

# NEWPORT FAIRNESS COMMISSION

## Newport City Council Budget Consultation 2020-21 Response from the Newport Fairness Commission January 2020

Authors:

Gideon Calder (Chair), Elen Ghassempoory, Ruth McKie, Terry Price, June Ralph, Cllr Kate Thomas, Shereen Williams.

### *Contents*

1. Executive summary	1
2. Background to this response	2
3. Principles of Fairness	3
4. Analysis of Budget Saving Proposals for 2020-21	4
i. Summary of ratings	5
ii. Commentary	7

# 1. Executive summary

- We have analysed each Budget Saving Proposal in connection with each **Principle of Fairness: Equity, Priority, Inclusion and Communication**.
- To summarise our comments, we have applied a **rating** to each proposal, in connection with each of those principles:
  - A. *No specific or pressing concerns*
  - B. *Low risk of negative impact*
  - C. *Moderate risk of negative impact*
  - D. *High risk of negative impact*
  - E. *Impact too difficult to gauge, on the basis of the information provided*

For full overviews of these ratings, see pp. 7 and 25. Here, we draw out the key themes emerging in this report.

## 1. The 2020-21 version of the budget consultation has far too many E ratings for comfort.

This rating says effectively ‘The Fairness Commission cannot determine whether this decision is fair, based on what you have told us.’ With many proposals, there is *simply no way of telling what the implications for fairness might be*, or whether these have been considered at all in the drafting of the budget. This is something that as a Fairness Commission, we notice immediately – it is part of our brief to pick these things up. But it is of even stronger concern when we think about how the public might engage through the consultation process. Thus there are significant concerns around the effectiveness (as well as the fairness) of a consultation in which the implications of the budget proposals at stake will not be apparent to the general public.

## 2. The Council has a potential communication problem, in general.

A majority of those E ratings are connected to the principle of Communication. This suggests that the Council is not proactively thinking about how its decisions will be disseminated to the public. A key example here is the proposal to raise Council Tax. **Taxation** is a prime example of an area of Council activity which is crucial to how services function, but about which there is a high degree of public misperception and frustration. From the Fairness Commission’s point of view it is a top priority, in terms of the improvement of the public conversation about fairness. We think it is vitally important that the quality of the public conversation about taxation is enhanced, for the sake of both Council and citizens.

## 3. The strongest negative ratings are concentrated in the areas of Equity and Priority.

This suggests that budget savings, when ‘risky’ in terms of fairness, are likely to be either failing to treat different groups in a fair way, exacerbating gaps between those with more and less, or further disadvantaging those most vulnerable in the community.

## 4. There remains a strong concern about the depletion of the public realm.

This point was stressed in our response the 2019-20 budget. The term ‘public realm’ refers both to the resources we share as a community, and the spirit of community relationships – it is partly material, and partly to do with perceptions and values. It is embodied in everything from the state of public facilities, to crime rates, to levels of civic pride, to trust in politicians, right down to people’s everyday engagement with each other in the street. Examples: proposals 3, 5, 9.

## 5. There remains a strong concern about corrosive disadvantages and knock-on effects of short-term savings.

This is also a recurring point. The term ‘corrosive disadvantages’ refers to how some disadvantages which people experience have negative impacts which extend far beyond the immediate factors involved. Examples: proposals 8, 9, 10.

## 2. Background to this response

### Devising the response

This is our eighth response to the annual Newport City Council budget. In line with recent practice, Council officers attended our November 2019 meeting, to brief us on priorities shaping the drafting of the budget. We then met again on 19 December to discuss the savings proposals just announced as being put forward for public consultation. The proposals were then divided between members of the Commission for analysis, in connection with our Principles of Fairness. As with the previous year, we simultaneously took steps to engage with community groups to broaden our own focus and help promote the value of responding to the consultation – this time at a meeting of the Newport 50+ Forum, and by correspondence with individual members of Newport People’s First. This informal input – and the experience of interpreting the proposals with these different audiences – has directly informed aspects of this report. We are very grateful for those insights, which opened up issues and perspectives that we would not otherwise have considered. That said, the Commission takes full responsibility for its contents, which should not be taken as a representation of the views of those groups – both of whom we strongly encouraged to make their own contributions to the public consultation.

