

Equality Impact Assessment of the Consultation

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----------------|---|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| Directorate | People First | Section | Strategy | Person responsible for the assessment | Peter Singh/ Vijay Malik | Date of the assessment | 13 December 2006 |
| Name of the policy to be assessed | | | Community Care Consultation – Your Views Matter | | Is this a new or existing policy | New proposed policy for current services | |
| 1. In what areas are there concerns, that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact (please tick) | | | i. Race <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | ii. Gender <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | iii. Disability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | iv. Age <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | v. Sexual orientation |
| | | | vi. Religious Belief | vii. Dependents | viii. Offending past | ix. Transgendered or transsexual | |
| 2. What are the concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on relevant groups. Please explain (continue on a separate piece of paper if necessary) | | | This includes – likely higher costs and other financial implications for service users and carers i.e. possible reduction of services; may adversely effect people with dementia and other vulnerable groups; potential changes in the quality or length of care available; implications of demand for alternative services; impact on carers; impact on current staff and future recruitment costs | | | | |
| 3. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? (continue on a separate piece of paper if necessary) | | | Consultation feedback see methodology in the report 'Consultation – Analysis of Responses' | | | | |
| 4. What are the risks associated with the policy in relation to differential impact | | | Contained in point 2 i.e. possible reduction in services, adverse impact on grounds of age, disability and race. | | | | |
| 5 Please state clearly the expected benefits of the policy | | | Reduced overall costs and more streamlined services | | | | |
| 6. Which experts/relevant groups did you approach to explore their views on the issues | | | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No | 7. Please list the relevant groups/experts | Number of local organisations and individuals from the voluntary sector, community and local groups and from Health e.g. HAD, HRCE, Mencap, MIND, etc | |

Appendix 2

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| 8. How was the views of these groups obtained? (please tick) | Letter √ Meetings √ Interviews Telephone √ Workshops Fora Questionnaires √ Other | 9. Please list the date when each group/expert was contacted | Within the 12 week consultation period between 29 September 2006 to 5 January 2007. | | | |
| 10. Please explain in detail the views of the relevant groups/experts on the issues involved (continue on a separate piece of paper if necessary) | Contained in the Cabinet Report dated 18 January | | | | | |
| 11. Taking into account the views of the relevant groups/experts, and the available evidence, please state clearly the risks associated with the policy (continue on a separate piece of paper if necessary) | Risks need to be fully assessed by means of individual full impact assessments for the services. It is recommended that a full impact assessment is carried out for the Meals on Wheels service once a decision has been made on the proposals considered by cabinet. | | | | | |
| 12. As a result of this assessment is a Full Impact Assessment necessary? | Yes √ | No | 13. Date on which the Full Assessment is to be started | To be undertaken as part of the implementation of any proposals agreed by Cabinet | 14. Date on which the Full Assessment should be completed | To be undertaken as part of the implementation of any proposals agreed by Cabinet |