

DEL's Budget 2008-11 Efficiency Delivery Plan

Index

INTRODUCTION	3
TARGETS.....	3
EFFICIENCY PROGRAMME SUMMARY TABLE	4
DELIVERY PLANS	5
<i>WS1: Reduction in Administration Costs</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>WS2: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>WS3: Reduction in Higher Education (HE) Recurrent Grant Allocations.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>WS4: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant due to Rationalisation of FE Structure....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>WS5: Reduce Level of Bridge to Employment</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>WS6: Limit Level of Adult Upskilling.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>WS7: Reduction in Funding of Disability Programmes.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>WS8: Removal of Training Provision formerly delivered by Enterprise Ulster.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>WS9: Increased efficiencies from Contracting Provision.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>WS10: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant due to Use of College Reserves.....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>WS11: Reduction in FE Capital Grant.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>WS12: Reduction in Higher Education (HE) Capital Grant.....</i>	<i>36</i>
STANDARD CATEGORISATION OF SAVINGS	39
HIGH LEVEL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENTS	40
<i>WS1: Reductions in Admin Costs.</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>WS2: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant.....</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>WS3: Reductions in HE Recurrent Grant.....</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>WS4: Restructure of the FE Sector.....</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>WS5: Reduce the level of Bridge to Employment</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>WS6: Limit the level of Adult Upskilling.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>WS7: Reduction in funding of Disability Programmes.....</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>WS8: Removal of training provision formerly delivered by Enterprise Ulster</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>WS9: Increased efficiencies from Contracting Provision.....</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>WS10: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant due to the Use of College Reserves....</i>	<i>69</i>
<i>WS11: Reduction in FE Capital Grant.....</i>	<i>73</i>
<i>WS12: Reduction in HE Capital Grant.....</i>	<i>76</i>

INTRODUCTION

1. The overall aim of the Department is to promote learning and skills, to prepare people for work and to support the economy. In pursuing this aim the key objectives for the Department are:
 - To promote economic, social and personal development through high quality learning, research and skills training; and
 - To help people into employment and promote good working practices.
2. This Delivery Plan explains how the Department for Employment and Learning will monitor and measure the efficiency gains that will be achieved across the services funded by the Department between 2008/09 and 2010/11.

TARGETS

3. Efficiency targets for the Budget 2008-11 period have been agreed with the Department of Finance & Personnel (DFP) as follows: 2008/09: £20.34m, 2009/10: £40.09m and 2010/11: £59.23m. A table summarising the various workstreams that will contribute to the achievement of these efficiency savings is shown below.

EFFICIENCY PROGRAMME SUMMARY TABLE

	2007-08 baseline	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
	£m	£m	£m	£m
WS1: Admin Savings	£44.1	£0.15	£0.59	£1.00
WS2: Reduction in FE Rec. Grant	£158.5	£4.00	£7.30	£7.52
WS3: Reduction in HE Rec. Grant	£185.2	£2.60	£12.54	£22.00
WS4: Rationalisation of FE Structure	£158.5	£2.00	£3.50	£3.50
WS5: Reduce Level of Bridge to Employment	£1.2	£0.50	£0.50	£0.50
WS6: Limit level of Adult Upskilling	£4.1	£1.00	£1.00	£1.00
WS7: Reduction in funding of Disability programmes	£5.7	£0.40	£0.40	£0.40
WS8: Removal of training provision formerly delivered by Enterprise Ulster	£4.3	£3.55	£4.30	£4.30
WS9: Increased efficiencies from Contracting Provision		£0.00	£0.40	£0.60
WS10: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant due to Use of College Reserves	£158.5	£2.80	£4.40	£11.50
Total Current Efficiencies		£17.00	£34.93	£52.32
WS11: Reduction in FE Capital Grant	£40.9	£2.00	£2.50	£3.00
WS12: Reduction in HE Capital Grant	£27.8	£1.34	£2.66	£3.91
Total Capital Efficiencies		£3.34	£5.16	£6.91
Total Departmental Efficiencies		£20.34	£40.09	£59.23

DELIVERY PLANS

4. The following section details the individual delivery plans for the twelve workstreams identified by DEL.

WS1: Reduction in Administration Costs

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Other
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Greg Mc Connell

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin	44.1	0.15	0.59	1.00
Resource				
Capital				
Total	44.1	0.15	0.59	1.00

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

Each NI Department has been set a mandatory target of 5% administration cost savings. This translates into a total saving of £1.74m sub-divided as above. As we will already have delivered reductions of 82 posts by March 2008 as part of the Fit for Purpose exercise under Spending Review 2004, this efficiency saving will be extremely challenging. We plan to do so through reviewing current Departmental staffing levels and administrative expenditure.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

None.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up- Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions

- To identify at divisional level where and how staff reductions will be delivered
- To identify at divisional level where and how GAE reductions will be delivered
- To identify potential ICT efficiencies.
- To take forward reviews of large staffing divisions.

4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs

None.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES

Date	Action	Owner	Outcome
------	--------	-------	---------

Spring 2008	To agree a plan of action for delivering admin cost reductions during Budget 2007.	DEL Board	Delivery of the savings throughout the CSR period..
-------------	--	-----------	---

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
Staff / Admin Reduction Targets.	Numbers of staff in post / Admin budget.	Personnel	Quarterly

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
Potential impact due to current gender profile within the Department (34:66 – male: female)	N/A

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of service delivery may be detrimentally impacted due to staff reductions. Reduction in Admin expenditure may impact upon the ability of Corporate Service functions to perform their role to the required standard. 	