It is important to note that the Fairness Commission (FC) is not an elected body, nor a special interest group. And while we are diverse, neither does the FC represent any kind of perfect cross-section of the Newport community. Our role is not to lobby, nor to make specific policy recommendations. Rather the aim of this Response, as with our other work, is to provide tools with which to tackle challenges and devise priorities – to think in fresh and critical ways about the implications of Council decision-making, and to foster public debate which takes fairness, equality and well-being seriously.

### Economic context

Our previous budget responses have stressed the importance of the background conditions of austerity, in understanding the circumstances of places such as Newport, and the constraints under which local authorities across the UK and Wales are operating. Rather than repeat these points, we take them as read. We fully appreciate the ongoing impacts of this climate on individuals, community relations and the state of the public realm. Even more than would usually be the case, local authorities find themselves trading-off between different kinds of undesirable options – or from our point of view, different potential kinds of unfair impact. That said, we should also note that for 2020-21, the Welsh Government settlement provided local authorities with greater resources than expected – and that the Council faces a changed set of strategic choices as a result.

### Key points

- *We continue to seek to generate the FC response to the budget consultation in more extended and inclusive ways.*
- *As previously, this response should not be taken as providing policy recommendations, but rather as encouraging critical reflection on the budget on the part of Newport City Council and its officers – and providing tools with which such reflection can be carried out.*
- *Austerity remains vital to the understanding of budget decisions and their implications, and makes questions about fairness more pressing, and more difficult.*

## 3. Principles of Fairness

In 2019 the Commission devised **Four Principles of Fairness**, designed specifically to be applied in practical decision-making. The intention is that any decision-maker at any level might pick them up and use them as a framework for considering the implications of a proposal or course of action. From now on, we will use these principles as a framework for our own annual Budget Response.

The **Four Principles of Fairness** are as follows:<sup>1</sup>

### Equity

We should acknowledge differences but also treat people in a consistent way, while aiming to reduce the gap between those with more and less.

- *Are people being treated in a consistent way, while acknowledging their differences?*
- *Will the gap between those with more and less be reduced?*
- *Have the interests of different groups affected (such as minorities) been taken into account?*

### Priority

We should prioritise the needs of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged.

- *Have the needs of the most disadvantaged and vulnerable across the city been given priority?*
- *Have we taken care to consider possible indirect consequences for these people of decisions made with other priorities in mind?*

### Inclusion

Citizens should be given the opportunity to participate in the shaping of how services are decided upon, designed and delivered.

- *Will the voices of all those affected be heard?*
- *Have possible impacts on the well-being of future generations been taken into account?*
- *Are all relevant citizens able to participate in and shape the service, as well as receiving it?*
- *Has consideration been given to the impact on citizens' relations with each other, and the spaces they share?*

### Communication

All decisions should be clearly communicated to those affected, in a way which allows for feedback and recognises the obligations between citizens and their Council.

- *Are decisions being made transparently and consistently?*
- *Will relevant decisions be communicated to those affected in a clear way, with the opportunity for feedback?*
- *Are the obligations of citizens to the Council, and vice versa, clear?*

---

<sup>1</sup> These principles supplement the Fairness Commission's original Four Parameters of Fairness, used as a framework to identify different kinds of fairness-related issues and help navigate the debates to which they give rise: **1**: Equal treatment while recognizing difference; **2**: Mutual obligations between citizens and local government; **3**: Interdependency and reciprocity within community relations; **4**: Transparency and accountability in decision-making.

## 4. Analysis of Budget Saving Proposals for 2020-21

This section presents our analysis of each Budget Saving Proposal, in connection with each Principle of Fairness.

4 (i) provides a summary of our analysis, allocating to each proposal an overall rating on how well each principle is satisfied.

4 (ii) provides the full analysis, including commentary providing the basis for those ratings, and observations – for example, on how the proposal relates to the Parameters of Fairness.

