

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings 2025 - Option 1 Remove Central Education Funding for Campus Police Officers

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Campus Police Officers do not provide core education provision. They can provide a valuable, additional contribution to the life of a school. It would be hoped that partnership working would continue with Police Scotland through community engagement programmes.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings 2025 - Option 2 Remove Central Funding for primary swimming lessons

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : This proposal is only to reduce central funding for swimming lesson and will not remove the ability for schools to still engage in swimming lessons for their pupils through alternative funding. Schools decide on the inclusion of swimming in their curriculum and the accessibility of local pools and PEF funding for those with the highest levels of deprivation ensures that the removal of

Assessing for Relevance

this central funding will have little impact.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings 2025 - Option 3 General Management Saving In Schools and other education establishments

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Management actions will be taken to ensure that the impact on children and young people is minimised. New ways of working will be established to ensure that all remaining Education provision is aligned to the Council's strategic priorities and statutory requirements. This saving will be across full Service and not targeted in one area being mindful of the needs of learners from areas

Assessing for Relevance

of socio-economic disadvantage.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings 2025 - Option 4 Central management redesign through retiral and changes to term-time

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Redesign of central team will ensure that remits and responsibilities are reviewed and aligned to Council and

Education Service strategic priorities and statutory requirements. No impact on children and young people as all statutory requirements and

Service priorities will still be met through central team redesign.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings 2025 - Option 5 - Alternative funding to be sought for Early Years community staffing aligned to supporting employ

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : No reduction in service â€“ alternative funding to be used to maintain the existing service.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving 2025 - Option 6 Reduction in some additional, temporary support staffing

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : This will impact on additional targeted supports will not impact across the whole of education. Risks will need to be mitigated via careful deployment of resources within schools and through improvements to universal support which will be presented through the ASN Review. We have established processes for assessing the required support for children and young people via Inclusion

Assessing for Relevance

Review Group and Strategic Inclusion Group which will ensure that those children who most need support will still have this. There will be no impact on employees as these are all temporary contracts.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving 2025 - Option 7 Further review of early years service

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : BVSr indicated that the new delivery model will be able to operate on a reduced budget so we will examine all areas of spending to identify where more efficient delivery of service can be achieved. This will not result in a reduction of statutory delivery of services to children.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving 2025 - Option 8 Change to Devolved School Management (DSM) to include turnover target across all settings

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : No reduction in core allocated staffing, savings to be achieved via natural turnover.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings 2025 - Option 9 Reduction in all central Supplies and Services budgets

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Continuing to implement a business critical spend model centrally and ensuring that resources can be more readily shared will minimise impact. Growing use of technology will also reduce the need for some physical resources. This is a resource for central teams and will not directly impact children and young people.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings 2025 - Option 10 Source alternative funding to support referrals for 0 - 2 year olds

Policy Lead Officer : Linda McAulay-Griffiths

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Early Years BVSr highlighted the need to review the arrangements for referrals from other agencies for ECC places for 0-2 year olds. We will be further exploring potential options around alternative family support models and cost-sharing to support 0-2 year olds to reduce the financial burden on Education Service.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings 11 - F&ICT - Review of staffing and operational arrangements aligned to the Digital Strategy

Policy Lead Officer : Joe McLachlan

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The saving proposal seeks to rationalise and streamline current working processes and ICT contract costs to ensure digital processes are maximised. This will lead to savings in ICT contract costs as we maximise the current ICT systems to full capacity but also potentially reducing manual input. This would be managed alongside current vacancies within the service.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : People and Culture Budget Efficiencies, Savings No.1, Core Budget for Business Support Assistant

Policy Lead Officer : Amanda Lowe, Head of People and Culture

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : This post is currently vacant, and therefore, there will be a low impact due to the agreement of these hours being deleted as part of the People and Culture Service Redesign.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : People and Culture Budget Efficiencies, Savings No.2, Reduction in Transport Budget

Policy Lead Officer : Amanda Lowe, Head of People and Culture

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Reduction in travel budget to reflect and support flexibility in terms of the Flexible Working policy with no impact on Service delivery.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : People and Culture. Budget Efficiencies, Savings No.3, Reduction in Occupation Health

