

OFFICIAL
NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde
Equality Impact Assessment Tool

Equality Impact Assessment is a legal requirement as set out in the Equality Act (2010) and the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties)(Scotland) regulations 2012 and may be used as evidence for cases referred for further investigation for compliance issues. Evidence returned should also align to Specific Outcomes as stated in your local Equality Outcomes Report. Please note that prior to starting an EQIA all Lead Reviewers are required to attend a Lead Reviewer training session or arrange to meet with a member of the Equality and Human Rights Team to discuss the process. Please contact Equality@ggc.scot.nhs.uk for further details or call 0141 2014560.

Name of Policy/Service Review/Service Development/Service Redesign/New Service:

Policy on Issuing of Grant Funding to External Organisations

Is this a: Current Service Service Development Service Redesign New Service New Policy Policy Review

Description of the service & rationale for selection for EQIA: (Please state if this is part of a Board-wide service or is locally driven).

Public sector funding of external organisations is an important part of ensuring delivery of a wide range of services, in conjunction with a range of partners, to provide a 'seamless' service which offers greater choice for service users and patients whilst delivering quality services which secure best value.

Grant funding is not intended to be a replacement for the procurement of services and its use requires to be governed to ensure compliance with the relevant rules and regulations.

However, it can be a useful vehicle in supporting a range of organisations to offer support and services which can contribute to the delivery of the IJB's aims, whilst engaging with service users and patients in a way that traditional procured services cannot achieve. Importantly grants enable community organisations to address specific health and social care needs at a local community level and empowers community groups to take an active role in improving the well-being of their population and the people who access their resources. Examples are the ability of voluntary organisations to engage with socially excluded groups such as drug users and the homeless who may be reluctant to contact statutory agencies to access services. In addition, these services can offer wider benefits to local communities by, for example, helping people to develop skills and encouraging community involvement.

The purpose of this policy is to recognise that grant funding is one tool available to the IJB in the delivery of its Strategic Plan with delivery supported through the grant giving powers of both Partner Bodies. This policy will define when it would be appropriate to use grants as a funding route.

This is an overarching grants policy and is supported by procedures to support its implementation. The guidance and procedures put in place to support this policy is reflected in this EQIA.

This policy was selected for EQIA because services supported by grants could be directed at service users/ patients with protected characteristics and it is therefore important that the policy is assessed to identify any impact on service user/patients with protected characteristics and to identify the mitigations which are in place. Grants

OFFICIAL

programmes run by the IJB will be underpinned by the IJBs Strategic Priorities.



1. Prevention, early intervention and well-being



4. Strengthening communities to reduce harm



2. Supporting greater self-determination and informed choice



5. A healthy, valued and supported workforce



3. Supporting people in their communities



6. Building a sustainable future

Who is the lead reviewer and when did they attend Lead reviewer Training? (Please note the lead reviewer must be someone in a position to authorise any actions identified as a result of the EQIA)

Name: Margaret Hogg, Assistant Chief Officer, Glasgow City HSCP

Date of Lead Reviewer Training:

Please list the staff involved in carrying out this EQIA

(Where non-NHS staff are involved e.g. third sector reps or patients, please record their organisation or reason for inclusion):

Margaret Hogg, Assistant Chief Officer, Glasgow City HSCP

OFFICIAL

		Example	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
1.	<p>What equalities information is routinely collected from people currently using the service or affected by the policy? If this is a new service proposal what data do you have on proposed service user groups. Please note any barriers to collecting this data in your submitted evidence and an explanation for any protected characteristic data omitted.</p>	<p>A sexual health service collects service user data covering all 9 protected characteristics to enable them to monitor patterns of use.</p>	<p>Each individual grant programme will be targeted to meet a specific need and at the outset will define the service user/patients which have to be targeted by the service being supported by grant funding.</p> <p>The application form designed to support grant programmes collects information on those who will benefit from projects supported by grant funding. This includes equality information.</p> <p>The application also asks the organisations seeking funding to confirm if staff and committee members have received equalities and diversity training in the past 2 years. If this has not happened links can be provided to free training which has become available nationally to the equality and human rights training, which will be available on TURAS.</p> <p>Monitoring forms at the end of the project will also capture information on those people who accessed and benefited from the project including details on equality information.</p>	
		Example	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
2.	<p>Please provide details of how data captured has been/will be used to inform policy content or service design.</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant</p>	<p>A physical activity programme for people with long term conditions reviewed service user data and found very low uptake by BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) people. Engagement activity found</p>	<p>A test of change was undertaken to support the development of this policy and equalities information was collected at both the application process and as part of the monitoring report at the end of the programme. The feedback received from all of those who participated in the test of change has been used to influence the final draft of the policy and procedures.</p> <p>All grant programmes will be defined in advance in relation to the aim of the fund, the outcomes anticipated, the priorities of the</p>	<p>The evaluation of the test of change has identified that monitoring information requested on equality information is limited and this would benefit to being widened to gain a more comprehensive collection of data. This will be developed before the next programme starts.</p>