The **ratings** are as follows:

<b>A</b>	<b>No specific or pressing concerns</b>  We have no specific or pressing concerns to raise about this proposal, in connection with this principle. This does not mean that there is no possibility of unfairness arising from this proposal – just that there is no <i>obvious</i> cause for concern.
<b>B</b>	<b>Low risk of negative impact</b>  In our view it is possible this proposal will have a negative impact, in connection with this principle.
<b>C</b>	<b>Moderate risk of negative impact</b>  In our view this proposal is likely to have a negative impact, in connection with this principle.
<b>D</b>	<b>High risk of negative impact</b>  In our view this proposal is highly likely to have a negative impact, in connection with this principle.
<b>E</b>	<b>Impact too difficult to gauge, on the basis of the information provided</b>  We have not been able to make a clear assessment of the fairness or otherwise of this proposal. This should <b>not</b> be seen as a ‘neutral’ rating. It is a negative rating, in an important sense. The implications of the proposal in question have not been presented in a fully explicit way. It is therefore difficult to gauge the impact of, whether for the Fairness Commission or – more significantly – the public at large.

## (i) Summary of ratings

No.	Proposal name	Equity	Priority	Inclusion	Communication
1	Reduction in Day Opportunities	E	E	B	E
2	Telecare service	E	E	E	E
3	Reduction in Funding Awarded to Third Party Organisations	E	D	C	E
4	Staffing Review	E	A	A	A
5	Family Support Services – Barnardo’s Partnership	D	D	E	E
6	Staffing across Children’s Services	D	D	E	E
7	Reduction of posts across Children’s Services	E	E	E	E
8	Education Welfare Service Savings	D	D	C	E
9	Reduction of the Inclusion Enrichment Team	C	C	C	E
10	Gwent Music Service Reduction in Hardship Funding	B	C	C	E
11	Improved Budget Efficiency within Education Services	A	A	A	A
12	Increase in Fees	B	C	C	B
13	Termination of Home to College Transport Provision...	C	D	B	E
14	Increased Recycling – Bag Sorting	A	A	A	C
15	Car Parking – Faulkner Road and Civic Centre	E	C	E	A
16	Digital Savings – Public Building Wi-Fi...	A	A	B	C
17	Reduction in Statutory Enforcement...	A	C	A	A
18	Council Tax Reduction Scheme	A	A	A	B
19	Council Tax Increase	E	A	A	E

- Elements of **eight proposals** have been deemed to raise no specific or pressing concerns (**rating A**):
  - 4, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19

In terms of the Principles of Fairness, this rating, when applied, was spread quite evenly across the four principles.

- Elements of **ten proposals** have been deemed to have a **medium risk of negative impact (rating C)**:
  - 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
- Elements of **five proposals** have been deemed to have a **high risk of negative impact** in connection with one or other principle of fairness (**rating D**):
  - 3, 5, 6, 8, 13

In terms of the Principles of Fairness, these impacts were identified **only** in relation to *Equity* or *Priority*.

- **Twelve proposals** have received **rating E**, meaning that there is insufficient information on which to gauge their fairness:
  - 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15

In terms of the Principles of Fairness, this rating was heavily concentrated in the area of *Communication*.

## (ii) Commentary

### Theme: ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

No.	Proposal name	Equity	Priority	Inclusion	Communication	Other remarks, e.g. regarding the Parameters of Fairness
1	Reduction in Day Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on unpaid carers should be incorporated</li> <li>No information on which sections of the community receive a service, and so what needs it addresses.</li> <li>While there are assurances about lack of impact on training and some statutory obligations...</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information as to the groups receiving the service and hence no clue as to how it might affect different sections of the community and priority groups.</li> <li>It is impossible to gauge whether the current budget places priority on the most disadvantaged, or whether they may be especially adversely affected.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assurance that Well-being obligations will be maintained - but no information on whether citizens will have any input on the proposals</li> <li>Projections suggest <i>increased</i> demand in future, despite current decrease?</li> <li>Support for young people's transition from Childrens' Services need to be fully addressed.</li> <li>Relations to the future could be more explicit here. Preparation and adjustments are important to maximise young people's opportunities for participation in society with the best skill set for their needs and individual life chances.</li> </ul> <p>B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information at this stage on the basis of which any comment can be made.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal is extremely vague, with no description of what the budget actually pays for. It appears an easy decision because the current budget is underspent by the total proposed savings. Yet there is no indication as to the reasons it is underspent, nor whether that is due to less demand overall or (e.g.) the services on offer not fulfilling the needs of the intended audience.</li> </ul> <p>The vagueness of this proposal poses real hurdles to an assessment of its impact in general, including in terms of fairness.</p>
2	Telecare service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No description of groups currently receiving a service, nor of those most affected by any cuts.</li> <li>There may be potential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mention of increased spending from Direct Payments budgets to enable citizens to buy in their own services, which increase council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mention of how it increases the individual's access community connectedness i.e. supportive social networks, increased</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little detail about the nature of new interventions apart from accessing alternative funding sources. There is an implication that face to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments made on WBFG Act commitments do not apply where reductions are to be implemented.</li> <li>A little more written</li> </ul>

