather than agency.

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

Spending linked to priorities in School Improvement framework, delivered in conjunction with Lewisham Learning.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff: The work can be delivered through the proposed plan.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

4. Impact and risks of proposal

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	2,378			
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Rationalising Central Education Services functions	150			150
Total	150			150
% of Net Budget	6%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No	Yes	Yes		
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in orde	r of DECREASING impact
Giving children and young people the	Corporate priorities
best start in life	1. Open Lewisham
2. Good governance and operational	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
effectiveness	3. Giving Children and young
3.	people the best start in life
	4. Building an inclusive local
4.	economy
	5. Delivering and defending:
5.	health, social care & support
	6. Making Lewisham greener
6.	7. Building safer communities
7.	8. Good governance and
	operational effectiveness
8.	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact						
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A						
Ethnicity:	N/A	N/A Pregnancy / Maternity: N/A				
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil	N/A			
		Partnerships'				
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A			
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A			
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A			
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what						
mitigations are proposed						
Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No NO						

9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No				no	
Workforce p	rofile:				
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered
Scale 1 – 2					
Scale 3 – 5					
Sc 6 – SO2					
PO1 – PO5					
PO6 – PO8					
SMG 1 – 3					
JNC					
Total					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual orientation	Straight / Heterosex.	Gay / Lesbian	Bisexual	Not disclosed	

10. Legal implications State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

none

11. Summary timetable						
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and						
	oposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),					
decision, transition w	ork (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:					
Month	Activity					
September 2020	Proposals prepared					
October 2020	Business plan developed					
November to						
December 2020						
November to	ovember to					
December 2020	ecember 2020					
December 2020	December 2020					
January 2021	nuary 2021 Procurement process					
February 2021						
March 2021						

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Review of Children with Complex Needs (CWCN)
Reference:	A-13
Directorate:	CYP
Director of Service:	Angela Scattergood
Service/Team area:	Children with Complex Needs (CWCN)
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Barnham
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	CYP

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
Review structure	No	No	Yes

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed: The Children with Complex Needs service (CWCN) is a multi-disciplinary service that supports children and young people and their families who have complex Special Educational Needs and disabilities. The service comprises of statutory and nonstatutory teams this includes the Special Educational Needs Team, Children with Disabilities Social Care Team, Portage, Travel Assistance and SEND Advisory Service. All services work in a multi-agency way to support children and young people and their families with SEN to achieve better outcomes.

Cuts proposal*

In the last couple of years there has been a dependency on making use of agency staff to deliver key aspects of the service.

It is proposed that there is a review of the service with the explicit aim of reducing this dependency as much as possible, by having a secure, in-house, permanent team of staff, including permanent managers. This is an ambitious aim, given the ongoing challenges in recruiting to permanent social work posts across the sector nationally.

The review will explore different ways of working and rationalisation, while ensuring we continue to meet statutory requirements, while delivering savings.

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

Following the review, it is expected that a restructure will be undertaken, based on a needs analysis to ensure that statutory duties are met in line with regulatory duties.

3. Description of service area and proposal

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

The restructure will be based on needs analysis for service delivery to ensure that statutory duties are met in line with regulatory duties.

All staff impacts will look to mitigation via redeployment as first route where possible.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

There may be a need to upskill staff as a result of changes to specific roles.

Caseloads will need to be carefully managed to ensure continued effective delivery.

There are ongoing challenges in recruiting to permanent, in-house social work posts across the sector.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

Delivery of statutory duties will be considered. The restructure will be based on needs analysis for service delivery to ensure that statutory duties are met in line with regulatory duties.

5. Financial				
information				
Controllable budget:	Spend	Income	Net Budget	
General Fund (GF)	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	55,861	49,796	6,065	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total £'000
	£'000	£'000	£'000	
	195			195
Total	195			195
% of Net Budget	3%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No	Yes			
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact					
1.Delivering and defending: health, social care &support	Corporate priorities 1. Open Lewisham				
2. Giving children and young people the best start in life	 Tackling the Housing Crisis Giving Children and young 				
3. Building an inclusive local economy	people the best start in life				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact				
4. Open Lewisham	4.	Building an inclusive local		
		economy		
5. Good governance and operational	5.	Delivering and defending:		
effectiveness		health, social care & support		
6.	6.	Making Lewisham greener		
	7.	Building safer communities		
7.				
	8.	Good governance and		
8.		operational effectiveness		