WS2: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Other
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Bernie O'Hare

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource	158.5	4.00	7.30	7.52
Capital				
Total	158.5	4.00	7.30	7.52

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

These savings will be achieved by removing the 'blanket' approach ("Additionality") to delivering key skills/employability skills to all 16-19 year old students enrolled in FE colleges. The policy will be replaced with a new policy which will result in the development of an Individual Learning Programme (ILP), for all students. This approach will provide a learning programme which will be tailored specifically to individuals' abilities and aspirations as assessed by a mandatory initial guidance process. The ILP will have a strong economic focus. Consequently, provision such as key skills and employability skills will be provided as a necessary component of the learning programme to support individuals' progression to higher qualification and skill levels, and will be based on each individual's identified needs.

The removal of the existing policy has been agreed as a result of rigorous analysis carried out by the Department, in line with the 'Good Policy Making Guide', to assess curriculum areas that were not in line with the economic focus of FE Means Business, and/or were not achieving the desired outputs for individuals. This analysis was then compared to statistical data relating to funding to determine the extent of the financial support allocated to the provision. This detailed analysis, which included some 170,000 individual enrolments, was conducted on a college by college basis as well as at a sector-wide level. Finally, the provision in question was the subject of independent assessment by the Education and Training Inspectorate who confirmed the Department's findings that the 'blanket' approach to delivering key skills/employability skills was neither efficient nor effective.

The curriculum policies will also require all colleges to have 95% of their funded enrolments on courses accredited on to the National Qualifications Framework (NQF), subject to the outcome of consultation.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

Individualised learner programmes and the requirement to have 95% (subject to the outcome of consultation) of funded enrolments on courses which are accredited on to the NQF, will enable resources to be focused on quality provision which will have more relevance to both the learner and the economy. Consequently, retention and achievement will be improved, which will ultimately realise an increase in individuals with qualifications at level 2 and above leaving FE with the skills required by employers. This will have a direct impact on Government's ability to deliver against the NI Skills Strategy. It will also support the recently published anti poverty strategy, as it will provide all 16-19 year olds with a tailored learning programme, offering each individual the opportunity to progress into Further or Higher education, training or employment, including those with low level or no qualifications.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up- Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions
As detailed in Section 5 below, the key actions are to discontinue an element of existing FE curriculum policy, to finalise development of a replacement policy, to identify the impact on the new FE funding model, and to introduce the new policy from the 2009/10 academic year.
4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs
None.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome
<u>Additionality</u>			
Spring 2007	The Department advised the FE sector that the current "Additionality" policy will not apply post June 2007, and that no new students are to be enrolled in this area from Sept 2007.	Bernie O'Hare will be the 'policy' owner, and FE Colleges will be the 'delivery' owners.	To ensure that such a reduction is manageable and deliverable throughout the removal of the existing policy and the introduction of the new policy in September 2009.
September 2007 to June 2008	The Department to continue to support individuals who commenced learning in this policy area in September 2006, over the period of their two year course of study. This will result in an orderly run down of the policy area with no impact on existing learners.		
<u>ILP</u>			

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome
March 2008	EQIA and public consultation to be completed.		
April 2008	The Department to commence work with the Education and Training Inspectorate to review the existing provision offered to 16-19 year olds by the Further Education sector, including how an Individual Learner Programme approach, and associated quality assurance arrangements and performance indicators, can be built into the 16-19 offer.		
December 2008	To identify the impact of the new policy on the new funding model for resourcing the FE sector.		
September 2009	The Department introduces the new 16 to 19 policy within the FE sector, and the first learners enter the new system.		
<u>NQF</u>			
March 2007	FE colleges were advised that the current Qualifications policy would be amended to reflect 95% on the NQF to be phased in over three years (subject to the outcome of consultation).		
Spring 2008, and annually thereafter.	The Department to agree with each FE College their performance targets for enrolments on courses that are on the NQF, through the new College Development Plan process		
September 2008,	Phased implementation to		

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome
and annually thereafter.	commence, set against agreed performance targets.		

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
Reduction, and eventual phasing out, of the FE Resource Grant used for "Additionality". New curriculum performance measures will be introduced to support the new policy.	The NICIS (Northern Ireland College Information System) IT system.	FE Finance and policy branches	Annually. In addition, ETI will introduce a new inspection process to ensure the policy is operating effectively within the FE Sector. This approach will be built into the Improving Quality Raising Standards guidelines and will be a mandatory element of every ETI inspection within FE colleges.

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
The new policy was the subject of stakeholder consultation with the FE sector during 2007, and this was followed by public consultation which closed on 7 January 2008. The responses to the consultation are currently being analysed, but initial analysis shows that there is widespread support for the proposed new curriculum offer for 16-19 year olds in FE colleges.	The initial consultation with the FE sector influenced the final draft policy which was the subject of recent public consultation. No learner will be disadvantaged, as all existing funding to support existing learners will be honoured during the period when the existing policy is phased out and the new one phased in. Further mitigating action will be taken, as appropriate, informed by the analysis of responses to the consultation process.

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of the funding for the existing policy could see a reduction in some colleges' budgets, leading to financial instability. Colleges may not have the ability to introduce the vital assessment and advice stage of the new 16 to 19 policy on which the ILP is developed. FE Colleges will become selective in the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish the extent to which colleges will be affected by the proposed change. Ensure a manageable and phased withdrawal of the existing policy is overseen. Establish robust guidance and early intervention by ETI to support the new policy and identify any potential areas of concern.