		<p>equity-related benefits related to ‘helping people live independently for longer in their own homes’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We cannot gauge whether the current budget is equitable, or whether the reduction would be felt more by some groups than others.</li> </ul> <p><b>E</b></p>	<p>spending.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is likely to produce higher spending by other public services e.g. NHS Wales or ambulance services as deterioration in clinical conditions may only be addressed at a later stage.</li> <li>Exacerbations such as these do see loss of capacity for individuals to living independently in their own home; often institutionalised care placement follows.</li> <li>Again, it is impossible to gauge whether the current budget places priority on the most disadvantaged, or whether they may be especially adversely affected.</li> </ul> <p><b>E</b></p>	<p>family engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This could reduce tenant’s connection and their previous links to their SRL (and the support networks some provide). It could increase their perceived or real isolation and loneliness.</li> <li>Again, this proposal is prohibitively difficult to assess from an inclusion perspective.</li> </ul> <p><b>E</b></p>	<p>face time with support will be reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not clear if this reduction will increase opportunities for self-advocacy, information exchange, or opportunities to share concerns.</li> <li>We cannot gauge whether or how this principle might be met.</li> </ul> <p><b>E</b></p>	<p>information compared to Proposal 1, but unfortunately not of a kind that allows for analysis of fairness. Proposals are broken down a little but not quantified in any sense that allows one to establish how different elements of savings may impact on recipients. There is no description of services provided in total nor of overall budgets and of what groups currently receive services and their needs. Options give no idea of actual impact.</p> <p><b>The vagueness of this proposal poses real hurdles to an assessment of its impact in general, including in terms of fairness.</b></p>
3	<b>Reduction in Funding Awarded to Third Party Organisations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Majority of cuts will impact support for mental health services. Mental health has recently been identified as a key priority through the Public Health Wales consultation across Gwent.</li> <li>Alternative support to obtain grants funding assumes other public bodies are providing it at previous levels. This may</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Third Sector’s services tend not to be prioritised and rarely gain prominence in spending distribution - but are typically preventative and help maintain better mental health.</li> <li>Although all groups affected appear to be particularly vulnerable, the proposals do not provide an indication of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Again, these services have the characteristics of being preventative and maintaining better mental health through encouraging community inclusion and participation.</li> <li>No direct assessment of inclusion elements – may reflect an assumption that the authorities know best.</li> <li>False assumption of like for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Third Sector is composed of disparate organisations able to reach out to individuals whose needs, if supported, may be alleviated and the long-term damage to the future resilience of families – the building blocks of communities and society.</li> <li>Third Sector organisations can empower in a way that statutory services tend not</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compared to proposals 1 and 2 there is more direct information here on level of savings and current grants.</li> <li>However there is no sense of context and how crucial the grant is within overall budget of organisations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Our concern here is that some organisations will take proportionately greater hits</b></p>

		<p>not be the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No sense of how the proposals might impact on different vulnerable groups and whether the proposals might be equitably distributed. My suspicion is some will feel the hit far more severely than others.</li> <li>No feeling that differing needs have been considered nor the fit of different services/approaches to recipients needs/wishes</li> <li>It is not clear here whether the different needs and wishes of those affected – or the ‘fit’ of the services concerned with those needs and wishes – have been considered.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<p>any assessment of how comparative needs are being taken into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BUT despite the lack of information, given the groups affected by this proposal, we can say that there is a high likelihood that these savings will adversely, and disproportionately affect the least vulnerable.</li> </ul> <p>D</p>	<p>like replacements helping make up shortfall created.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In some cases, it seems likely that savings made here will have to be picked up by social services at any rate – in which scenario there would be no overall efficiency gain, but instead a displacement of costs from one part of the Council budget to another?</li> <li>Organisations such as Newport People First (who do not ‘offer’ advocacy as their description suggests, but facilitate <i>self</i>-advocacy) have inclusion as an intrinsic part of their mission.</li> <li>Given the nature of the services at stake in this case, there is particular cause for concern that inclusion has not been directly addressed.</li> </ul> <p>C</p>	<p>to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Again, communication is especially valuable in this context – and there is no provision for this as yet.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<p><b>on future viability and that it might simply be assumed that suitable alternative services might fill the gaps. This would undermine the protection of frontline services struggling to meet their existing commitments.</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