Policy Lead Officer : Amanda Lowe, Head of People and Culture

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Reduction in Occupation Health costs due to renegotiation of contract with new supplier, reduction in costs for early intervention appointments by bringing in-house.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : People and Culture, Budget Efficiencies, Savings No.4, Salary Sacrifice

Policy Lead Officer : Amanda Lowe, Head of People and Culture

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Maximise income from Salary Sacrifice schemes with no impact on Service delivery or other Services.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings 16 - Core Budget for G10 Admin Officer

Policy Lead Officer : Julie McGarry

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : there is no impact or change to this policy. This is just the windfarm operators now paying for this post instead of the Council.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings - 17 - Reallocation of Duties Senior Admin Assist G7

Policy Lead Officer : Julie McGarry

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : There is no impact of this decision. The postholder retired and her duties were reallocated among other staff in Governance.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings - 18 and 19 - Governance Savings Proposals 2025-26

Policy Lead Officer : David Mitchell

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : All proposals comprise either the removal of vacant posts or the reduction of a historically underutilised budget line.

Therefore, there will be no impact on any employees or service users.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Saving Option 47 Governance Reduce Supplies and Services

Policy Lead Officer : Julie McGarry

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Following a line by line budget review, taking small savings across various budget heads (ie stationery, staff travel budgets) which have been underspent in the last few years. There is no impact to staff or services.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings - 21 - Corporate Support 2025/26 Budget Savings

Policy Lead Officer : Iain Tough

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The redesign of the service undertakes an assessment of workforce planning and service operational budget resource requirements going forward in future years.

The service redesign details will be presented to Cabinet following relevant consultation with staff, Council Management and Trade

Assessing for Relevance

Unions.

Service balances will be utilised short term until the service redesign is fully implemented. A further EQIA will be undertaken as part of the

Service redesign.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : 22 - Budget Savings - Cease Renewal of Automatic Public Conveniences Contract

Policy Lead Officer : Malcolm Rae

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities : yes

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : yes

Older people, children and young people : yes

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : yes

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : high

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : high

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 1

5. Rationale for decision : The current 15-year lease with JC Decaux is finished - APC at Foregate has already been removed in preparation for a multi-storey car park demolition. Mauchline APC could be closed. This is not a statutory service required by the authority to provide.

It is likely that if we renew the lease, it will cost more annually than currently budgeted and therefore become budget pressure.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : 23 - Budget Savings - Private Operation of Tanyard Toilets

Policy Lead Officer : Malcolm Rae

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : yes

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : yes

Older people, children and young people : yes

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : yes

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Intended to attract new business to the kiosk/area, which could benefit from extra footfall due to toilet facilities.

In addition, there may be a reduction in the level of ASB in the area which is currently being experienced.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : 24 - Budget Savings - Increased Lair Purchase Charges

Policy Lead Officer : Nick Kelly

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : yes

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : yes

Women and men (boys and girls) : yes

Older people, children and young people : yes

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : yes

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : yes

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : yes

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : 1. We have mitigated fiscal impact by the introduction of respectful funeral service supported by local undertakers

2. Child burials are free including lair purchase as per Scottish government policy.

Assessing for Relevance

3. We have a dedicated Muslim and child section within some cemeteries.
4. Traditional costs for burials have been in line with historic decisions and now require to be raised in line with the Scottish average increase new lair by Â£413.43 (3rd lowest to 17th lowest in Scotland) and interment increase by Â£264.54 (4th lowest to 15th lowest in Scotland) which still put us in a favorable position across all 32 authorities.)

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : 25 - Budget Savings - Reduction in Street Bins

Policy Lead Officer : Nick Kelly

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : yes

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : yes

Women and men (boys and girls) : yes

Older people, children and young people : yes

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : yes

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : yes

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : yes

People who are married or in a civil partnership : yes

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Provision of Street Bins is not a statutory function of the Council. We would propose that in estate bins would be removed and only retained within key locations such as Public Parks/play parks, Schools, and local shop areas. We believe that the number of staff required can be reduced, however the support budgets such as transport, fuel etc. as outlying areas will still likely require servicing

Assessing for Relevance

as there are usually play areas / schools and local shops in most communities.

