

STIRLING COUNCIL: EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM
SUMMARY DETAILS



1. Title of policy, strategy, service, function or proposal:

SERVICE

SOC001 - Redesign of Services – Maximising community support and individual choice	Social Services
---	------------------------

2. Lead Officer (Head of Service / Service Manager) responsible for undertaking assessment and Contact Officer details:

Lead Officer : Title and Name	Contact Officer : Title and Name
Jane Menzies – Assistant Head of Social Services	Jane Menzies – Assistant Head of Social Services

3. Which other Council Services or partner agencies are / will be involved in the delivery of this policy, strategy, service, function or proposal?

Clackmannanshire Council / NHS Forth Valley

4. Have they been involved in the Equality Impact Assessment process and if so how?

Not directly however, ongoing feedback from stakeholders was considered in the writing of the EQIA
--

5. What is the nature of the change being proposed? *(Tick all that apply)*

Review of existing policy/strategy		Introduction of a new policy/strategy	✓	Removal of existing service		Increased budget	
Review of existing service/function	✓	Introduction of new service/function		Decreased budget	✓	Other (please specify) e.g. technical, progress, or procedural report	

6. For changes with implications for budgets, please also complete the following information:

Current expenditure on this service/ function (£'000s)	In Council area	£30,896,000
	In/for specific community/ies (where known)	
Total Anticipated Savings/ proposed increased spend (£'000s)	In/for Council area	£764,000
	In specific community/ies (where known)	
Timescale for implementation	Start date for savings/increased spend	01/04/2014
	End Date for savings/increased spend	31/03/2019

To be aligned	Phasing e.g. Year 1- £'000's, Year 2 - £'000's	Year 1 – Cost £50,000 Year 1 – Saving £346,000 Year 1 – Potential Saving £296,000 Year 2 – Cost £50,00 Year 2 – Saving £728,000 Year 2 – Potential Saving £678,000 Year 3 – Ongoing Saving of £764,000
----------------------	--	--

OUTCOMES , AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

7. What outcomes are the policy, strategy, service, function, revised policy or proposal expected to achieve? Consider the Single Outcome Agreement, Serving Stirling (and Equality Outcomes from post May 2013).

Outcome	Source
Improved support for disadvantaged and vulnerable families and individuals	Single Outcome Agreement Number 2
Communities are well served, better connected and safe	Single Outcome Agreement Number 3
Reduced risk factors that lead to health and other inequalities	Single Outcome Agreement Number 5
Improved opportunities for learning, training and work	Single Outcome Agreement Number 6

8. What are the main aims of the policy, strategy, service, function or proposal?

<p>To improve access to Social Care support, directed by the individual where possible</p> <p>To offer support at an early stage, preventing worsening of situations</p> <p>To decrease reliance on services by offering alternatives nearer a person's home</p> <p>To promote independence through appropriate individual and community support.</p>

9. What are the main changes proposed to this?

A shift in Social Care provision and community resources – advice, libraries and contact points.

To offer direct access to services where appropriate i.e. minor equipment

To work in partnership with health to offer a simple gateway to the secondary service

To ensure all support is evidencing both awareness & improved outcomes for the individual

10. Who are the intended beneficiaries of the change/s proposed? (Geographical communities / particular service users / “protected characteristic groups” - quantify numbers affected by the policy/ proposal and the changes proposed if possible).

Adults currently accessing or likely to access secondary NHS & Social Care Support

The localities within Clacks & Stirling local authority areas

Current numbers held within Social Care Case Management System

MEETING THE GENERAL DUTY - GATHERING EVIDENCE AND ASSESSING IMPACT

GATHERING EVIDENCE

11. What evidence have you used to identify any potential positive or negative impacts of this proposal on meeting the needs of the General Equality Duty (Q12), people within protected characteristic groups (Q13), and communities or individuals vulnerable to poverty (Q14)? Please amend/add to the examples of evidence sources listed as required.

Evidence Source	Details
Research (national/local)	National strategy – Reshaping Older People's Care (RSOPC), Mental Health Strategy for Scotland, Same as You. Numerous Consultations (see below) Dementia Strategy Client Numbers Client Perception, Annual Survey, Financial data NHS Client Data, Long Term Care figures, Intermediate Care Actions, Referrals Data
Service delivery data/information including who receives the service	As Above Client Actions Financial Information Perception Data
Consultation/engagement	RSOPC – OP Consultation Learning Disability (LD) Redesign (IMPOWER) Consultation Right time, right place 2009 consultation

User feedback e.g. on the quality of service received	Annual Survey Themes with surveys included: Choice Home Support Individual care, less institutional care Dying at home Independence, less reliance on services Personal choice Access Local based service
--	--

ASSESSING IMPACT

12. What has the evidence obtained told you about the potential impact of this proposal on the key needs of the General Equality Duty listed below?

- **Eliminating unlawful treatment** (discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010)
- **Advancing equality of opportunity** (between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not)
- **Fostering good relations** - including the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding (between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not)

Please select the appropriate impact for each of the key needs listed:

General Equality Duty “needs”	Positive(+) impact	Neutral(0) impact	Negative(-) impact	Summary of reasons for response
Eliminating unlawful treatment	+			Establish a uniform & equitable approach to service provision Specialised pathways of specific resource when indicated Early intervention reduces risk of escalation or inequality
Advancing equality of opportunity	+			Equitable and uniform approach Improving access & local service to those less able to travel Greater focus on independence. Care & community supplier

Fostering good relations				Work in partnership with service which has unique knowledge Evidence response is more aligned to client feedback Fairness in approach Focus on community engagement
	+			

13. What has the evidence obtained told you about the potential impact of this proposal on people in protected characteristic groups? Will this policy, strategy, service, function or proposal have a positive (+), neutral (0), or negative (-), impact on those belonging to a Protected Characteristic Group? The impact of this proposal should be considered in terms of its potential for eliminating unlawful treatment, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations **already considered in more general terms in question 12 above. Please insert + / 0 /- .**

Definitions of the protected characteristic groups are provided at the end of this document.