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?
	N/A

8. Service equalities impact				
Expected impact on servic	e equalities fo	or users – High / Medium / Lo	ow or N/A	
Ethnicity:	NA	Pregnancy / Maternity:	NA	
Gender:	NA	Marriage & Civil	NA	
		Partnerships:		
Age:	NA	Sexual orientation:	NA	
Disability:	NA	Gender reassignment:	NA	
Religion / Belief:	NA	Overall:	NA	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what				
mitigations are proposed:				

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No

9 Human P	9. Human Resources impact					
Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No Ye						
Workforce p		e un impuor o		1037110	105	
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Var	ant	
1 0010	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency /	Not	
	in poor	in poor		Interim	covered	
				cover	covered	
Scale 1 – 2						
Scale 3 – 5						
Sc 6 – SO2	4	4.0				
PO1 – PO5	35	33.0		8		
PO6 – PO8	5	5.0		2		
SMG 1 – 3	2	2.0				
JNC						
Total	46	44.0		10		
Gender	Female	Male				
	36	10				
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known		
	18	20		8		

9. Human Resources impact					
Disability	Yes	No	PNTS	Not	
				disclosed	
	2	14	8	22	
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not	PNTS
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		disclosed	
	27			5	14

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

None anticipated

11. Summary timetable				
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and				
implementation of pro	oposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),			
decision, transition w	ork (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:			
Month	Activity			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers			
	 – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities 			
	assessment and initial HR considerations)			
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C			
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing			
December 2020				
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where			
December 2020	required) prepared			
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments			
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest			
February 2021	bruary 2021 Final decisions at M&C with the Budget			
March 2021	Cuts implemented			

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Replace Educational Psychologist locums through expanding
	the generic EP Team
Reference:	A-14
Directorate:	CYP
Director of Service:	Angela Scattergood
Service/Team area:	Educational Psychology
Cabinet portfolio:	Cllr Barnham
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	CYP Select

2. Decision Route

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision*	Public Consultation	Staff Consultation
	Yes / No	Yes / No and	Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the	Statutory vs	Statutory vs
	Constitution	informal	informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/		
	mayorandcouncil/		
	aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
Replace 6.0 Locum	No	No	No
EPs by expanding			
generic EP Team			

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

Description of service area: Educational Psychology Team

The Educational Psychology Team provides a traded service, working with schools to provide statutory assessments, early years work and critical incident support.

From 2015 to 2019, the number of children in Lewisham with an Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) increased by 65.5%, from 1,408 to 2,344.

The number of ECHPs in Lewisham now stands at 2,873, representing a further 22.5% increase since the January 2020 SEN2 census date. The Education Psychology team did not have capacity for this increase so has had to employ additional locum Educational Psychologists in order to deliver our statutory duty. This has led to an overspend.

Cuts proposal*

In order to meet the increased demand, it is proposed to restructure the service, bringing in more permanent, in-house capacity, to avoid reliance on the use of more expensive locums. This would achieve a saving of £200,000. This proposal has been discussed and developed over time with staff.

3. Description of service area and proposal

All staff impacts will look to mitigation via redeployment as first route where possible.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff: Impact would be very positive

- This would solve the ongoing issues we have had with capacity issues for the last few years
- We would have improved accountability and management of assessments and plans being submitted on time and improved reputation
- Improved standard of work as all EPs will be part of generic team, same access to supervision, CPD, and better knowledge of LA process and ethos
- Improved structure of team, in line with other boroughs. (We are one of the only London boroughs to have only one senior post). An improved structure will improve retention and recruitment.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

The one risk is if we are not successful in recruiting main grade EPs as there is a national shortage.

If we are unable to recruit we may not be able to complete the statutory work and this will affect KPIs for the borough. Consideration will need to be given to marketing and recruitment and retention initiatives

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
	1,424	593	831	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Locums to permanent staff	200			200
Total	200			
% of Net Budget	24%	%	%	%
Does proposal impact	General	DSG	HRA	Health
on:	Fund			
Yes / No	Yes			
If DSG, HRA, Health				
impact describe:				
impact describe:		<u> </u>		<u> </u>

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order of DECREASING impact			
Giving children and young people the	Corporate priorities		
best start in life	1. Open Lewisham		

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in orde	er of	DECREASING impact
2. Delivering and defending: health, social care and support	2. 3.	Tackling the Housing Crisis Giving Children and young
3. Building an inclusive economy	4.	people the best start in life Building an inclusive local
4. Good governance and operational effectiveness	5.	economy
5.	6.	health, social care & support Making Lewisham greener
6.	7.	Building safer communities
7.	8.	Good governance and operational effectiveness
8.		