OFFICIAL

	<p>boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>promotional material for the interventions was not representative. As a result an adapted range of materials were introduced with ongoing monitoring of uptake. (Due regard promoting equality of opportunity)</p>	<p>fund and who is eligible to apply. Each application will be independently assessed using a pre-determined scoring matrix to ensure a fair and transparent process with no groups discriminated from access to funds based on protected characteristics.</p> <p>As part of programme design consideration will be given to any opportunities to include or prioritise groups who are under represented.</p> <p>The application form designed to support grant programmes collects information on those who will benefit from projects supported by grant funding. This includes equality information.</p> <p>Monitoring forms at the end of the project will also capture information on those people who accessed and benefited from the project including details on equality information.</p> <p>All of this information will be used to shape future updates to the policy and procedures as required.</p>	
	<p align="center">Example</p>	<p align="center">Service Evidence Provided</p>	<p align="center">Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>How have you applied learning from research evidence about the experience of equality groups to the service or Policy?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant</p>	<p>Looked after and accommodated care services reviewed a range of research evidence to help promote a more inclusive care environment. Research suggested that young LGBT+ people had a disproportionately difficult time through</p>	<p>A test of change was undertaken to support the development of this policy and equalities information was collected at both the application process and as part of the monitoring report at the end of the programme. The feedback received from all of those who participated in the test of change has been used to influence the final draft of the policy and procedures.</p> <p>Some examples of the changes we have made include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of a shorter form for smaller grants to reduce the administration burden for groups • Using a different format for the application form which is 	

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

	<p>boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>exposure to bullying and harassment. As a result staff were trained in LGBT+ issues and were more confident in asking related questions to young people. (Due regard to removing discrimination, harassment and victimisation and fostering good relations).</p>	<p>more accessible and easier to complete</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of accessibility costs such as interpreting as an eligible expense for grant support • Inclusion of practical tips including ensuring community equality groups are included in the development of the grants programme as well as the communications including awareness/help sessions • Widened the recording of equality information to include those experiencing poverty 	
	<p>Example</p>	<p>Service Evidence Provided</p>	<p>Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Can you give details of how you have engaged with equality groups with regard to the service review or policy development? What did this engagement tell you about user experience and how was this information used? The Patient Experience and Public Involvement team (PEPI) support NHSGGC to listen and understand what matters to people and can offer support.</p> <p>Your evidence should show</p>	<p>A money advice service spoke to lone parents (predominantly women) to better understand barriers to accessing the service. Feedback included concerns about waiting times at the drop in service, made more difficult due to child care issues. As a result the service introduced a home visit and telephone service which significantly increased uptake.</p>	<p>A test of change was undertaken to support the development of this policy and equalities information was collected at both the application process and as part of the monitoring report at the end of the programme. The feedback received from all of those who participated in the test of change has been used to influence the final draft of the policy and procedures.</p> <p>Some examples of the changes we have made include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of a shorter form for smaller grants to reduce the administration burden for groups • Using a different format for the application form which is more accessible and easier to complete • Inclusion of accessibility costs such as interpreting as an eligible expense for grant support • Inclusion of practical tips including ensuring community equality groups are included in the development of the grants programme as well as the communications 	

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

	<p>which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>(Due regard to promoting equality of opportunity)</p> <p>* The Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017 requires organisations to take actions to reduce poverty for children in households at risk of low incomes.</p>	<p>including awareness/help sessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widened the recording of equality information to include those experiencing poverty • Consideration of co-production of programmes with the local community/community equality groups/service users/patients and their families 	
	<p>Example</p>	<p>Service Evidence Provided</p>	<p>Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Is your service physically accessible to everyone? If this is a policy that impacts on movement of service users through areas are there potential barriers that need to be addressed?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination,</p>	<p>An access audit of an outpatient physiotherapy department found that users were required to negotiate 2 sets of heavy manual pull doors to access the service. A request was placed to have the doors retained by magnets that could deactivate in the event of a fire.</p> <p>(Due regard to remove discrimination, harassment and</p>	<p>Application forms and guidance have been developed in an accessible format. Applicants can also access translation and sign language services where this is required.</p>	