Protected Characteristic Group	Eliminating unlawful treatment (+/0/-)	Advancing equality of opportunity (+/0/-)	Fostering good Relations (+/0/-)	Comment
Age	0	0	0	Further work to be completed re transitions when passing 65 years
Disability	0	0	0	Proposal align to client need and related national strategy
Gender Reassignment	0	0	0	Equality Strategy Maintained
Marriage and Civil Partnership	0	0	0	Equality Strategy Maintained
Pregnancy and Maternity	0	0	0	Equality Strategy Maintained
Race	0	0	0	Equality Strategy Maintained
Religion and Belief	0	0	0	Equality Strategy Maintained
Sex	0	0	0	Equality Strategy Maintained
Sexual Orientation	0	0	0	Equality Strategy Maintained

IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS VULNERABLE TO POVERTY

14. Will this policy, strategy, service, function or proposal have a positive (+) or negative (-) impact on any other geographical communities, groups or individuals - particularly those with a higher risk of experiencing poverty. **Please insert + / 0 / - , detail the impact and describe the groups affected.**

Refer to the notes at the end of the document for communities and groups of people who have a higher risk of experiencing poverty and see the link below for guidance on making poverty sensitive budget and service planning decisions.

<http://www.stirling.gov.uk/documents/temporary-uploads/assets-and-support/stirling-tackling-poverty-framework.pdf>

Those affected	Positive(+) impact	Neutral(0) impact	Negative(-) impact	Comment
Geographical Community /ies (Please specify)	+			Commitment to locality based need assessment and engagement will develop services sympathetic to local need. Deprived areas, rural settings or specific client groups.
Individuals or household groups (Please specify)	+			Individualised care supports improved management of budgets and greater choice in accessing personal independent choice. Improved empowerment and services.

OVERALL IMPACT

15. Based on the response to questions 12, 13 and 14 please summarise the overall impact/s of this proposal – positive, neutral or negative; highlighting any particular groups affected.

The proposal will have some positive benefits for vulnerable groups with the distinct advantages of :

- Individual care and support
- Improved accessibility
- Equitable and united approach and care and resource allocation
- Negative effects cannot be identified but a quality assurance framework will be put in place
- Alignment and response to expressed user views and consultation feedback

MITIGATING POTENTIAL NEGATIVE IMPACT

16. If you have identified any potential negative impacts use the matrix below to help identify the level of this, the number of people potentially affected and confirm this in the box provided below.

<u>Number of People Affected</u>	<u>HIGH</u>	Your function or policy is likely to be discriminatory. Refer to the EqlA Toolkit on how to modify your function or policy. (Page 11)	Your function or policy is likely to be directly discriminatory . You must reject or substantially modify your function or policy.
	<u>LOW</u>	Consider ways in which you can minimise or remove any low level negative impact that affects a small number of people.	Your function or policy is likely to be discriminatory. Refer to the EqlA Toolkit on how to modify your function or policy. (Page 11)
		LOW	<u>HIGH</u>
<u>LEVEL OF NEGATIVE IMPACT</u>			

Level of impact	Number of people potentially affected
LOW	All Service Users

17. Do you consider the policy / service function / proposal is a) directly or b) potentially discriminatory in its current form?

- a) No
- b) No

If answering yes to question 17a) the policy **must** be rejected or substantially modified - See Section 16 of this form and Page 11 of the EqIA Toolkit

If answering yes to question 17b) consideration should be given to modifying the policy – See Section 16 of this form and Page 11 of the EqIA Toolkit

The resulting modified policy requires to be re – assessed to identify any potential positive or negative impacts as per questions 12, 13 and 14.

18. Describe in detail the actions taken to remove any identified negative impact

The proposal will have some positive benefits for vulnerable groups with the distinct advantages of :

- Individual care and support
- Improved accessibility
- Equitable and united approach and care and resource allocation
- Negative effects cannot be identified but a quality assurance framework will be put in place
- Alignment and response to expressed user views and consultation feedback

19. For the **final** policy being proposed, where negative impacts cannot be removed or minimised, clearly state your justifications for continuing the policy or function in its existing format.

N/A

MONITORING AND REVIEW

20. a) How will the implementation of this function or policy be monitored, how frequently and by whom ?
b) How will the results of the monitoring be used to develop the function or policy?
c) What is the timescale for reviewing the policy?

- a) Adult Social Services Management Team will monitor the implementation of this policy and is likely to be on a monthly basis
b) The results will be used to inform any further changes / adapt to the function or service area.
c) To be determined following implementation.

21. Please summarise the results of the EqlA. In doing so it should be noted that the Council is committed to fulfilling its statutory duty to publish the results of any assessment where the policy change/ proposal is to be implemented. This statement requires to be authorised and signed by the Lead Officer responsible for the assessment.

The proposal will have some positive benefits for vulnerable groups with the distinct advantages of :

- Individual care and support
- Improved accessibility
- Equitable and united approach and care and resource allocation
- Negative effects cannot be identified but a quality assurance framework will be put in place
- Alignment and response to expressed user views and consultation feedback

This policy is not considered to have a negative impact in terms of equality The proposal suggests that more appropriate services are made available to individuals in their communities, reducing the need for access to formal social work.

Authorisation by Lead Officer (Head of Service / Service Manager)

Name / Title	Signature	Date
JANE MENZIES – Assistant Head of Social Services		22/January/2014