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	No specific impact
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact					
Expected impact on serv	vice equalities for	or users – High / Medium / L	ow or N/A		
Ethnicity:	N/A	Pregnancy / Maternity:	N/A		
Gender:	N/A	Marriage & Civil	N/A		
		Partnerships'			
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A		
Disability:	N/A	Gender reassignment:	N/A		
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	N/A		
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what					
mitigations are proposed:					

Is a full service equalities impact assessment required: Yes / No

NO

9. Human Resources impact						
Will this cuts	Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No no					
Workforce p	rofile:					
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant	
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered	
Scale 1 – 2						
Scale 3 – 5						
Sc 6 – SO2						
PO1 – PO5						
PO6 – PO8						
SMG 1 – 3						
JNC						
Total						

9. Human Resources impact					
Gender	Female	Male			
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known	
Disability	Yes	No			
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not	
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		disclosed	

10. Legal implications State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

none

11. Summary timetabl	11. Summary timetable					
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and						
implementation of pro	implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),					
decision, transition w	ork (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:					
Month	Activity					
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers					
	 e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities 					
	assessment and initial HR considerations)					
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C					
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing					
December 2020						
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where					
December 2020	required) prepared					
December 2020 Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments						
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest					
February 2021						
March 2021	Cuts implemented					

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Changes to Children's Social Care services – care leaver accommodation and workforce development
Reference:	A-17 and A-16
Directorate:	CYP
Director of Service:	Lucie Heyes
Service/Team area:	Children's Social Care
Cabinet portfolio:	Chris Barnham
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	CYP

2. Decision Route

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision* Yes / No	Public Consultation Yes / No and	Staff Consultation Yes / No and
	See para 16.2 of the Constitution	Statutory vs informal	Statutory vs informal
	https://lewisham.gov.uk/ mayorandcouncil/ aboutthecouncil/		
	how-council-is-run/		
	our-constitution		
1. Care leaver housing/accommod ation costs (A-17)	no	no	no
2. Reduction of Workforce Development Budget (A-16)	no	no	no

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed: A range of services and functions sitting within Children's Social Care and in particular the budget for providing placements for children and young people in care or who are care leavers.

Cuts proposal*

It is firstly important to note that the budget for placements for Children Looked After and accommodation for Care Leavers is significantly overspending at present. All the savings listed below are in train already and are contributing to a reduction in the overspend in this financial year. The proposals will reduce the overspend, but given the scale of current spend here they are not anticipated to lead to additional cuts in the budget over the next 3 years. Managing the budget with little or no overspend however removes some future financial risks to the Council.

1. <u>Care leaver housing/accommodation costs</u>

Work has already started with Housing to develop accommodation pathways for both young people under the age of 18 who become homeless (Children's Services have a statutory requirement to accommodate young people in this situation) and also care leavers. It is difficult to quantify how this work with reduce costs at present but a figure assuming a 5% reduction is costs is currently assumed. Work is underway at present

3. Description of service area and proposal

to develop improved housing pathways that should also be cheaper than the current arrangements. Once this work is completed the savings figure may increase, in particular for Year 2 after any investments in new accommodation and support have been made.

2. Reduction of workforce development budget

Increased amounts of NQSW's generates income through a grant that supports the induction and training of newly qualified social workers. This will be used for workforce development. This income reduces the need for financial support from the General Fund to support the training and development of social workers. We have seen a significant increase in the number of NQSW's joining Lewisham.

Sponsorship to attend externally run training and conferences will cease, unless it is critical to business.

Mitigating Actions for 21/22

Actions currently underway have generated a significant reduction in expenditure. The actions listed above should continue with this direction of travel.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff:

The actions listed above should not have a negative impact on the quality of care and in many cases should lead to an improvement in the service offer. These proposals do <u>not</u> involve denial or downgrading of services to protect children and young people: quite apart from the Council's strong commitment to the safety and wellbeing of our most vulnerable children, the services concerned are governed by strict statutory requirements.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

The current proposals are being closely monitored by both the Executive Director for Children and Young People and the Executive Director for Finances and Resources, together with the two Cabinet Members. All of these savings have been achieved in other Local Authorities.