4	Staffing Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council have recognised the increase in numbers of disabled young people entering adult services and also the financial impact of the council's responsibilities towards older people with learning disabilities who, unable to live independently, were previously looked after by their parents who are now ageing or infirm and who will in future need publicly funded support. (Extra provision of £1477k is proposed.)</li> <li>Possible redundancies pose potential impacts on equity for existing staff.</li> <li>Please also see comments in right-hand column.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	A	A	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is some lack of clarity on what this proposal actually amounts to – and specifically: what the 'impacts' on the 9 FTE posts would be, which posts would be affected, and what services they currently provide.</li> <li>We cannot fathom the information provided in the "FEIA" box that there will be no impact on the wider community – unless there are currently 9 posts doing nothing of use.</li> </ul> <p><b>The lack of clarity regarding the impacts of this proposal on staffing may obscure potential unfairness.</b></p>
---	-----------------	---	---	---	---	---

Theme: CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

No.	Proposal name	Equity	Priority	Inclusion	Communication	Other remarks, e.g. regarding the Parameters of Fairness
5	Family Support Services – Barnardo’s Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition that the main pressure comes from children in need of fostering and Out of Area placements and are increasing the budget provision in these areas (£769k), and it plans to increase the associated costs of legal fees (£445k)</li> <li>Proposal may create further gaps between those with ‘more and less’ – as they will be accessing less support and intervention work prior to Children’s Services intervention.</li> </ul> <p>D</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This service has specifically addressed the needs of some of the most dysfunctional and unstable of families, around e.g. substance abuse, mental illness and learning disability.</li> <li>This saving will impact services particularly to women struggling to appropriately support their families to develop constructive and fulfilling future lives. As their children will have ACEs, there is a risk of increased chances of inherited familial dysfunction (with substantial potential costs for society as well as the families concerned).</li> <li>It is unclear how referrals will be prioritised, what will be done to mitigate potential impacts on children in care</li> <li>This saving seems highly likely to create further pressure and financial demand on the care system in Newport – and other services prioritising</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no indication that current and potential service-users, or ‘on the ground’ staff been consulted on the proposals</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information at this stage on the basis of which any comment can be made – e.g. potential communication with service-users, or other service providers affected.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	

			children in care in particular  D			
6	Staffing across Children's Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those with children are especially likely to have been adversely affected by recent cuts – making them vulnerable in themselves, but also increasing the risk of antisocial behaviour and damaging behaviour within families.</li> <li>Increasing pressures on staff workloads, across a range of different social groupings may mean that there is not an equitable level of provision in relation to service-user need.</li> <li>Impacts of additional work pressures in relation to service-user are potentially significant.</li> </ul> D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reduction in number of cases supported may lead to higher demand for fostering, respite or permanent placements which are extremely costly and future provision is difficult to anticipate.</li> <li>Social Worker MAPS: the intersection of the impacts of this proposal with proposal 5 have not been addressed. The proposal states this work is now provided from the Barnardo's Family Support Team. Yet with budget savings proposed in relation to that team, would the work still be able to be prioritised adequately under increasing pressures.</li> <li>There are shortages of Foster Carer Families, as well as care home places, which means that already the 'best matches' may not be facilitated.</li> </ul> D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a clear link to reducing the opportunities for positive outcomes for the worst affected individuals. There is also an impact on communities and the availability of support which they may have previously been able to offer as a resource.</li> <li>We cannot tell from the information provided whether the voices of service-users have been heard.</li> <li>We cannot tell either whether the long-term impact of these proposals been considered – whether, e.g. risks associated with grant funding changing for certain roles or caseloads increasing in certain areas.</li> </ul> E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The most socially deprived in society are least likely to communicate their needs through conventional constructive channels and participation. They are also most likely to express dissatisfaction through antisocial behaviour and dissociation.</li> <li>There is no indication of potential communication with service-users.</li> </ul> E	
7	Reduction of posts across	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Redundancies have different impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similarly, we can't see from the information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Again, we have no picture from the information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are not told here how either how decisions on the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a lot is actually revealed within this</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Children's Services</b></p>	<p>depending on the individual concerned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly, the impacts of the deletion of a post will vary according to the specific role in question.</li> <li>• We can't see from the proposals whether the job-loss itself, or the loss of the work involved, may have unfair impacts in terms of equity.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<p>given how the proposed redundancy may impact on the most vulnerable, either in terms of the post-holder or their role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will be important that workloads affected are reorganised in a way which prioritises the needs of the most vulnerable service-users.</li> <li>• The impacts of proposal 5 overlap with this one, as well as proposal 6. This is an intervention service at its core, looking to prevent removals from family – so it is possible that there will be more risk of children and young people being placed in fostering and residential care, and a resultant strain on the remaining workforce.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<p>provided of any possible long-term risks associated with the redundancy proposal – or of the likely strain the deletion will put on other Council or third-sector service areas.</p> <p>E</p>	<p>deletion will being made, or how they will be communicated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will be important to make clear that any statutory obligations in this service area are explicitly acknowledged.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<p>proposal – e.g. what options are being considered in terms of redundancies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to considering this in relation to fairness it would be good to know exactly what is being proposed as currently it is quite vague and discusses 'voluntary redundancies' as a hope. This does not allow a full assessment of the likely fairness of the impacts of the proposal.</li> </ul> <p><b>The lack of clarity regarding the impacts of this proposal on staffing may obscure potential unfairness.</b></p>
--	-----------------------------------	---	---	--	---	---