OFFICIAL

	<p>harassment and victimisation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>victimisation).</p>		
	<p>Example</p>	<p>Service Evidence Provided</p>	<p>Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>How will the service change or policy development ensure it does not discriminate in the way it communicates with service users and staff?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Following a service review, an information video to explain new procedures was hosted on the organisation's YouTube site. This was accompanied by a BSL signer to explain service changes to Deaf service users.</p> <p>Written materials were offered in other languages and formats.</p> <p>(Due regard to remove discrimination, harassment and</p>	<p>Grants Programmes will be communicated using a number of formats to ensure that a wide range of groups can access them. This will include the use of social media, promotion in the third sector including GCVS and their network or organisations including their equality network and community equality groups.</p> <p>Any changes to the policy will be subject to reporting to the IJB. This will include highlighting the changes made. This will be communicated to relevant staff usual the channels which are already in place to communicate policy changes.</p> <p>Changes should not be made to grants programmes once they are underway. If there are changes made during programmes these will be communicated using the channels outlined above.</p> <p>Application forms and guidance have been developed in an accessible format. Applicants can also access translation and sign language services where this is required.</p>	

OFFICIAL

	<p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The British Sign Language (Scotland) Act 2017 aims to raise awareness of British Sign Language and improve access to services for those using the language. Specific attention should be paid in your evidence to show how the service review or policy has taken note of this.</p>	<p>victimisation and promote equality of opportunity).</p>	<p>Accessibility costs such as interpreting are included as an eligible expense for grant support</p>	
7	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required	
(a)	<p>Age</p> <p>Could the service design or policy content have a disproportionate impact on people due to differences in age? (Consider any age cut-offs that exist in the service design or policy content. You will need to objectively justify in the evidence section any segregation on the grounds of age promoted by the policy or included in the service design).</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions in relation to age. However individual grants programmes may be restricted based on the groups targeted for funding. An example would be a programme for the supporting of early year activity which is targeted at children who are 0-5 years. Any restrictions will be based on the outcomes which the programme is seeking to secure.</p>		

OFFICIAL

	<p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		
(b)	<p>Disability</p> <p>Could the service design or policy content have a disproportionate impact on people due to the protected characteristic of disability?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions in relation to disability. Accessibility costs have been included as eligible costs for grant funding to ensure there is no disproportionate impact on people due to the protected characteristic of disability.</p> <p>Application forms and guidance have been developed in an accessible format. Applicants can also access sign language services where this is required.</p> <p>Accessibility costs such as interpreting are included as an eligible expense for grant support.</p>	<p>Grants programmes may cap the maximum grant that can be applied for by any one organisation. Any cap applied should have consideration of the additional costs which are required to be incurred by groups with disabilities to support access to ensure any cap does not disadvantage the funding which is accessed. Advice for programme leads has been included within the guidance.</p>

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
(c)	<p>Gender Reassignment</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on people with the protected characteristic of Gender Reassignment?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions in relation to gender reassignment. However individual grants programmes may be restricted based on the groups targeted for funding. Any restrictions will be based on the outcomes which the programme is seeking to secure.</p>	
	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
(d)	<p>Marriage and Civil Partnership</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the protected characteristics of Marriage and Civil Partnership?</p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions in relation to marriage and civil partnership. However individual grants programmes may be restricted based on the groups targeted for funding. An example would be a programme which support activities for lone parents. Any restrictions will be based on the outcomes which the programme is seeking to secure.</p>	

OFFICIAL

	<p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		
(e)	<p>Pregnancy and Maternity</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the protected characteristics of Pregnancy and Maternity?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions in relation to pregnancy and maternity. However individual grants programmes may be restricted based on the groups targeted for funding. Any restrictions will be based on the outcomes which the programme is seeking to secure.</p>	

OFFICIAL

	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
(f)	<p>Race</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on people with the protected characteristics of Race?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions in relation to race. However individual grants programmes may be restricted based on the groups targeted for funding. Any restrictions will be based on the outcomes which the programme is seeking to secure.</p> <p>Application forms and guidance have been developed in an accessible format. Applicants can also access translation where this is required.</p> <p>Accessibility costs such as interpreting are included as an eligible expense for grant support.</p>	
(g)	<p>Religion and Belief</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the protected characteristic of Religion and Belief?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions in relation to religion and belief. However individual grants programmes may be restricted based on the groups targeted for funding. Any restrictions will be based on the outcomes which the programme is seeking to secure.</p>	