The key areas of risk in meeting these savings is that support for CLA is a statutory requirement on local authorities where support is provided dependant on demand and individual needs. Examples of risks include potential increase in demand arising from circumstances being associated with Covid and Brexit. A further consideration is price which can be influenced by factors such as increase in wage costs and also market place i.e. availability of suitable provision.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000 56,103	Income £'000 -3,834	Net Budget £'000 52,269	
HRA	50,103	-3,834	52,209	
DSG				

5. Financial information				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Care Leaver Housing/accommodation	500	0	0	500
Workforce Development budget reduction	50	0	0	50
% of Net Budget	3%	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL	550	0	0	550
Does proposal impact on: Yes / No	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
	Yes	Yes	No	yes
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:		Re- alignment of some costs to the DSG HNB		Some recharge to the CCG for health related costs

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order	r of DECREASING impact
1.	Corporate priorities
	1. Open Lewisham
2.	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
	3. Giving Children and young
3. Giving Children and Young People the best	people the best start in life
start in life	4. Building an inclusive local
4.	economy
	5. Delivering and defending:
5.	health, social care & support
	6. Making Lewisham greener
6.	7. Building safer communities
7.	8. Good governance and
	operational effectiveness
8. Good governance and operational	
effectiveness	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	Borough wide
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

8. Service equalities impact					
Expected impact on service equalities for users – High / Medium / Low or N/A					
Ethnicity:	Ethnicity: low Pregnancy / Maternity: low				
Gender:	low	Marriage & Civil	N/A		
Partnerships:					
Age:	N/A	Sexual orientation:	N/A		

8. Service equalities impact						
Disability:	low	Gender reassignment:	N/A			
Religion / Belief:	N/A	Overall:	low			
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:						
Is a full service equalities	impact assess	sment required: Yes / No	No			

9. Human Resources impact

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No No						
Workforce profile:						
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establishm	Vac	ant	
	in post	in post	ent posts	Agency / Interim cover	Not covered	
Scale 1 – 2						
Scale 3 – 5						
Sc 6 – SO2						
PO1 – PO5						
PO6 – PO8						
SMG 1 – 3						
JNC						
Total						
Gender	Female	Male				
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known		
Disability	Yes	No				
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Not		
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		disclosed		

10. Legal implications

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal:

None

11. Summary timetab	le			
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff), decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:				
Month	Activity			
September 2020	Proposals prepared (this template and supporting papers – e.g. draft public consultation paper, equalities			
assessment and initial HR considerations)				
October 2020	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C			

11. Summary timetal	ble
November to	Scrutiny meetings held with consultations ongoing
December 2020	
November to	Consultations undertaken and full decision reports (where
December 2020	required) prepared
December 2020	Proposals to M&C, including Equality & HR assessments
January 2021	Decision reports return to Scrutiny at the latest
February 2021	Final decisions at M&C with the Budget
March 2021	Cuts implemented

1. Cuts proposal	
Proposal title:	Libraries maintain a click and collect only service
Reference:	A-18
Directorate:	Community Services
Director of Service:	Liz Dart, Director of Culture, Libraries and Learning
Service/Team area:	Libraries and Information Service
Cabinet portfolio:	Community Sector, Cllr Jonathan Slater
Scrutiny Ctte(s):	Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee

2. Decision Route			
Cuts proposed:	Key Decision* Yes / No See para 16.2 of the Constitution https://lewisham.gov.uk/ mayorandcouncil/ aboutthecouncil/ how-council-is-run/	Public Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal	Staff Consultation Yes / No and Statutory vs informal
	our-constitution		
Reconfiguration of library service.	yes	Yes Informal	
Staff reorganisation			Yes Informal

3. Description of service area and proposal

Description of the service area (functions and activities) being reviewed:

Lewisham Library and Information Service provides free unbiased access to books and information through the following channels:

- Hub Libraries in Catford, Lewisham, Deptford and Downham.
- Nine Community Libraries delivered in partnership with community organisations
- E-Library, providing online access to a wide range of books, periodicals, reference materials and engagement activities
- Home Library service for housebound residents
- Archives and Local History Service

Cuts proposal*

The Library and Information service plays an important role in providing access to books, information, learning, cultural activities and computers. It has been some years since the Council considered how this service is delivered to make sure the Council fulfils its statutory duties, while also modernising the service and contributing to the cuts the Council needs to make.

During the coronavirus pandemic, the library service has adapted well to offer Covidsafe services to residents, including click and collect and maximising online platforms. This has enabled some members of staff to be redeployed to support other services and residents. These new ways of working have created both challenges and positive learning, which will be fed into a strategic review of the service.

A strategic review of the service – which will include engagement with residents - will consider how we can best provide a modern library service while identifying cuts of \pounds 300-500,000 in total. It is proposed to bring this review to Mayor and Cabinet in

3. Description of service area and proposal

March/April 2021. Depending on the outcome of the review, it is anticipated that £100-230,000 could be made this year, with further savings coming in 2022/23.

Savings can be made in 2021/22 by freezing vacant posts. The service's salary budget makes up 80% of its total budget. Freezing recruitment to vacant posts could save £150,000 in 2021/22. This is alongside a part year saving of £100k from the review.

