Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00100 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Children's Services	Lead Officer Name:	Sara Lacey
	Social Work	Team:	Social Work
		Tel:	01324 50 6695
		Email:	sara.lacey@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Additional Support Needs Service Review - Review of Service Level Agreements (SLA) / Commissioning	Reference No:	CS22

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	Yes
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):

01/10/2018 The service will undertake a significant piece of work of strategic commissioning to ensure that we realign programmes of work to deliver the overall strategic outcomes.

Key actions which will contribute to the development of the financial position above:

• Engage with stakeholders and 3rd sector services to review their current activity.

• Realign the activity identified to that of the revised strategic plan.

• Engage with the procurement team to prepare specifications to go out to tender for the revised services.

• Engage with colleagues from across the Forth Valley area to review our approach to delivering Speech and Language Services.

• Review and renegotiate our service level agreements with NHS to align our service needs and our strategic goals.

Identify the m	dentify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):				
01/10/2018	Savings to be delivered from the improved way third sector services are commissioned and delivered, with the "principles" of delivering Services Closer to Home and developing closer local capabilities. The services provided are Family Support and will be reviewed, redesigned and will then be tendered to all providers to ensure best value.				

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION				
For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average	
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:			
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:	100		
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:	N/A		
If this is a change to a charge or	Current Annual Income Total:			
concession please complete.	Expected Annual Income Total:			
If this is a budget decision, when will the	Start Date:	01/08/2019		
saving be achieved?	End Date (if any):	31/07/2020		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE	Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)
A - Quantitative Evidence	This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.
Review is currently underway	- further information will be provided in future updates.
	Closer to Home Strategy, which will engage in transformational activity across Children's Services over the next 5 years.
The service will undertake a soutcomes.	ignificant piece of work of strategic commissioning to ensure that we realign programmes of work to deliver the overall strategic
	x. 25000 pupils and their families
of which there are:	
ASN Pupils: 3500Looked After Children:	360
B - Qualitative Evidence	This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.
Social - case studies; persona	I / group feedback / other
	- further information will be provided in future updates. Through engagement and partnership working develop new models of ery, which maximise the efficiency of resources and improve outcomes for our most vulnerable children and young people.

Best Judgement:		
Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	No	
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?		
What gaps in data / information were identified?	Review is currently on going.	
Is further research necessary?	Yes	
If NO, please state why.		

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected	No	
characteristics and socio-economic status?		
If YES, please state who was engagement with.		
state why. • Engage with • Realign the arrow of the state of the sta		ently on-going, the key actions will contribute to the development of the financial position above: stakeholders and 3rd sector services to review their current activity. activity identified to that of the revised strategic plan. the procurement team to prepare specifications to go out to tender for the revised services. colleagues from across the Forth Valley area to review our approach to delivering Speech and ices. renegotiate our service level agreements with NHS to align our service needs and our strategic
How was the engagement carried out?		What were the results from the engagement? Please list
How was the engagement carried out? Focus Group	No	What were the results from the engagement? Please list
	No No	What were the results from the engagement? Please list
Focus Group	No	What were the results from the engagement? Please list
Focus Group Survey	No	What were the results from the engagement? Please list
Focus Group Survey Display / Exhibitions	No No	What were the results from the engagement? Please list
Focus Group Survey Display / Exhibitions User Panels	No No No	What were the results from the engagement? Please list
Focus Group Survey Display / Exhibitions User Panels Public Event	No No No	
Focus Group Survey Display / Exhibitions User Panels Public Event Other: please specify Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed	No No No d / changed as	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT					
Equality Protected Characteristics:	What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, public protection etc.				
Protected Characteristic	Neutral ImpactPositive Negative ImpactNegative Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.			Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.	
Age					
Disability		✓		Pupil with Additional Support Needs are high users of the service. Improved targeting of resources to the most vulnerable groups of children and young people	
Sex	✓			Both sexes use service.	
Ethnicity					
Religion / Belief / non-Belief					
Sexual Orientation					
Transgender					
Pregnancy / Maternity					
Marriage / Civil Partnership					
Poverty		√		Improved targeting of resources to the most vulnerable groups of children and young people.	
Other, health, community justice, public protection etc.					
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)	No risks ide	ntified.			

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	Improved targeting of resources to the most vulnerable groups of children and young people.
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDER		
Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	Yes	Redesign and re-negotiation of the delivery models and utilisation of potentially other lower cost providers, to align with our strategic vision.
Councils	No	
Education Sector	Yes	Safely reduce the number of children looked after away from home All our children, including the most vulnerable, will achieve in learning, life and work Families will be central to decision making and planning for their children
Fire	No	
NHS	Yes	Redesign and re-negotiation of the delivery models and utilisation of potentially other lower cost providers, to align with our strategic vision.
Integration Joint Board	Yes	Redesign and re-negotiation of the delivery models and utilisation of potentially other lower cost providers, to align with our strategic vision.
Police	No	
Third Sector	Yes	Redesign and re-negotiation of the delivery models and utilisation of potentially other lower cost providers, to align with our strategic vision.
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

	Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.						
To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan Quality Outcomes			
Children and their families.	 Through redesign and re-negotiation of the delivery models and utilisation of potentially other lower cost providers, to align with our strategic vision. Improved targeting of resources to the most vulnerable groups of children and young people. Improved efficiency of the available resources to maximise the number of children and young people receiving support. 	David MacKay					
	To Who Children and their	To WhoAction(s)Children and their families.Through redesign and re-negotiation of the delivery models and utilisation of potentially other lower cost providers, to align with our strategic vision.Improved targeting of resources to the most vulnerable groups of children and young people.Improved efficiency of the available resources to maximise the number of children and young people	To WhoAction(s)Lead OfficerChildren and their families.Through redesign and re-negotiation of the delivery models and utilisation of potentially other lower cost providers, to align with our strategic vision.David MacKayImproved targeting of resources to the most vulnerable groups of children and young people.Improved targeting of the available resources to maximise the number of children and young peopleImproved targeting of the available resources to maximise the number of children and young people	To WhoAction(s)Lead OfficerEvaluation and Review DateChildren and their families.Through redesign and re-negotiation of the delivery models and utilisation of potentially other lower cost providers, to align with our strategic vision.David MacKayImproved targeting of resources to the most vulnerable groups of children and young people.Improved efficiency of the available resources to maximise the number of children and young peopleImproved targeting of resources to the number of children and young people			

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

Are actions being reported to Members?	No
If yes when and how ?	

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.					
No major change required	Yes	This proposal is aimed at having a positive impact on reducing inequalities of outcome caused by socio-economic disadvantage for children and young people.			
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No				
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	No				
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No				
SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF					
Lead Officer:					

Signature:	Kirsty Wilsdon	Date:	01/02/2019

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY							
OVERALL AS	SESSMENT OF	well as ownership and a	A: Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?				
ASSESSMEN	T FINDINGS		The review is further progr	nce the review is			
If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA							
If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA							
Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without</u> <u>making changes been made</u> ?			Yes / No	If YES, please describe:			
LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA							
LEVEL COMMENTS							
HIGH	Yes / No						
MEDIUM	Yes / No						
LOW	Yes						

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF						
Director / Head of Service:						
Signature:	Robert Naylor	Date:	18/02/2019			