OFFICIAL

	<p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		
	<p>Protected Characteristic</p>	<p>Service Evidence Provided</p>	<p>Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required</p>
<p>(h)</p>	<p>Sex</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the protected characteristic of Sex?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions in relation to sex. However individual grants programmes may be restricted based on the groups targeted for funding. Any restrictions will be based on the outcomes which the programme is seeking to secure.</p>	
<p>(i)</p>	<p>Sexual Orientation</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the</p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions in relation to sexual orientation. However individual grants programmes may be restricted based on the groups targeted for funding. Any restrictions will be based on the outcomes which the programme</p>	

OFFICIAL

	<p>protected characteristic of Sexual Orientation?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>is seeking to secure.</p>	
	<p>Protected Characteristic</p>	<p>Service Evidence Provided</p>	<p>Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required</p>
<p>(j)</p>	<p>Socio – Economic Status & Social Class</p> <p>Could the proposed service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on people because of their social class or experience of poverty and what mitigating action have you taken/planned?</p> <p>The Fairer Scotland Duty (2018) places a duty on public bodies in Scotland to actively consider how they can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions. If relevant, you should evidence here what steps have been taken to assess and mitigate risk of exacerbating inequality on the ground of socio-economic status. Additional information available here: Fairer Scotland Duty: guidance for public bodies - gov.scot (www.gov.scot)</p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions in relation to socio-economic status and social class. However individual grants programmes may be restricted based on the groups targeted for funding. Any restrictions will be based on the outcomes which the programme is seeking to secure.</p> <p>As part of programme design consideration will be given to any opportunities to include or prioritise groups which are under-represented. This could include targeting people living in poverty.</p>	

<p>Seven useful questions to consider when seeking to demonstrate ‘due regard’ in relation to the Duty:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What evidence has been considered in preparing for the decision, and are there any gaps in the evidence?2. What are the voices of people and communities telling us, and how has this been determined (particularly those with lived experience of socio-economic disadvantage)?3. What does the evidence suggest about the actual or likely impacts of different options or measures on inequalities of outcome that are associated with socio-economic disadvantage?4. Are some communities of interest or communities of place more affected by disadvantage in this case than others?5. What does our Duty assessment tell us about socio-economic disadvantage experienced disproportionately according to sex, race, disability and other protected characteristics that we may need to factor into our decisions?6. How has the evidence been weighed up in reaching our final decision?7. What plans are in place to monitor or evaluate the impact of the proposals on inequalities of outcome that are associated with socio-economic disadvantage? ‘Making Fair Financial Decisions’ (EHRC, 2019)²¹ provides useful information about the ‘Brown Principles’ which can be used to determine whether due regard has been given. When engaging with communities the National Standards for Community Engagement²² should be followed. Those engaged with should also be advised subsequently on how their contributions were factored		
---	--	--

OFFICIAL

	<p>into the final decision.</p>		
<p>(k)</p>	<p>Other marginalised groups</p> <p>How have you considered the specific impact on other groups including homeless people, prisoners and ex-offenders, ex-service personnel, people with addictions, people involved in prostitution, asylum seekers & refugees and travellers?</p>	<p>The policy contains no restrictions which should impact on other marginalised groups. However individual grants programmes may be restricted based on the groups targeted for funding. Any restrictions will be based on the outcomes which the programme is seeking to secure.</p> <p>It is anticipated grants will enable community organisations to address specific health and social care needs at a local community level and empowers community groups to take an active role in improving the well-being of their population and the people who access their resources. Examples are the ability of voluntary organisations to engage with socially excluded groups such as drug users and the homeless who may be reluctant to contact statutory agencies to access services.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Does the service change or policy development include an element of cost savings? How have you managed this in a way that will not disproportionately impact on protected characteristic groups?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected</p>	<p>No</p>	

OFFICIAL

	characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
		Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
9.	What investment in learning has been made to prevent discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and foster good relations between protected characteristic groups? As a minimum include recorded completion rates of statutory and mandatory learning programmes (or local equivalent) covering equality, diversity and human rights.	The application asks the organisations seeking funding to confirm if staff and committee members have received equalities and diversity training in the past 2 years. If this has not happened links can be provided to free training which has become available nationally to the equality and human rights training, which will be available on TURAS.	