Key risks	Contingent Action
student enrolment process which may impact on DEL's social inclusion responsibilities.	

WS3: Reduction in Higher Education (HE) Recurrent Grant Allocations

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Allocative Efficiency
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Fergus Devitt

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource	185.2	2.60	12.54	22.00
Capital				
Total	185.2	2.60	12.54	22.00

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

In order to maximise the delivery of efficiencies from HE recurrent grant allocations over the Budget 2007 period, the institutions will be encouraged to increase their income from sources other than government grants, to ensure that all their activities are costed on a full economic cost recovery basis, and to maximise the delivery of efficiencies achieved through a examination of their own internal cost structures and processes, including procurement and implementation of shared service arrangements where this delivers enhanced value for money. These actions will contribute to a reduction in the need for public resources whilst maintaining the overall level of service provision.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

HE institutions will be encouraged to maximise their institutional efficiency and make the most effective use of income from all sources, including that derived from variable fees.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up-Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions

- To identify at an early stage, the potential impact such savings might have on the value or content of the HE institutional funding model.
- To communicate the impact of the efficiency savings to the HE institutions in a timely manner and put in place arrangements to monitor delivery.
- To encourage the institutions to closely examine the costs of all their activities and to identify opportunities for cost reductions and procurement efficiencies, including the scope for shared service arrangements.

4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs

None.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome
2007/08	To determine the impact of efficiency saving requirements for the HE institutions and to model any impacts for the HE institutional funding model.	Higher Education Finance Branch	Ensure that the outcome of modelling exercises is advised to HE institutions.
2008/09 to 2010/11	Monitor the implementation of the efficiencies delivered by the institutions from their recurrent grant allocations.		Efficiencies are delivered and demonstrated.

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
Efficiency savings demonstrated within HE recurrent grant, with required outcomes delivered	HE funding model and returns from institutions	Higher Education Finance Branch	Quarterly

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
None	

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the grant issued to HE institutions results in a reduced range and / or quality of courses offered to students 	Examine the impact for HE institutions and planned response.

WS4: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant due to Rationalisation of FE Structure

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Corporate Services Through the implementation of " <i>Further Education Means Business</i> ", the FE Strategy for Northern Ireland, the FE sector is being re-structured from 16 to 6 FE colleges. This re-structuring will result in staff efficiency savings.
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Bernie O'Hare

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource	158.5	2.00	3.50	3.50
Capital				
Total	158.5	2.00	3.50	3.50

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

These savings will be achieved as a result of merging the existing 16 college structure to a new six college model, thus rationalising senior management positions, senior academic positions and a range of corporate activities.

Six new Chairs and Directors or Directors designate were appointed for the six new colleges that were introduced on 1 August 2007. As part of the college merger planning process, consideration was given to the optimum structure of the new colleges. The six new colleges took consultancy advice on the most effective management and organisational structures for their new colleges. While this work is the responsibility of the colleges, and while it is still at a relatively early stage, the Department is confident that efficiency savings as outlined in this efficiency measure will result from the merger process.

The 2007/08 academic year will be a, largely, transitional year, and the process of finally agreeing all aspects of the new college structures, and subsequently filling posts in the new structure, will take place progressively during the 2007/08 academic year. It is envisaged that most of the staff reductions identified will be delivered from the 2008/09 academic year onwards.

It is estimated that the level of staff reductions will deliver efficiency savings of £2.0, £3.5 and £3.5 million in the three years under consideration. The savings in year 1 are less than in years 2 and 3 because they would be effective from the start of the 2008/09 academic year, which is 7 months of the Department's financial year. Some of the staff reductions will be as a result of redundancies, and in some of these cases there may be a cost associated with those redundancies. Any redundancies will be managed through the existing redundancy arrangements that apply in the FE sector. It is not possible at this relatively early stage in the re-structuring process to be precise about the potential cost of this dimension. Another area where efficiency savings may be realised is the introduction of a Shared Service Centre model for a number of corporate service activities across the sector. While, again, this is, ultimately, the responsibility of the sector, the Association of Northern Ireland Colleges (ANIC) is currently reviewing its role and remit. This review will include an analysis of the potential for the introduction of shared services in the sector.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

It is possible that there will be other benefits resulting from the college merger process. For example, there could be reduced accommodation requirements for some corporate services within individual colleges, and across the FE sector if shared service approaches are adopted.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up-Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions

The action of introducing six new colleges has already been achieved. As detailed in Section 5 below, the key actions going forward are for the six new colleges to plan and implement their new structures progressively during the 2007/08 academic year in time for the commencement of the 2008/09 academic year.

4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs

There may be immediate costs associated with "lump sum" payments in respect of those staff who qualify for redundancy payments under the existing arrangements in operation in the sector.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome
1 August 2008.	The staff reductions are delivered, progressively, from this date.	Bernie O'Hare	The number of FE colleges in Northern Ireland will be reduced from 16 to 6, and estimated staff efficiency savings will have been delivered.
1 August 2010.	The continued impact of the staff reductions delivered in previous years.	will be the 'policy' owner, and FE Colleges will be the 'delivery' owners.	

