

Fair Treatment Assessment (FTA)



This abbreviated Fair Treatment Assessment is to be used for assessing the impact on budget savings only. It does not replace our existing FTA toolkit nor our statutory duty to complete impact assessments as a routine part of our business.

These forms are designed to help you identify the potential negative impact of the Council’s proposed savings on its customers, staff and communities. Any decisions made on savings will be based on judgements using the best information available in determining efficient priorities of spend in the borough. The Council’s FTA guidance notes and supporting information are valuable sources to use to assist you with your assessment.

The role of EIA’s/FTA’s is to identify, and wherever possible, mitigate any negative adverse impact identified. Equality legislation however, is not designed to prevent reductions in public expenditure - its role is to ensure fairness is at the heart of the decision making process.

To save space services, policies, strategies, procedures and functions will be referred to as “functions” for the rest of this form!

Part A: Area for Review

1	Name of service or function etc	Medium term financial strategy 2021/22 to 2023/24		
2	Directorate	All	3	Responsible Senior Officer Paul Johnson Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive
4	Which Budget does this saving affect?	Various budgets across the Council		
5	Is this an existing service or a proposed saving?	Proposed saving		
6	Scope/Amount of Proposed Saving	No new savings proposals but the MTFS includes savings approved in previous years for implementation in 2021/22 The budget proposals also include mitigating actions The MTFS assumes an annual council tax increase of 2.99% in each of the years from 2021/22 to 2023/24 – the final council tax recommendation and adult social care precept element will be subject to Full Council approval.		

Part B: Background

7	Has this function been the subject of an EIA or FTA?	No		
8	Are any other departments or partners involved in the delivery of the function?	Yes – these proposals cross all portfolios. Depending on the specific proposal, there may also be involvement from partners.		
9	How are/will they be involved in this assessment?	Managers within the relevant service areas/portfolios will lead on further work required to implement budget proposals, including where necessary carrying out individual FTAs and		

involving partners as appropriate.

Part C: Information sources

10 What available equality data or research have you reviewed or carried out in the process of identifying the proposed saving?

A high-level analysis of existing data on Solihull's population and workforce has been undertaken to inform this initial strategic assessment, as summarised below.

Characteristic	Existing data
Age/Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office for National Statistics (ONS) estimated Solihull's population in 2018 as 214,909. 21% of the population is aged 65 and over. By 2038 it is projected that the number of individuals aged 85 and over will increase to nearly 12,000 (5% of the total). The proportion of children (19.5%) is in line with the national average, but the working population is relatively low (59.4% compared to 62.6%). The number of children aged 0-15 years is projected to increase by 7.2% between 2018 and 2038. Of the 2,806 people working for the Council (excluding schools) as at September 2020, 60% were aged over 45. Four percent were aged between 16 and 24.
Ethnicity	<p>Based on the 2011 census:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 85.8% of residents described themselves as White British - compared to the West Midlands average of 79.2%. The largest Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) group in Solihull is Asian or Asian British forming 6.6% of the total population. 2.1% identified as mixed race. 1.6% of the population is Black/Black British with 0.6% of other ethnic backgrounds. Number of residents identifying as Indian has witnessed the most significant increase relative to other ethnic groups. Of the 2,806 people working for the Council (excluding schools) as at September 2020, 81% identified as White, 7% as Asian/Asian British, 5% as Black/Black British and 2% as mixed race.
Religion	<p>Based on the 2011 census:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 65.6% of residents identified as Christians 2nd largest group (21.4% of individuals) followed no religion 2.5% of the population identified as Muslim 1.8% of the population identified as Hindu, with 1.7% as Sikh 0.3% stated other religion, with 0.2 % of the population Buddhist and 0.2% Jewish.
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 37,000 Solihull residents stated that their day-to-day activities are limited by either a long-term illness or disability 16,850 state that their activities are limited a lot by their disability. Of the 2,806 people working for the Council (excluding schools) as at September 2020, 4.8% described themselves as having a disability.
Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2018 the estimated population of 214,909 was split between 104,605 (48.7%) males and 110,304 (51.3%) females.
Gender Reassignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no readily available data for this protected characteristic in respect of the borough's population.
Sexuality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no readily available data for this protected characteristic in respect of the borough's population.
Pregnancy/ Maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2016, there were 2,315 live births to mothers resident in Solihull. Wards in the North of the Borough have the highest General Fertility Rate, with an average of 79.1 live births per 1000 women aged 15-49, compared to 61.9 for the borough as a whole.
Marriages and Civil partnerships	<p>Based on the 2011 census:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50.9% of residents were married. 9.0% cohabited with a member of the opposite sex 0.5% lived with a partner of the same sex 23.7% were single and have never been married or in a registered partnership 7.9% were divorced 9,812 widowed individuals lived in Solihull.