Theme: EDUCATION

No.	Proposal name	Equity	Priority	Inclusion	Communication	Other remarks, e.g. regarding the Parameters of Fairness
8	Education Welfare Service Savings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools have accepted the challenges of reducing the numbers of teachers and teaching assistants posts.</li> <li>• They have been encouraged to increase the number and range of duties existing staff undertake. Taking on more responsibilities could risk essential preventative services becoming unsafe.</li> <li>• Attendance is a measure of well-being used by ESTYN. This proposal reduces the amount of support within the area of school attendance. Children from challenging socio-economic backgrounds are likely to have lower attendance – these savings will have an impact on the support provided to them.</li> <li>• Girls are also more vulnerable to the impact of period poverty on school attendance.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center; color: purple; font-weight: bold; font-size: 2em;">D</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite the council accepting that there are a few alternatives to these cuts within the central education services, if NCC is to present a balanced budget, the loss of these posts could threaten the safeguarding of children’s and individuals in families, which is also one of the council’s highest priorities.</li> <li>• It is correct to state that these posts support maintaining attendance. – an area which Welsh Government prioritise. Also, vitally, they link school to home and therefore these officers are capable of identifying risk where families are struggling in areas of their lives which could threaten family stability and the ability of children to thrive in the future.</li> <li>• All schools will have struggling families. The commentary suggests that priority for this reduced service would</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the information provided, we cannot gauge whether the safeguarding impact on young people been assessed</li> <li>• EWOs play a crucial safeguarding role – removal of 1 to 2 posts reduces the resources to support young people and their families.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center; color: blue; font-weight: bold; font-size: 2em;">C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear from the information provided whether (or what) alternatives are in place for schools, how the implications of this cut may be communicated to the schools, or whether they are aware that they will have less access to EWOs.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center; color: orange; font-weight: bold; font-size: 2em;">E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal is connected to parameters 1 and 2. The proposal could cause a conflict between these 2 parameters.</li> </ul>