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
<p>WS4: Reduction in FE Resource Grant</p> <p>The level of staffing in the new colleges, and the amount of recurrent grant used to fund staff salaries.</p>	<p>This will be monitored through a number of data sources. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. annual college accounts; b. annual College Development Plans (CDPs); and c. project benefit evaluation arrangements that will have to be established in relation to the business case that was completed in respect of the college merger process – this will require colleges to provide a pre-merger staffing baseline against which progress can be monitored. 	<p>FE Finance Branch, FE Accountability Branch and FE Programme Branch.</p>	<p>Annually. Given the nature of staff changes, it is felt that annual monitoring is sufficient and realistic.</p>

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
<p>The college merger process was the subject of a Preliminary Equality Impact Assessment (PEQIA) under the Department's Equality Scheme. The outcome of the PEQIA was that the merger process did not constitute any adverse impact, and that a full Equality Impact Assessment was, therefore, not required.</p>	<p>None.</p>

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colleges' inability to deliver the scale of efficiency savings identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colleges used consultants to identify the most appropriate structures for their new colleges. The reduced level of FE recurrent grant will encourage colleges to identify the required level of staff savings.

WS5: Reduce Level of Bridge to Employment

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Transactions Within the context of near full employment in the economy this efficiency is about limiting expenditure in this area of general pre-employment training in favour of other higher priority programmes.
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Nuala Kerr

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource	1.2	0.50	0.50	0.50
Capital				
Total	1.2	0.50	0.50	0.50

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

This efficiency is about limiting expenditure in this area of general pre-employment training in favour of other higher priority programmes. We believe much of the policy objectives in this general programme area can be delivered at less cost.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

None.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up-Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions

To identify impact on services / policy delivery at an early stage related to this efficiency.

4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs

None.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome

Winter 2007 / Spring 2008	Skills and Industry Division to identify the implications of such a budget reduction and prepare a policy paper indicating how this reduction will be managed. This paper will identify possible changes to the operation of the programme e.g. eligible sectors; type of training including levels and duration and eligibility of applicants to meet the projected savings.	Nuala Kerr	To ensure that such a reduction is manageable and deliverable wef April 2008.
------------------------------	---	------------	---

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
Reduce Level of Bridge to Employment	Skills and Industry	Programme Management Branch	Quarterly

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
None	N/A

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
None	

WS6: Limit Level of Adult Upskilling

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Allocative Efficiency
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Nuala Kerr

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource	4.10	1.00	1.00	1.00
Capital				
Total	4.10	1.00	1.00	1.00

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

This efficiency is about limiting expenditure in this area in favour of other higher priority programmes. We believe much of the policy objectives in this area can be delivered at less cost.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

None.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up- Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions
To identify impact on services / policy delivery at an early stage.
4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs
None.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome
Winter 2007 / Spring 2008	Skills and Industry Division to identify the implications of such an efficiency saving and will ensure any key priority issues are included in the new programme for adult apprenticeships.	Nuala Kerr	To ensure that such a reduction is manageable and deliverable wef April 2008.

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
WS6: Limit level of Adult Upskilling.	Skills and Industry	Training Programmes Branch	Quarterly

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
Section 75 Age	We will maximise the use of the remaining budget to ensure that the resources are used as efficiently and effectively as possible.

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
Section 75 breach may result in lack of support for efficiency saving at ministerial level.	Consider alternative proposals including increasing savings elsewhere.
Negative press for DEL.	

WS7: Reduction in Funding of Disability Programmes

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Transactions This efficiency is about limiting expenditure in this area.
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Patricia McAuley

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource	5.70	0.40	0.40	0.40
Capital				
Total	5.70	0.40	0.40	0.40

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

This efficiency is about limiting expenditure in this area.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

None.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up-Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions
To identify impact on services / policy delivery at an early stage.
4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs
None.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome
Winter 2006 / Spring 2007	Prep for Work Division.	Patricia McAuley	To ensure that such a reduction is manageable and deliverable wef April 2008.

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
Reduction in Funding of Disability Programmes.	Prep for Work	Disabled Advisory Service	Quarterly

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
Section 75 Disability	We will maximise the use of the remaining budget to ensure that the resources are used as efficiently and effectively as possible.

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
Section 75 breach may result in lack of support for efficiency saving at ministerial level.	Consider alternative proposals including increasing savings elsewhere.
Negative press for DEL.	

WS8: Removal of Training Provision formerly delivered by Enterprise Ulster

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Allocative Efficiency The Secretary of State announced the closure of Enterprise Ulster on 21 March 2006. Recruitment to the pilot Training for Work programme ceased from 28 April 2006. Funding is required to manage closure of EU. However, some savings are possible within Budget 2007.
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Patricia McAuley

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource	4.30	3.55	4.30	4.30
Capital				
Total	4.30	3.55	4.30	4.30

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

Enterprise Ulster is being closed and the pilot Training for Work programme discontinued. Some savings are possible in the latter part of CSR07.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

None.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up-Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions

To identify an early stage, the extent to which costs can be saved with effect from April 2009.

4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs

These have been deduced from the potential saving available.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome

Summer/Autumn 2007	Prep for Work Division to confirm 2009/10 savings.	Patricia McAuley	To ensure that such a reduction is manageable and deliverable wef April 2009.
--------------------	--	------------------	---

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
Removal of training provision formerly delivered by Enterprise Ulster.	Prep for Work	PfW	Quarterly

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
None.	None.

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
None.	

WS9: Increased efficiencies from Contracting Provision.

