

BUDGET CUT ASSESSMENT FORM

Budget Cut Assessment Form	YOUTH OFFENDING ASB	Ref No Hu2	Responsible AD	Responsible Finance Manager	Responsible HR Manager	Responsible Lawyer	Responsible EIA Officer
-----------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------

Description of Proposal:

YOS

The Youth Offending Team's budget is made up of a mixture of grant funding, Council budget and contributions from a number of income streams as well as in kind contributions from partner agencies: police/PCC/probation. The ability to deliver a range of services that are non-statutory is very likely to have an impact on the levels of criminality that lead to statutory involvement by the criminal justice system including the YOS. There is also likely impact on other council and partner services as criminal behaviour and anti-social behaviour may increase throughout the Borough. DBC funding via public health (£20k), DBC education (£27k), ETE (£16) will cease.

Partner agencies have yet to indicate what their future contributions to the YOS will be. The continuation of the current level of the YJB grant and likely cuts to the probation service contribution are a significant risk.

The current model that has been developed in Darlington has:

- focused on preventative interventions that lessen the requirement for statutory orders and has been very successful
- the focus will be on three national priorities of reducing first time entrants, reducing the use of custody and reduction in re-offending in the new model

Non-statutory work that will no longer be covered:

- restorative disposals such as mediation between victim and offender would be reduced. The success of such schemes in terms of re-directing young people from criminal behaviour and providing the victim with closure is well documented.
- early intervention work in children's homes and with the area social work teams will be reduced as the focus will be on statutory orders. The delivery and subsequent support on Restorative Approaches will be reduce
- caseloads of YOS officers may increase lessening the ability to work intensively with young people subject to statutory or non-statutory interventions.

Any dips in performance could trigger HMIP inspection. A recent YJB report has highlighted concerns in the reduction of staff and management capacity to maintain levels of performance. Activity will be prioritised on meeting targets set in the annual YOS plan that are a condition of receipt of the YJB grant.

Risks

- a reduction in pre-court activity would lead to young people entering the criminal justice system at a higher threshold and receiving criminal convictions that might otherwise have been avoided
- the cost to the Local Authority of increased use of custody could be significant

ASB

Given uncertainty over the future funding from the YJB and partner agencies to the YOS sourcing additional resources for ASB is unlikely. It is proposed that delivering the LA statutory duty to provide a response to ASB is delivered in future with partners through the YOS. An ASB officer is currently assigned to work closely on the preventative agenda with each of the Area Teams. Reduced ASB capacity will reduce the capacity to have this level of dedicated alignment with the locality teams.

Under the Crime and Disorder Act there has to be a response to reports of ASB. There is no prescribed way to deliver this but police resources are unlikely to bridge the gap. The ASB team is closely aligned with the YOS. Each locality team is aligned with an ASB officer currently working closely on the preventative agenda. Reduced ASB capacity will reduce the capacity to have this level of dedicated alignment with the locality teams.

Under the ASB & Crime & Policing Act 2014 there must be a response to Community Triggers (made by members of the public). There has to be a co-ordinated multi agency response. Without a dedicated ASB team the investigation of these issues would have an impact on the YOS depending on the ability of partner agencies to respond.

Community remedies – police refer low level crime/ASB for low level/preventative type interventions.

Impact of reduced service: an increase in ASB activity with reduced means of addressing statutory responsibilities. An increase in statutory cases for YOS and in cases going through to CAP/MASH in crisis as issues that may have been addressed deteriorate and are escalated.

Caseloads of YOS/ASB

The caseloads of YOS officers are currently around 22. They may increase should a rise in ASB/offending result from removal of early intervention services.

Human Resources Impacts		Asset Management Impacts	Decommissioning Costs	Cost Shunting
No. of posts to be deleted	7	Detail any released buildings/building space Identify disposal or requisition issues	In addition to HR and Asset costs identify any others e.g. early contract termination costs	Is there any known or potential to increase costs elsewhere within Council budgets Increase in statutory cases for YOS. Increases in cases going through to CAP/MASH
No. of potential redundancies	7			
Estimated Redundancy costs	£95,474			

	Financial Summary				
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Estimated reduction to budget	19,672	177,060	178,519	229,992	229,992
Redundancy Costs	95,474				
Asset Implication					
Decommissioning Costs					
Known Cost Shunting					
Overheads	644	5,719	5,691	7,276	7,276
NET Budget Reduction	(75,158)	182,779	184,210	237,268	237,268

Equality Impacts

Overview is EIA needed?			Protected Characteristics				Explain decision, level of impact and any change across the options	Yes	Brief Details
Put 'x' in relevant box if the proposal:			Impact		Level				
		'x'	Comments, including any charge across the options. Include the number of people affected, where known		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put 'x' in the box in the Impact column if there are positive (P) or negative (N) equality impacts. Leave box blank if there are no potential equality impacts Put L, M, H or ? in relevant column using following descriptions: L = sustainable adjustment in daily routine M = significant reorganisation or change H = life changing or limiting impact on quality of life ? = not known at this stage. 				
Affects	Service users	x	young people 10 - 18						
	Employees	x		P	N	L/M/H/?		Have Cumulative Impacts been identified?	
	The wider community	x	Impact on community re crime and disorder	Age	x	H		Have unlawful impacts been identified?	
Significantly affects how services are delivered?		x	Reduced capacity to deliver statutory services	Race				Are there opportunities to advance equality?	
Have a significant effect on partner organisations?		x	Increased activity for police, schools, probation, health	Sex				Are there opportunities to foster good relations?	
Affect services known to be important to particular protected groups?				Gender Reassignment				Have any other options been explored and discounted?	
Affect different protected groups in different ways?				Disability					
Relate to service areas with known inequalities				Religion or Belief					
				Sexual Orientation					
				Pregnancy or Maternity					
				Marriage/Civil Partnership					

MFTP – 2016/17 – Equality Screenings. This screening tool is to gather information on potential equality impacts to inform decision making. It is not an equality impact assessment. EIA will be done at a later stage where appropriate. All proposals must have an equality screen document. Decision makers must have equality screening information before any decision is taken. DBC is at risk of legal challenge if decision makers do not have this information.