4. Impact and risks of proposal

Outline impact to service users, partners, other Council services and staff: The detailed proposals brought back in March/April 2021 will ensure that the service remains accessible to residents, in particular the most vulnerable and those living in areas of deprivation.

In making cuts of £300-500,000 there will need to be a reduction in the service salaries budget which makes up 80% of the service's expenditure. In the first instance the service will be holding vacant posts. It is likely that when proposals are brought forward they will require a full restructure of the service, which may result in a loss of further posts.

All staff impacts will look to mitigation via redeployment as first route where possible.

Outline risks associated with proposal and mitigating actions to be taken:

The Council must ensure it continues to satisfy the statutory requirements of the 1964 Public Libraries Act to provide a "comprehensive and efficient" service to residents. This will be a key consideration in the detailed proposals.

5. Financial information				
Controllable budget: General Fund (GF)	Spend £'000	Income £'000	Net Budget £'000	
, í	3,087.4	75.8	3,011.6	
HRA				
DSG				
Health				
Cuts proposed*:	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	Total £'000
Freezing vacant posts & part year of restructure	150			150
Further saving following decision on detailed proposals and staff reorganisation (8 months affect in 21/22) Scale dependent on proposals.	100-230	50 - 120		150-350
	050.000	50.400		000 500
Total	250-380	50-120		300-500
% of Net Budget	8-13%	2-4%	%	10-17%

5. Financial information				
Does proposal impact on:	General Fund	DSG	HRA	Health
Yes / No	Yes			
If DSG, HRA, Health impact describe:				

6. Impact on Corporate priorities: list in order	of DECREASING impact
1. Building an inclusive local economy	Corporate priorities
	1. Open Lewisham
2. Giving Children and young people the	2. Tackling the Housing Crisis
best start in life	3. Giving Children and young
3. Building safer communities	people the best start in life
, C	4. Building an inclusive local
4. Open Lewisham	economy
	5. Delivering and defending:
5.	health, social care & support
	6. Making Lewisham greener
6.	7. Building safer communities
7.	8. Good governance and
	operational effectiveness
8.	

7. Ward impact	
Geographical	No specific impact / Specific impact in one or more
impact by ward:	
	If impacting one or more wards specifically – which?

Ethnicity:	Medium	or users – High / Medium / L Pregnancy / Maternity:	Medium	
Gender:	Medium	Marriage & Civil	Medium	
	Medium	Partnerships:	Mediam	
Age:	Medium	Sexual orientation:	Medium	
Disability:	Medium	Gender reassignment:	Medium	
Religion / Belief:	Medium	Overall:	Medium	
For any High impact service equality areas please explain why and what mitigations are proposed:				
mitigations are proposed	:			
mitigations are proposed This proposal is a reduction challenge. A full service eq	n in a universal s ualities impact a pecific equality a	service that could be the subje issessment would be undertak reas may be disproportionatel	ect of ken to fully	

Will this cuts proposal have an impact on employees: Yes / No Workforce profile:

Yes

9. Human Resources impact						
Posts	Headcount	FTE	Establish	Vac	ant	
	in post	in post	ment	Agency /	Not	
			posts	Interim	covered	
				cover		
Scale 1 – 2	0	0	0	0	0	
Scale 3 – 5	18	12.8	30	0	12	
Sc 6 – SO2	33	25.8	42	0	9	
PO1 – PO5	6	6	7	1	0	
PO6 – PO8	0	0	0	0	0	
SMG 1 – 3	1	1	1	0	0	
JNC	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	58	45.6	80	1	21	
Gender	Female	Male				
	34	24				
Ethnicity	BME	White	Other	Not Known		
	21	30	2	5		
Disability	Yes	No				
	2	40	13	3		
Sexual	Straight /	Gay /	Bisexual	Prefer not		
orientation	Heterosex.	Lesbian		to say		
	22			36		

10. Legal implications

April 2021

August 2021

State any specific legal implications relating to this proposal: The council has a "statutory duty" to provide a library service as per the Public Libraries and Museums act 1964

11. Summary timetable	
Outline timetable for main steps to be completed re decision and	
implementation of proposal – e.g. proposal, scrutiny, consultation (public/staff),	
decision, transition work (contracts, re-organisation etc), implementation:	
Month	Activity
January 2021	Proposals submitted to Scrutiny committees leading to M&C
February 2021	In principle approval at M&C to seek a saving from library
	service and freeze vacant posts pending detailed proposals.
January 2021 to	Completion of strategic position statement and infrastructure
March 2021	plan for libraries including public consultation.
April 2021	Report to M&C with detailed proposals for how the library
	service will operate post Covid and deliver a saving of £300-
	500k.

Staff reorganisation commences

New staff structure implemented and saving achieved