

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

EIA Ref	C/13/62	
Lead Officer	Name	Angela McNamara
	Position	DM - Commissioning
	Contact details	0151 511 8448

SECTION 1 –Context & Background

1.1 What is the title of the policy/practice?

Domiciliary Care

1.2 What is the current status of the policy/practice?

Existing ☒

Changed ☒

New ☐

1.3 What are the principal aims and intended outcomes of the policy/practice?

Improvements leading to a shift to an outcome based service that improves flexibility and quality of care in the home.

1.4 Who has primary responsibility for delivering the policy/practice?

Halton BC

1.5 Who are the main stakeholders?

Halton BC, Domiciliary Care providers.

1.6 Who is the policy/practice intended to affect?

Residents ☒

Staff ☐

Specific Group(s) ☐

(add details below)

People over 65 who are in receipt of a care package at home.

1.7 Are there any other related policies/practices?

None specifically.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

SECTION 2 – Consideration of Impact

2.1 Relevance: – the Public Sector Equality Duty

Does this policy / practice / service have due regard to the need to: -

- (a) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conflict that is prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
- (b) Advance equality of opportunity between two persons who share a relevant protected characteristic
- (c) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

Yes (✓) No ()

State reasons below

(Relevance to service users/staff)

High proportionality due to the nature of the service.

2.2 Has data and information been used in determining the impact of the policy/procedure under review?

(for example research, surveys, complaints, consultation, , monitoring data)

Equality Group(s)	Extensive data on service users. User survey November 2012; consultation on potential changes & new model of service.
--------------------------	--

Baseline data and information

Service users – age, gender, disability, faith/culture etc.

2.3 On the basis of evidence, has the actual/potential impact of the policy/practice been judged to be positive (+), neutral (=) or negative (-) for each of the equality groups and in what way? Is the level of impact judged to be high (H), medium ((M), or low (L)?

Protected Characteristic	Impact type +, =, -	Level H, M, L, -	Nature of impact
Age	=	-	Specified at ages 65 and over
Disability	=	-	Nature of disability supplied and service adapted accordingly
Gender	=	-	Dignity and cultural issues are taken into account and positive action will be taken as appropriate – this is an increased level of service from the current model.
Race/ethnicity	=	-	
Religion / belief	=	-	
Sexual Orientation	=	-	
Transgender	=	-	
Marital status/ Civil Partnerships	=	-	

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

Pregnancy/Maternity	N/A		
In Halton two further vulnerable groups have been identified: -			
Carers	+	M	The service will be designed to be more in tune with carers needs.
Socio – economic disadvantage	=	-	Existing financial assessment arrangements will continue.

2.4 Does the policy/practice have any potential impact on safeguarding vulnerable people?

It has been recognised that the increased flexibility of the changed service could lead to more risks, this will be a part of more stringent monitoring arrangements, along with feedback from service users.

2.5 How will the impact of the policy/practice be monitored?

Internal QA mechanisms, each individual is regularly monitored, feedback from users, extra resources have been committed to monitor the service changes over the first twelve months.

2.6 Who will be responsible for monitoring?

QA Team, Commissioning Team.

2.7 If any negative impacts, or potential negative impacts, have been identified what mitigating actions will be put in place, thereby eliminating the need for a further Stage 2 assessment Where none have been identified insert 'no further action required' in the first column

Action & purpose / outcome	Priority	Timeframe	Lead Officer
No further action required.	-	-	-

2.8 Summary of stakeholders involved in this review

Name / Job Title	Organisation/representative of
Mark Holt, Commissioning Manager	Communities Directorate, Halton BC
Les Unsworth, Policy Officer	Policy and Resources Directorate, Halton BC

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

2.9 Completion Statement

As the identified Lead Officer of this review I confirm that:-
No negative impact has been identified for one or more equality groups and that a Stage 2 Assessment is not required ☒

Signed: *Mark Holt*

Date: 19/7/13

Completed EIAs should be sent to Les Unsworth, Corporate and Organisational Policy, to be given a unique reference number and for inclusion on the central register.

Appendix 1

Public Sector Equality Duty – EIA Checklist

The Equality Act s149 (the Public Sector Equality Duty) requires is that HBC has due regard to the need to:-

- (a) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

These are matters that we must show we have taken into the reckoning in making decisions about the Council's functions. We therefore need evidence of the following:

1. We know about the duty
2. We have reflected on the duty
3. We have consulted those affected or likely to be affected
4. We have used relevant information already in the council's possession (surveys etc.)
5. We have allowed adequate time for consultation with those affected and/or those who speak for those affected
6. We have allowed adequate time for earnest and genuine consideration of the information and views received
7. We have identified any adverse effects
8. We have sought to mitigate any adverse effects of decisions
9. We have identified principal options
10. Decision makers have not made up their mind in advance
11. We have considered all material considerations including our own financial situation, policy and strategy documents alongside along views received from consultees but have not applied those policies etc. In a rigid or unthinking way.