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Procurement : This efficiency relates to contracts for New Deal/Steps to Work programme
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Patricia McAuley

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource	18.00*	0.00	0.40	0.60
Capital				
Total	18.00	0.00	0.40	0.60

*Total programme costs. Saving is on one element of the contract.

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

This efficiency relates to new contracts for delivery of New Deal/Steps to Work.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

None.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up- Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions
To: Tender for delivery of New Deal/Steps to Work from Autumn 2008.
4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome

From Q3/Q4 2008/09	Prep for Work Division	Patricia McAuley	New contract for provision for unemployed/economically inactive from Autumn 2008
--------------------	------------------------	------------------	--

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
Reduction in cost of one element of contract	Prep for Work	Programme Management and Development Branch	Annually

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
Tenders received are significantly above estimates.	Consider alternative proposals.

WS10: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant due to Use of College Reserves

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	<p>Allocative Efficiency</p> <p>As part of the funding and governance strands of “<i>Further Education Means Business</i>”, the FE Strategy for Northern Ireland, the Department plans to introduce a more rigorous approach to the management of FE College reserves. Longer term, this process will, effectively, cap the level of reserves that colleges will be able to accumulate. In the short to medium term, colleges will be required to use an appropriate level of their existing reserves to fund a number of costs associated with the re-structuring the sector from 16 to 6 FE colleges. However, it is anticipated that there is a sufficient level of reserves in the FE sector to also enable efficiency savings to be made across the CSR period.</p>
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes.
Senior Responsible Officer	Bernie O'Hare

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource	158.50	2.80	4.40	11.50
Capital				
Total	158.50	2.80	4.40	11.50

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

In managing the college merger process, one of the fundamental aims is to ensure that all of the 6 new colleges remain in a financially healthy state. This will have to be achieved against a background of a, largely, static level of funding available to the sector, and at a time of major re-organisation that could have a number of associated one-off costs. In order to manage these issues in an effective manner, the Department has been in discussion with the sector regarding the appropriate use of college reserves.

Under the FE Order, the Department is not able to remove reserves from

colleges. Also, the FE Order dictates that in a college merger situation, all assets, liabilities, etc belonging to the individual colleges that are merging become the "property" of the newly merged colleges. Therefore, when the colleges merged on 1 August 2007, the reserves of the current 16 colleges became the reserves of the 6 new colleges. However, different colleges (both the old 16 and the new 6) have considerably different levels of reserves at their disposal. This inconsistent level of reserves is a factor that has to be taken into account in achieving the aim of financial health in all six colleges.

In managing this process, colleges will still need to retain a certain level of reserves - one of the main reasons for colleges holding reserves is to provide a measure of contingency, consistent with sound financial practice. In addition, colleges have plans for the use of some of their reserves and, as indicated above, further use of reserves will be required to meet some restructuring costs arising from the recent college mergers. However, based on an analysis of the college reserves position over the last few years, and taking account of the factors outlined above, the Department is confident that the sector as a whole will have a sufficient level of unplanned reserves to fund the level of efficiency saving set out in this efficiency plan.

The realisation of the efficiencies in this efficiency plan will be taken forward by the Department with colleges through the annual College Development Planning process.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

Given the nature of the efficiency measure, no significant wider benefits are anticipated. However, the more complete use of existing FE budgets is a major benefit in its own right.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up-Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions

As detailed in Section 5 below, the key actions are for the Department to manage the College Development Planning process and the budget setting process in the 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11 academic years. Managing the level of college reserves will be an integral part of these processes going forward.

4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs

It is not anticipated that there will be any up-front costs associated with this efficiency saving.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome

By May 2008.	The Department to manage the 2008/09 College Development Planning and college budget setting processes.	Bernie O'Hare.	The outcome of the College Development Planning, college budget setting and college reserves processes will be managed to enable the stated efficiency savings to be achieved.
By May 2009.	The Department to manage the 2009/10 College Development Planning and college budget setting processes.		
By May 2010.	The Department to manage the 2010/11 College Development Planning and college budget setting processes.		

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
WS9: Reduction in FE Resource Grant The level of reserves held by FE colleges will have been reduced.	This will be monitored through a number of data sources. These are: a. annual college accounts; b. annual College Development Plans (CDPs); and c. the annual budget setting process.	FE Finance Branch and FE Accountability Branch.	Annually. Given the nature of how and when the efficiency savings will be delivered, it is felt that annual monitoring is sufficient and realistic.

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
The efficiency savings in this area will come about as a result of requiring colleges to use a portion of their existing reserves to enable the proposed reduction to be made to the FE recurrent grant without having a negative impact on the service delivered to customers. It is considered that an equality impact assessment is neither appropriate, nor indeed possible, in this case.	None.

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is minimal risk to the efficiency saving being realised, as the FE recurrent grant given to colleges will be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be managed through the College Development Planning

<p>reduced as required. However, the risk is that the efficiency saving, when taken together with other efficiency savings through the FE Recurrent Grant , and together with the need for colleges to use a separate portion of their reserves to fund one-off elements of the college restructuring process, will have a negative impact on service delivery.</p>	<p>process and the budget setting process. In addition, college planning and funding will be focused increasingly on meeting the Department's priorities for the FE sector as outlined in Further Education Means Business.</p>
---	---

WS11: Reduction in FE Capital Grant

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Procurement Place more responsibility on the FE College Sector to identify alternative sources of funding in respect of their capital and equipment requirements for their Minor Works/H&S/SLDD/ICT programmes.
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Bernie O'Hare

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource				
Capital	40.90	2.00	2.50	3.00
Total	40.90	2.00	2.50	3.00

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

The FE Sector has received significant funding for Health and Safety deficiencies, Minor Works, Capital and Equipment, including ICT and disabled access upgrades over recent years.