			<p>focus on schools with the lowest attendance. This will cause neglect of the issues that might lead ultimately to breakdown of families and higher costs in child placements in care; an area of unpredictable and far higher cost to the public. The recommended Option Two, would appear unlikely to reap 'balanced savings'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low attendance has more impact on the most vulnerable children and young people in the city. It also affects young carers – there is no clarity in the proposal on how the impact of the loss of EWO's will be mitigated on these groups.</li> <li>• This proposal is not supportive of improving educational attainment or supporting pupils disadvantaged by poverty (as stated in the proposal)</li> </ul> <p><b>D</b></p>			
9	<b>Reduction of the Inclusion Enrichment Team</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This cut risks an unfair impact on the students that need the most support i.e. those with additional learning needs (disability).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considering the changes to the ALN processes across Wales, it seems likely that this saving will impact the council's ability to implement those changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal does not fit well with the principles of the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act.</li> <li>• It is targeted at the most vulnerable students (and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the communication around the challenges of delivering statutory duty been done?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal is connected to parameters 1 and 4.</li> </ul> <p><b>The lack of clarity regarding the impacts of this proposal on staffing may obscure potential unfairness.</b></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One group is being singled out in terms of impact and it is unclear on what mitigation is in place to manage this.</li> </ul> <p>C</p>	C	families by extension), it will hinder the Council's ability to meet its statutory duty.	E	
10	<b>Gwent Music Service Reduction in Hardship Funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal does reduce the contribution towards supporting students on FSM accessing specialist music provision however to an extent it brings Newport's contribution in line with two other Gwent LA's.</li> <li>There needs to be clarity on how this reduction impacts the students e.g. less hrs of classes provided? Less FSM students being able to access classes?</li> <li>There is an obvious face-value concern here about equity – but whether or not it has unfair impacts will partly depend on how the cuts are managed.</li> </ul> <p>B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst there is a challenge to make financial savings across the service area, music provision can easily be construed as a 'non-essential' provision. This does not reflect the positive impact music can have on a young person's well-being as well as the lifelong skills that can be nurtured.</li> </ul> <p>C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal could further exclude FSM students from accessing provision simply due to the fact that their families/caregivers are unable to afford the provision.</li> </ul> <p>C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There needs to be further information on how can FSM students access the provision in future and could this be an area that causes division within a classroom between those who can afford lessons and those who are unable to.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal is connected to parameters 1, 3 and 4.</li> </ul>
11	<b>Improved Budget Efficiency within Education Services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal supports the on-going provision and sustainability of services to EAL students and those supported within the PRU</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal supports the provision of service for vulnerable students i.e. in need of PRU provision as well as those with EAL needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In line with the principles of the WBFG Act.</li> </ul> <p>A</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consider the positive promotion of the relocation of the Key Stage 2 PRU provision particularly if within a school setting – alternative provision within</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposal is connected to parameters 2 and 3</li> </ul>

		provision. <b>A</b>	<b>A</b>		a mainstream setting. <b>A</b>	
--	--	------------------------	----------	--	-----------------------------------	--

## Theme: CITY SERVICES

No.	Proposal name	Equity	Priority	Inclusion	Communication	Other remarks, e.g. regarding the Parameters of Fairness
12	Increase in Fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highways – no apparent issues. Costs are paid by road maintenance &amp; utilities companies. No cost to residents.</li> <li>Waste receptacle charges for HMOs- how will this increase be applied to HMO in which there are tenants on housing benefits and those who are not?</li> </ul> <b>B</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no indication of how any increase in fees will affect those in receipt in benefits – likely to be among the most vulnerable tenants.</li> </ul> <b>C</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This appears to be a one size fits all approach to fees. Could the council review the services for HMO and find bespoke solutions.</li> </ul> <b>C</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to make clear why a value is being set now when there was previously no value set.</li> </ul> <b>B</b>	
13	Termination of Home to College Transport Provision...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One option suggested would increase officers time through assessment panel attendance. This would indirectly increase the cost of the service and may take people away from their other responsibilities.</li> <li>As the number of children with disabilities is following a trend to rise, this may add to pressures on the family</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALN students would be in disadvantaged &amp; vulnerable group of citizens. Total or partial removal seems to impact hugely on this group.</li> <li>Lower income students disproportionately affected</li> </ul> <b>D</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-being of future generations impact here if provision was removed as ALM students in the future have fewer or no options for FE.</li> <li>Well being of future generations impact here if post 16 students in the future have fewer or no options for FE.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What have comms with FE establishments produced? Can other co-operative transport arrangements can be made.</li> <li>What have comms with FE establishments produced? Can other co-operative transport arrangements can be made.</li> </ul> <b>E</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equal treatment while recognising difference</li> <li>It should not necessarily be an aim to provide equal services between mainstream and Additional Learning Needs (ALN) pupils. This move might be an impediment to children with disabilities accessing the provision most appropriate for their needs and future development.</li> </ul>