Caring Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Around 24,100 Solihull residents identified themselves as being a carer in the 2011 census, 21% of whom provided more than 50 hours of care per week • 545 of the 2,400 carers actively engaged with the Solihull Carers Centre are under the age of 25 and classified as a young carer • In May 2016 there were 2,480 Solihull residents in receipt of a Carers Allowance (1,930 female and 550 male). Estimates suggest that around 1,300 Solihull carers may be eligible for, but not claiming, Carers Allowance.
----------------------	--

Part D: Consultation

11 Who have you consulted with about this proposed saving, and how were they consulted?

Consultation on specific savings proposals will be undertaken as required before implementation. This may include consultation with staff, customers, communities, trades unions the voluntary and community sector or other partners as applicable.

12 Do you need to undertake any further consultation? If so, what and who with?

See above

Part E: Assessment – Degree of relevance

13 Please determine, using the table below the degree of relevance, that applies to each group below, as High, Medium, Low or No Impact.

High (H):

- have a substantial effect
- there is strong evidence of public concern (actual or potential)
- the most power to influence Council services and partner organisations in:
 - tackling the most significant causes of discrimination, disadvantage or inequality
 - improving the take up and quality of services to that particular group
 - improving the recruitment, retention and development of members of that particular group

Medium (M):

- will have some impact
- there is some evidence of public concern about the impact

Low (L): likely to have only a limited impact on equality and community relations

No Priority (N): has no impact

Characteristic	H	M	L	N	Any further comment
Age			X		No new savings are proposed for adults' or children's services and so the potential impact has been categorised as low. The MTFS recommends additional funding in support of children's services to address pressures in that area.
Carers			X		No new savings are proposed for adults' or children's services and so the potential impact has been categorised as low. The MTFS recommends additional funding in support of children's services to address pressures in that area.
Disability			X		No new savings are proposed for adults' or children's services and so the potential impact has been categorised as low. The MTFS recommends additional funding in support of children's services to address

THIS FORM IS TO BE USED FOR BUDGET SAVINGS ONLY Appendix H2

					pressures in that area.
Gender reassignment				X	At this stage it is not expected that any of the budget proposals will have a differential impact for this group; however, this will be assessed as part of the FTAs for specific budget proposals as required.
Looked after children/care leavers				X	At this stage it is not expected that any of the budget proposals will have a differential impact for this group; however, this will be assessed as part of the FTAs for specific budget proposals as required.
Marriage/civil partnership				X	At this stage it is not expected that any of the budget proposals will have a differential impact for this group; however, this will be assessed as part of the FTAs for specific budget proposals as required.
Pregnancy/maternity				X	At this stage it is not expected that any of the budget proposals will have a differential impact for this group; however, this will be assessed as part of the FTAs for specific budget proposals as required.
Race/ethnicity				X	At this stage it is not expected that any of the budget proposals will have a differential impact for this group; however, this will be assessed as part of the FTAs for specific budget proposals as required.
Religion/belief/faith				X	At this stage it is not expected that any of the budget proposals will have a differential impact for this group; however, this will be assessed as part of the FTAs for specific budget proposals as required.
Safeguarding- children and vulnerable adults			X		No new savings are proposed for adults' or children's services and so the potential impact has been categorised as low. The MTFs recommends additional funding in support of children's services to address pressures in that area.
Sex/gender			X		National research suggests that public sector spending reductions in recent years have had a disproportionate impact on women. However, no new savings are proposed as part of this budget and so the impact of this MTFs has been categorised as low.
Sexual orientation				X	At this stage it is not expected that any of the budget proposals will have a differential impact for this group; however, this will be assessed as part of the FTAs for specific budget proposals as required.
Socio-economic disadvantage		X			The proposal to increase council tax may have a differential impact on the group. At this stage the potential impact has been categorised as medium pending a more detailed assessment of mitigating actions.
Sustainable communities				X	At this stage it is not expected that any of the budget proposals will have a differential impact for this group; however, this will be assessed as part of the FTAs for specific budget proposals as required.

Part F: Summary

14 What are your main conclusions on the likely impact of the proposed savings on different equality groups?

There are no new savings proposals put forward in the MTFs this year. Headline analysis identifies that the MTFs (in particular the proposed increase in council tax) may impact differently on people with certain protected characteristics, specifically socio-economic deprivation, and budget proposals affecting staff will be implemented in line with council policy and management of change processes. Specific impacts on gender reassignment, sexuality, marriage and civil partnership have not been identified at this stage. Where applicable, detailed FTAs will be undertaken for individual budget proposals which will take account of service-specific data and intelligence and mitigating actions in order to more accurately assess the potential impact on different customers, staff and communities.

Part G: Actions

15 What actions will be taken to mitigate or reduce any negative impact?

Action	Outcome	Lead	Timescale	How will progress be monitored?
--------	---------	------	-----------	---------------------------------

The actions and associated timescales will depend on the FTAs undertaken on individual savings proposals.

Part H: Sign off

16 This FTA has been completed by

Signed (Lead for FTA)	
Name and job title (please print)	
Date	

17 This FTA has been reviewed by the directorate leadership team and/or directorate equality and diversity group.

Signed (on behalf of group)	
Name and job title (please print)	
Date reviewed	

18 This FTA has been approved by Director/Head of Division (or equivalent)

Signed	
Name and job title (please print)	
Date	