The Service is currently operating with these staffing levels vacant, therefore, initially there will be an increase in capacity to respond to remaining bins but will not rebound to previous service standard experience. Therefore, there will be no impact to employees or communities in relation to service delivery.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings - 26 - Housing Services - Increase Private Landlord Registration charges

Policy Lead Officer : Blair Millar

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : An increase in private landlord registration charges will have no impact on vulnerable communities or protected characteristics.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : 27 - Budget Savings - Outsourcing Parking Enforcement

Policy Lead Officer : Barrie McDonnell

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Proposal relates to the future provision / management of the parking enforcement service - individual groups unaffected.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : 28 - Budget Savings - Extension of parking charges to Stewarton, Cumnock, Mauchline and Galston

Policy Lead Officer : Barrie McDonnell

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The parking proposals are designed to introduce equitable parking charges out with Kilmarnock which make best use of Council facilities.

Any additional revenues will be used to help support general Roads functions.

Assessing for Relevance

Charges applied universally and they do not target specific groups.

Blue badge holders will be exempt from charges.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : 29 - Budget Savings - Catering Vacancies and Staff Reductions

Policy Lead Officer : Mark Hunter, Strategic Lead Food and Facilities Support

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The aims and objectives will be to maximise the efficiency of the service through service redesign without impacting significantly on services delivered to customers and the community. The service has a high turnover of staff and the proposed savings it is expected can be managed within existing vacancies and changes to advertised posts without reducing specific staff hours.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : 30 - Budget Savings - School Crossing Reduction to Assessment Criteria

Policy Lead Officer : Mark Hunter, Strategic Lead Food and Facilities Support

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : The aims and objectives will be to maximise the efficiency of the service through service redesign without impacting significantly on services delivered to customers and the community. The service has a high turnover of staff and the proposed savings it is expected can be managed within existing vacancies and changes to advertised posts without reducing specific staff hours.

Assessing for Relevance

Recent assessments in line with Road Safety UK have identified several crossing points that are out with the current benchmarked threshold.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : 31 - Budget Savings - Cleaning Vacancies and Staff Reductions

Policy Lead Officer : Mark Hunter, Strategic Lead Food and Facilities Support

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Overall review of hours allocated to each location in line with National benchmark performance measure and by not filling current vacancies held as part of current year budget controls.

The aims and objectives will be to maximise the efficiency of the service through service redesign without impacting significantly on

Assessing for Relevance

services delivered to customers and the community. The service has a high turnover of staff and the proposed savings it is expected can be managed within existing vacancies and changes to advertised posts without reducing specific staff hours.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budgets Savings - 32 - Surplus property cost reduction

Policy Lead Officer : Andrew Kennedy

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Ongoing reduction of property costs associated with surplus and vacant property.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : 33 - Budget Savings - Catering Productivity Review

Policy Lead Officer : Mark Hunter, Strategic Lead Food and Facilities Support

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : Initiate the first phase of a catering production review within school kitchens to maximise efficiency in production methods.

The aims and objectives will be to maximise the efficiency of the service through service redesign without impacting significantly on

Assessing for Relevance

services delivered to customers and the community. The service has a high turnover of staff and proposed savings it is expected can be managed within existing vacancies although possibility to offer some staff early retirement.

Assessing for Relevance

FORM A: Assessing for Relevance

1. Policy Details

Policy : Budget Savings - 34 - F&PM - Review of management and professional services

Policy Lead Officer : Andrew Kennedy

Date Relevance Assessment conducted : 02-19-2025

2. Which groups of people do you think will be, or potentially could be, impacted upon by the implementation of this policy? (tick as appropriate)

People with disabilities: : no

People from black and minority ethnic communities and different racial backgrounds : no

Women and men (boys and girls) : no

Older people, children and young people : no

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people : no

People from different religions or beliefs and people with no belief : no

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave : no

People who are married or in a civil partnership : no

3. Do you have evidence or reason to believe that this policy/function/review will, or may potentially:

General Duties level of impact (high, medium or low)

Eliminate discrimination faced by particular groups : low

Impact upon the promotion of equality of opportunity between particular groups : low

Impact upon good relations between particular groups : low

Does it have overall relevance to equality? : low

4. Equality impact assessment required? (All high and medium results MUST be impact assessed) : 0

5. Rationale for decision : A full impact assessment as, and when, if required during the review process.