This efficiency measure is to cut the amount of funding being made available under these programmes and encourage colleges to address these issues from within their own resources. Over recent years, the Department has challenged colleges to develop estates strategies and improved asset management strategies, which has reduced the necessity for these programme funds. The Department is confident that these savings can be achieved without a detrimental impact on the quality of the services provided by colleges.

Ensuring that colleges accept and address this responsibility will be monitored through the College Development Planning process and through monitoring of the College accounts.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

Colleges will be encouraged to be more efficient in the running of their Colleges and take responsibility for ensuring that improvements to Learning environments are bedded into the culture of running the college.

This, in turn, will encourage Colleges to focus on better asset management with more resources into the delivery of frontline services.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up-Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions
Monitoring of College Development Plans and College accounts to ensure that this area of responsibility is being addressed.
4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs
None.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome
June 2008 to June 2010	Monitor College Development Plans and College accounts to ensure areas of responsibility are being addressed	Bernie O'Hare	Ensuring that efficiencies are achieved and responsibilities addressed

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
Reduction in capital funding to the FE sector.	Funding provided	FE Estates and Governance and Accountability	Quarterly

		Branches DEL Senior Mgt Team	
--	--	------------------------------------	--

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
None	N/A.

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
That Colleges do not address their responsibilities and college estate is allowed to deteriorate and not meet statutory requirements in terms of health and safety, disables access etc.	Colleges Development Plans will not be approved if these responsibilities are not addressed.

WS12: Reduction in Higher Education (HE) Capital Grant

Department	Department for Employment and Learning
Efficiency Measure	Procurement Efficiency
Ministerial Agreement to plan received	Yes
Senior Responsible Officer	Fergus Devitt

1. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Efficiency Measure (£m)

	Baseline	Savings		
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Admin				
Resource				
Capital	27.80	1.34	2.66	3.91
Total	27.80	1.34	2.66	3.91

2. Summary of evidence supporting scope for realising savings

This efficiency measure is aimed at placing a greater onus on the higher education sector to identify and implement alternative income sources, through actions such as full economic cost recovery, to deliver institutional investment programmes during the Budget 2007 period, thus reducing the requirement for investment of public resources. It is also anticipated that efficiencies will be delivered through enhanced procurement processes which will contribute to the delivery of value for money savings.

3. Summary of any potential wider benefits (including non-resource releasing gains)

Planning for the capital expenditure consequences of activities will become further embedded in the institutions costing and planning decisions leading to greater efficiency in the use of the sector asset base.

4. Summary of Key Actions and any Up-Front Costs

4a: Description of Key Actions

- To monitor the delivery of the institutions' capital investment and estates management strategies .
- To encourage the institutions to seek alternative income sources and maximise the scope for recovery of full economic costs.
- To encourage the examination of procurement processes and shared service arrangements to deliver enhanced value for money.

4b: Details of any Up-Front Costs

None.

5. Timetable

TIMETABLE FOR DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES			
Date	Action	Owner	Outcome
2007/08	Notify HE institutions of potential impact	Higher Education Finance Branch	HE institutions clearly understand the requirements and prioritise their capital expenditure plans accordingly over the Budget 2007 period in accordance with DEL priorities for the sector.
2008/09 to 2010/11	Monitor implementation of HE institutions capital investment plans and funded projects.		Efficiencies are delivered and demonstrated.

6. Summary of monitoring arrangements to ensure forecast level of savings are delivered without a detrimental impact on high priority services.

Indicator	Data Source	Who monitors?	How often?
Efficiency savings demonstrated with capital programmes delivered within budget throughout the period.	Capital expenditure and forecasting information provided by HE Institutions HE Research Policy / HE Finance	HE Research Policy and HE Finance Branches	Quarterly
Green Book compliant Economic Appraisals and Post Project Evaluations completed	Business Cases / PPEs submitted to DEL Finance Division and DFP.	HE Research Policy and HE Finance Branches	Appraisals prior to project approval/ Post – Project Evaluations on completion

7. Summary of equality impact assessment and details of any mitigating actions.

Equality Impact	Mitigating Action
None.	None.

8. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Contingent Action
The risk is that the sector will not invest sufficiently in its capital base to compensate for the reduction in public resources.	Prioritisation of capital expenditure proposals. Monitoring of capital investment plans and expenditure levels throughout the Budget 2007 period, in line with DEL priorities for the sector.

STANDARD CATEGORISATION OF SAVINGS

Savings accruing to Departmental DEL

£m in 2010-11	Procurement	Productive time	Corporate services	Transactions	Admin/PFR	Allocative efficiency	Other	TOTAL
WS1: All Areas - Admin							£1.00m	£1.00m
WS2: Reductions in FE Resource Grant							£7.52m	£7.52m
WS3: Reduction in HE Recurrent Block Grant						£22.00m		£22.00m
WS4: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant due to Rationalisation of FE Structure			£3.50m					£3.50m
WS5: Reduce the level of Bridge to Employment				£0.50m				£0.50m
WS6: Limit the level of Adult Upskilling						£1.00m		£1.00m
WS7: Reduction in Funding of Disability Programmes				£0.40m				£0.40m
WS8: Removal of training provision previously delivered by Enterprise Ulster						£4.30m		£4.30m
WS9: Increased efficiencies from Contracting Provision	£0.60m							£0.60m
WS10: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant due to use of college reserves						£11.50m		£11.50m
WS11: Reductions in FE Capital Grant	£3.00m							£3.00m
WS12: Reduction in HE Capital	£3.91m							£3.91m
TOTAL	£7.51m		£3.50m	£0.90m		£38.80m	£8.52m	£59.23m

HIGH LEVEL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

WS1: Reductions in Admin Costs.