10. In addition to understanding and responding to legal responsibilities set out in Equality Act (2010), services must pay due regard to ensure a person's human rights are protected in all aspects of health and social care provision. This may be more obvious in some areas than others. For instance, mental health inpatient care or older people's residential care may be considered higher risk in terms of potential human rights breach due to potential removal of liberty, seclusion or application of restraint. However risk may also involve fundamental gaps like not providing access to communication support, not involving patients/service users in decisions relating to their care, making decisions that infringe the rights of carers to participate in society or not respecting someone's right to dignity or privacy.

The Human Rights Act sets out rights in a series of articles – right to Life, right to freedom from torture and inhumane and degrading treatment, freedom from slavery and forced labour, right to liberty and security, right to a fair trial, no punishment without law, right to respect for private and family life, right to freedom of thought, belief and religion, right to freedom of expression, right to freedom of assembly and association, right to marry, right to protection from discrimination.

Please explain in the field below if any risks in relation to the service design or policy were identified which could impact on the human rights of patients, service users or staff.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

Please explain in the field below any human rights based approaches undertaken to better understand rights and responsibilities resulting from the service or policy development and what measures have been taken as a result e.g. applying the PANEL Principles to maximise Participation, Accountability, Non-discrimination and Equality, Empowerment and Legality or FAIR* .

Co-production of programmes with the local community/community equality groups/service users/patients and their families will be considered as part of the development of individual grant programmes.

*

- **Facts:** What is the experience of the individuals involved and what are the important facts to understand?
- **Analyse rights:** Develop an analysis of the human rights at stake
- **Identify responsibilities:** Identify what needs to be done and who is responsible for doing it
- **Review actions:** Make recommendations for action and later recall and evaluate what has happened as a result.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

Having completed the EQIA template, please tick which option you (Lead Reviewer) perceive best reflects the findings of the assessment. This can be cross-checked via the Quality Assurance process:

- Option 1: No major change (where no impact or potential for improvement is found, no action is required)
- Option 2: Adjust (where a potential or actual negative impact or potential for a more positive impact is found, make changes to mitigate risks or make improvements)
- Option 3: Continue (where a potential or actual negative impact or potential for a more positive impact is found but a decision not to make a change can be objectively justified, continue without making changes)
- Option 4: Stop and remove (where a serious risk of negative impact is found, the plans, policies etc. being assessed should be halted until these issues can be addressed)

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

11. If you believe your service is doing something that 'stands out' as an example of good practice - for instance you are routinely collecting patient data on sexual orientation, faith etc. - please use the box below to describe the activity and the benefits this has brought to the service. This information will help others consider opportunities for developments in their own services.

Actions – from the additional mitigating action requirements boxes completed above, please summarise the actions this service will be taking forward.

Date for completion	Who is responsible?(initials)
28.02.24 MH	

The evaluation of the test of change has identified that monitoring information requested on equality information is limited and this would benefit to being widened to gain a more comprehensive collection of data.

Ongoing 6 Monthly Review please write your 6 monthly EQIA review date:

Lead Reviewer: Name Margaret Hogg
EQIA Sign Off: Job Title Assistant Chief Officer
Signature
Date 21.12.23

Quality Assurance Sign Off: Name Alastair Low
Job Title Planning Manager
Signature Alastair Low
Date 12/01/2024

**NHS GREATER GLASGOW AND CLYDE EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TOOL
MEETING THE NEEDS OF DIVERSE COMMUNITIES
6 MONTHLY REVIEW SHEET**

Name of Policy/Current Service/Service Development/Service Redesign:

--

Please detail activity undertaken with regard to actions highlighted in the original EQIA for this Service/Policy

		Completed	
		Date	Initials
Action:			
Status:			
Action:			
Status:			
Action:			
Status:			
Action:			
Status:			

Please detail any outstanding activity with regard to required actions highlighted in the original EQIA process for this Service/Policy and reason for non-completion

		To be Completed by	
		Date	Initials
Action:			
Reason:			
Action:			
Reason:			

OFFICIAL

Please detail any new actions required since completing the original EQIA and reasons:

		To be completed by	
		Date	Initials
Action:			
Reason:			
Action:			
Reason:			

Please detail any discontinued actions that were originally planned and reasons:

Action:	
Reason:	
Action:	
Reason:	

Please write your next 6-month review date

--

Name of completing officer:

Date submitted:

If you would like to have your 6 month report reviewed by a Quality Assuror please e-mail to: alastair.low@ggc.scot.nhs.uk

OFFICIAL