		<p>with disabled young people. The family members most likely to be taking-on extra responsibilities are women, potentially exacerbating the pressures of their situation and reducing their capacity to follow full time careers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ALN students - Not clear if this is already means tested provision. May provide ALN students more difficulties in accessing FE education. Longer term implication for employability.</li> <li>• Post 16 – means tested already? May prevent post 16 students taking up FE opportunities. Longer term implication for employability</li> </ul> <p>C</p>		B		
14	Increased Recycling – Bag Sorting				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recycling information is already accused of being too complicated. This proposal needs very careful comms to engage the citizenry.</li> </ul> <p>C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WBFG Act – long-term</li> <li>• Could some citizens feel it's easier to avoid any recycling efforts if someone else is going to do it at the tip?</li> <li>• This measure may reduce the impact of the learning to recycle which the</li> </ul>

						<p>majority of citizens have complied with after recycling measures were initiated some years ago by the council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are their implications for data and privacy protection if bags containing personal details are opened?</li> </ul>
15	Car Parking – Faulkner Road and Civic Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which council staff will be eligible for the 50 designated spaces.</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is likely to increase the working day as staff struggle to find parking places. It is likely to increase discontent and create lower staff morale.</li> <li>• It is to be hoped that affected staff's working-day schedules and demands will be considered. Some social services staff may visit clients throughout the day, returning to base in-between. Searching for parking space would appear decrease efficiency and consequently increase pressures on preventative services.</li> <li>• Will priority be given to disabled and other vulnerable staff (eg returning to work staff from sickness absence)</li> </ul> <p>C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff consultation on parking provision?</li> </ul> <p>E</p>	A	

Theme: OTHER

No.	Proposal name	Equity	Priority	Inclusion	Communication	Other remarks, e.g. regarding the Parameters of Fairness
16	Digital Savings – Public Building Wi-Fi...			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have investigations been made into whether this provision is a significant facilitator for disadvantaged groups of citizens to access essential services? Could its withdrawal lead to hardship from loss of benefits etc?</li> </ul> <p>B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision should be made to signpost users to alternative free access enhancing collaboration.</li> </ul> <p>C</p>	
17	Reduction in Statutory Enforcement...		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It can be seen as essential to resource the enforcement Environmental Health legislation for the greater good and long-term well-being of the population.</li> <li>There are implications for mental well-being from local area antisocial behaviour and noise issues.</li> <li>The results of fly tipping encourage rodent infestation which can impact Public Health.</li> </ul> <p>C</p>			

18	Council Tax Reduction Scheme				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has there been a failure to reach and inform the most deprived households of this scheme?</li> </ul> <p><b>B</b></p>	
19	Council Tax Increase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has been seen as a benefit to Newport citizens that council tax rates have been preserved as the 2<sup>nd</sup> lowest in Wales but many people have failed to understand this, or that the council tax raises such a small proportion of the cost of local authority services.</li> <li>• It has increased reliance on Welsh Government Revenue Grant and long-term increases the citizens vulnerability to the impact of cuts.</li> <li>• Recent analysis by the Resolution Foundation confirms other findings that council tax is strongly regressive, ignoring the wealth of those who pay it: as property wealth has risen, property taxes have not.</li> <li>• Raising a regressive tax does not automatically make it more regressive across the board – this depends on the way</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most vulnerable and disadvantaged are on average less likely to be payers of council tax, and more likely to be regular users of/ reliant upon council services. This means that there is some potential for a combination of a rise in council tax and the spending of that revenue on certain council services to have some redistributive effects in favour of the most disadvantaged.</li> </ul> <p><b>A</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In itself, a rise in council tax is neutral with regards to inclusion – but it is vital that citizens feel that their voice has been included in how the spending of the revenue generated takes place.</li> </ul> <p><b>A</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no indication given of how the Council will engage with citizens about the rationale for the raising of council tax (though clearly the consultation process itself allows for public feedback on the proposal).</li> <li>• Communication around taxation – and the quality of the public understanding of how it is levied and used – is arguably one of the most important aspects of the obligations between citizens and their Council. In our view the Council should make this a priority (see Key Overall Points, below).</li> </ul> <p><b>E</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting informed citizen engagement on local taxation is a key priority, in our view. Taxation, the reasons for it, and the deployment of the revenue generated connect up with all four of the parameters of fairness.</li> </ul>

		<p>properties are banded, relative to the wealth of those who live in them. While it does not even things up between council tax payers on lower and higher bands, there is some potential for the tax to redistribute towards the most disadvantaged (see next column).</p> <p>E</p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--