Public Authority: Dept for Employment & Learning – Corporate Services Division Date: 02 /11/2006 Contact person: June Ingram

1. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS1: Efficiencies achieved through reductions in staff numbers and re-negotiation of ICT contract with Fujitsu.

2. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender		√			
Religion			√		
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Orientation					
Marital Status			√		
Disability			√		
Dependents			√		
Age			√		

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you MUST provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

Potential impact due to current gender profile within the Department (34:66 – male:female)

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?
 Positive Negative No impact

Description of Impacts

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

WS2: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant

Public Authority : Dept for Employment & Learning - FE Division Date : 02 /11/2006 Contact person : Bernie O'Hare

1. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS2: Through the implementation of FE Means Business, the department is rationalising specific curriculum policy areas delivered by FE Colleges, which will result in the provision of courses that are more student focussed and more relevant to the needs of employers and the economy.

2. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		
Marital Status			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Disability			√		
Dependents			√		
Age	√			<p>Elements of the proposal, i.e. employability skills for 16 to 19 year olds, will have a positive impact, in that 16 to 19 year olds will have access to a curriculum that is tailored to meet their individual abilities and aspirations, and which will support their progression to higher qualification and skill levels and, ultimately, their entry to employment.</p> <p>However, some elements of the proposal, for example the proposal to restrict funding of courses that are not on the national Qualifications Framework (NQF), may have a negative impact on older people. The extent to which this may be the case was analysed as part of the policy development and was included in the EQIA and consultation exercise on FE Curriculum. The responses to the</p>	

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
				consultation, which closed on 7 January, are being analysed, and will inform final policy decisions in March 2008.	

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

This is not relevant, because through the proposals all 16 to 19 year olds who enter FE will have access to the education and training programme that has been assessed as best meeting their abilities and aspirations.

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you **MUST** provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

These issues were dealt with in the policy development, EQIA and consultation processes.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

Positive Negative No impact
Description of Impacts

16 to 19 year olds who suffer social disadvantage will be included under the proposals, and their programme of education and training will meet their individual needs.

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race	√		As the FE Sector is a fully integrated educational environment, and the Colleges serve the whole community, this policy proposal has the potential to promote good relations.
Religion	√		As the FE Sector is a fully integrated educational environment, and the Colleges serve the whole community, this policy proposal has the potential to promote good relations.
Political Opinion	√		As the FE Sector is a fully integrated educational environment, and the Colleges serve the whole community, this policy proposal has the potential to promote good relations.
Sexual orientation	√		As the FE Sector is a fully integrated educational environment, and the Colleges serve the whole community, this policy proposal has the potential to promote good relations.
Persons with a disability and persons without	√		As the FE Sector is a fully integrated educational environment, and the Colleges serve the whole community, this policy proposal has the potential to promote good relations.

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

No.

WS3: Reductions in HE Recurrent Grant

Public Authority : Dept for Employment & Learning - HE Division Date : 02 /11 /2006 Contact person : David McAuley

1. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS3: To encourage and incentivise HE Institutions to deliver their services more effectively and efficiently. We will do this through further refinement of the HE funding model.

2. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Marital Status			√		
Disability			√		
Dependents			√		
Age			√		

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you **MUST** provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

~~Positive~~ ~~Negative~~ No impact
 Description of Impacts

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

WS4: Restructure of the FE Sector

Public Authority : Dept for Employment & Learning - FE Division Date : 13 /03 /20067 Contact person : Bernie O'Hare

1. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS4: Savings will be achieved as a result of merging the existing 16 college structure to a new six college model thus: rationalising and reducing the number of senior management positions (eg directors and deputy directors); rationalising and reducing the number of senior academic staff (eg heads of departments and principal lecturers); and rationalising staff in a number of key corporate activities (eg finance, personnel, and marketing activities).

The college merger process was the subject of a Preliminary Equality Impact Assessment (PEQIA) under the Department's Equality Scheme. The outcome of the PEQIA was that the merger process did not constitute any adverse impact, and that a full Equality Impact Assessment was, therefore, not required.

2. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		
Race			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		
Marital Status			√		
Disability			√		
Dependents			√		
Age			√		

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you MUST provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

Positive Negative No impact

Description of Impacts

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

No.

WS5: Reduce the level of Bridge to Employment

Public Authority : Dept for Employment & Learning – Skills and Industry Division Date : 02 /11/2006 Contact person : Nuala Kerr

1. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS5: Reduce the cost of Bridge to Employment through increased efficiency in delivery.

2. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		
Marital Status			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Disability			√		
Dependents			√		
Age			√		

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you **MUST** provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

~~Positive~~ ~~Negative~~ No impact

Description of Impacts

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

WS6: Limit the level of Adult Upskilling

Public Authority : Dept for Employment & Learning – Skills and Industry Division Date : 02 /11/2006 Contact person : Nuala Kerr

1. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS6: Reduce the level of Adult Upskilling through increased efficiency in delivery.

2. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		
Marital Status			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Disability			√		
Dependents			√		
Age		√		DEL will have less ability to deliver this programme through the reduction in budget of £1.0m p.a.	Budget is being reduced from £4.1m to £3.1m p.a.

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you **MUST** provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

We will maximise the use of the remaining budget to ensure that the resources are used as efficiently and effectively as possible.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

~~Positive~~ ~~Negative~~ No impact

Description of Impacts

--

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

--

WS7: Reduction in funding of Disability Programmes

Public Authority : Dept for Employment & Learning – Prep. For Work Division Date : 02 /11/2006 Contact person : Patricia McAuley

1. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS7: Reduction in funding of Disability Programmes through increased efficiency in delivery.

2. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Marital Status			√		
Disability		√		Less funding available to assist people with disabilities to access employment.	Budget is being reduced £0.4m p.a.
Dependents			√		
Age			√		

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you **MUST** provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

We will maximise the use of the remaining budget to ensure that the resources are used as efficiently and effectively as possible.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

~~Positive~~ Negative ~~No impact~~

Description of Impacts Potential for negative impact on people with disabilities.

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

WS8: Removal of training provision formerly delivered by Enterprise Ulster

Public Authority : Dept for Employment & Learning – FE Division Date : 02 /11 /2006 Contact person : Patricia McAuley

1. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS8: Removal of training provision formerly delivered by Enterprise Ulster through increased efficiency in delivery.

2. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		
Marital Status			√		
Disability			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Dependents			√		
Age			√		

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

(b) If any of the impacts are negative you **MUST** provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

~~Positive~~ ~~Negative~~ No impact

Description of Impacts

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

WS9: Increased efficiencies from Contracting Provision

Public Authority: Dept for Employment & Learning – Prep. For Work Division Date: 11/01/08

Contact person: Patricia McAuley

3. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS[]: Increased efficiency from contracting of New Deal/Steps to Work

4. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Marital Status			√		
Disability			√		
Dependents			√		
Age			√		

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you **MUST** provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

~~Positive~~ ~~Negative~~ No impact

--

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

WS10: Reduction in FE Recurrent Grant due to the Use of College Reserves

Public Authority : Dept for Employment & Learning - FE Division Date : 13 /03 /2007 Contact person : Bernie O'Hare

3. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS10: As part of the funding and governance strands of *“Further Education Means Business”*, the FE Strategy for Northern Ireland, the Department plans to introduce a more rigorous approach to the management of FE College reserves. Longer term, this process will, effectively, cap the level of reserves that colleges will be able to accumulate. In the short to medium term, colleges will be required to use an appropriate level of their existing reserves to fund a number of costs associated with the re-structuring the sector from 16 to 6 FE colleges. However, it is anticipated that there are appropriate reserves to also enable efficiency savings to be made across the CSR period.

The efficiency savings in this area will come about as a result of requiring colleges to use a portion of their existing reserves to enable the proposed reduction to be made to the FE recurrent grant, and without having a negative impact on the service delivered to customers. As this will be managed through the normal FE recurrent grant allocation process, it will not be possible, or desirable, to specify to colleges which area of service should be delivered using the “reserves” element of their budget. Therefore, it is considered that an equality impact assessment is neither appropriate, nor indeed possible, in this case.

4. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		
Marital Status			√		
Disability			√		
Dependents			√		
Age			√		

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you **MUST** provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

Positive Negative No impact

Description of Impacts

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

No.

WS11: Reduction in FE Capital Grant

Public Authority : Dept for Employment & Learning – FE Division Date : 02 /11 /2006 Contact person : Bernie O'Hare

1. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS11: Reduction in FE Capital Grant by placing more responsibility on the sector for identifying other sources of capital funding.

2. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		
Marital Status			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Disability			√		
Dependents			√		
Age			√		

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you MUST provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

~~Positive~~ ~~Negative~~ No impact

Description of Impacts

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)

No.

WS12: Reduction in HE Capital Grant

Public Authority: Dept for Employment & Learning – HE Division Date: 02 /11 /2006 Contact person: Jim Walker

1. Description of target/Funding proposal including aim/objective

WS10: Reduction in HE Capital Grant by encouraging the HE sector to secure long term capital investment from non departmental sources.

2. Will the target or funding proposal impact differently on any group within the nine S75 equality categories?

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Gender			√		
Religion			√		
Race			√		
Political Opinion			√		
Sexual Orientation			√		

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Description of impacts	Evidence Base
Marital Status			√		
Disability			√		
Dependents			√		
Age			√		

3. (a) If the impacts are positive or neutral please note any further adjustments which could increase equality of opportunity for groups within any category.

None

- (b) If any of the impacts are negative you **MUST** provide evidence of consideration of all possible mitigations or policy alternatives considered, including data or evidence sources where available, and justification of any decision to proceed despite the negative impacts.

4. Will the target or funding proposal have impacts on individuals, groups or areas suffering social disadvantage?

Positive Negative No impact

Description of Impacts

5a. Does the target or funding proposal provide an opportunity to promote good relations between people of different

	Yes	No	Description of way(s) in which good relations are or could be promoted
Race		√	
Religion		√	
Political Opinion		√	
Sexual orientation		√	
Persons with a disability and persons without		√	

5b. Could the target or funding proposal inadvertently inhibit or damage good relations between groups within any of the above categories?

NO YES (if yes, please provide description below, and justification for proceeding notwithstanding the impact)