

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:

Reduction in Older People Day Care Services to Monday to Friday Only

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).

This EQIA aligns with the IJB Financial Allocations and Budgets 2023-24 paper, presented to IJB members in March 2023.

This proposal will reduce Older People Day Care Services to Monday to Friday Only

It is proposed to reduce service provision in 4-day care units for older people from 6/7day services to Mon-Friday only. This will impact on 24 service users. These service users will be offered services at other times. This will result in a reduction of 8 FTE.

Currently there are 10 day services for older people across Glasgow, delivering a maximum of 1,650 placements per week to eligible older people. The service operates flexibly across a 7 day period. The aim of the service is to reduce social isolation and support them to remain stimulated. The service offers a range of supports which include personalised social activities to meet the needs and outcomes of users, along with personal care and support. This includes: -

- Physical exercise programmes
- Gardening
- Hobbies and crafts
- Games
- Music therapy
- Personal care (support to eat, drink, continence etc)
- Lunch is provided along with snacks and drinks throughout the day
- Transport to and from the service is available via minibus

The service is accessed via a Social Work assessment of need and is chargeable. Service users are means tested as part of their wider care and support package. The current charges for the service is £18.24 per day which is means tested, while all service users are expected to

pay £3.71 for their lunch each day they attend.

It is noted that current weekend provision is underutilised and has been since pre Covid-19, despite actively encouraging uptake. Due to underutilisation, current service users are offered transport arrangement to venues outwith their catchment area. However, there will be an impact for service users, and their carers, currently using the weekend services.

To mitigate impact on service users, we would aim to align current service users to available days during the week, on a case-by-case basis, this may not as fully meet service users needs and will remove an element of personal choice. For weekend support, there would be a referral and subsequent assessment by Social Work Team to consider access to alternate provision. Ongoing work will be required to monitor the impact of this reduction, including individual engagement with service users and their carers to support service users through this change, taking into consideration their individual needs.

This option is part of a larger review of operational Older People's Day Care. An equality impact assessment will be undertaken as part of the development of any recommendations and made available as part of decision making. Ongoing engagement with Service users will be a key part of this process.

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: Robin Wallace Afton Hill	Date of Lead Reviewer Training: 26 January 2023
---	---

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):

--

	<i>Example</i>	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required	
1.	What equalities information	<i>A sexual health service</i>	Assessments and reviews through Carefirst routinely	Work is currently taking place

	<p>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><i>collects service user data covering all 9 protected characteristics to enable them to monitor patterns of use.</i></p>	<p>record equalities information, covering all the protected characteristics listed in section 7 of this EQIA. Information collected forms part of an individual's outcome-based support plan. Some data capturing is also undertaken manually.</p>	<p>to improve data input quality in Carefirst. This will in turn help to improve recording and analysis of information by protected characteristics.</p>
	<p>Example</p>	<p>Service Evidence Provided</p>	<p>Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required</p>	
<p>2.</p>	<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 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 <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>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 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)</i></p>	<p>Analysis of current social work case management systems by protected characteristic helped to ensure an equalities sensitive approach was taken as part of the engagement with service users and to support them through transition, with an aim of minimising the impact, wherever possible</p>	<p>As per above, work is underway to improve data quality, including information by protected characteristics. However, if necessary a sample audit of caseloads may also have to be undertaken.</p>

	characteristics. 4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/>			
		<i>Example</i>	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
3.	<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 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 type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>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 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).</i></p>	<p>There is no current research or evidence available applicable to the reduction in these services. However, there was individual support and engagement with service users, as outlined below.</p>	
		<i>Example</i>	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
4.	Can you give details of how	<i>A money advice service</i>	Day Care management initiated a process of	

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.

Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).

- 1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- 2) Promote equality of opportunity
- 3) Foster good relationships between protected characteristics
- 4) Not applicable

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.

(Due regard to promoting equality of opportunity)

**** The Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017 requires organisations to take actions to reduce poverty for children in households at risk of low incomes.***

consultation with all service users who attend a service at the weekend; the consultation establishing their current attendance patterns, whether alternative arrangements would be required as assessed, whether Carer's Assessment would be required and opportunity to raise any concerns.

Overview of the Engagement, The results, comments and opportunity for mitigating action have been added under the relevant sections below:

Question	Yes	No	Comment
Do you attend on other days at the centre?	92%	8%	Vast majority already attend the centre on a day mid-week
Would you benefit from an alternative day Mon-Fri?	92%	8%	Majority feel they would also benefit from an alternative, which they've expressed a preference. Current vacancies would allow for this provision to happen in the service that they're currently receiving support.
Would you require alternative care arrangements e/g/ Care At Home on a Saturday?	20%	80%	5 service users advised that they would need some alternative care, and that their carers would source support from Care At Home if required.
Would your carer	0%	100%	No assessments required.

			require support on a Saturday? If so, would they benefit from a Carer's Assessment ?				
			Any other concerns regarding this proposed change?	4%	96%	One carer commented that there was disappointment as it would affect his respite.	
		Example	Service Evidence Provided				Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
5.	<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, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>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. (Due regard to remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation).</i></p>	<p>All Day Centres are fully DDA compliant and meet all legislative requirements for disability access.</p> <p>All areas are wheelchair accessible</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 type="checkbox"/></p>			
	<i>Example</i>	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required	
6.	<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 type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Written materials were offered in other languages and formats.</i></p> <p><i>(Due regard to remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation and promote equality of opportunity).</i></p>	<p>The programme of work was undertaken in line with the principles set out in GCHSCP's Participation and Engagement Strategy to ensure information is provided in an accessible way and format appropriate to individuals' needs.</p>	<p>At an individual level, it may be necessary to bring in Independent Advocacy Services to support understanding and participation.</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>		
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>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Age Profile</u></p> <p>60 – 80 years – 28% Over 80 – 72%</p> <p>This service is specifically targeted at vulnerable older people and any change is therefore more likely to have an impact on this group. Current service users will be offered available days during the week on a case-by-case basis, but this may not as fully meet service users needs and will remove an element of personal choice.</p> <p>It is noted that current weekend provision is underutilised and has been since pre Covid-19, despite actively encouraging uptake.</p> <p>Moving to a weekday provision, may also have an</p>	<p>To mitigate impact on service users, we engaged with service users individually and aligned them to available days during the week. For existing service users this has been accommodated within the service currently being accessed.</p> <p>20% of service users identified that they would require alternative care at the weekend and have been referred to Care at Home, as required.</p> <p>Ongoing work will be required</p>

	<p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>impact on those experiencing social isolation and loneliness, as this is a key aim of the service.</p> <p>‘10% of people over 50 say they feel lonely most or all of the time. This figure rises to 17% among those who live alone. <i>Source: AgeScotland, 2021</i></p> <p>52% of Day Care service users live alone.</p>	<p>to monitor the impact of this reduction, including future service users and supporting service users and their carers through this change.</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 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 type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Disability profile</u></p> <p>65% are living with dementia 13.4% are wheelchair users 10% have been diagnosed with a mental health issue 16% have a significant visual impairment 15% have a significant hearing impairment 5% required support from more than 1 staff member</p> <p>A significant proportion of the service users have identified themselves as having a disability or long term condition, therefore any change is likely to have an impact on this group. Current service users will be offered available days during the week on a case-by-case basis, but this may not as fully meet service users needs and will remove an element of personal choice.</p> <p>It is noted that current weekend provision is underutilised and has been since pre Covid-19, despite actively encouraging uptake.</p> <p>Moving to a weekday provision, may also have an impact on those experiencing social isolation and loneliness, as this is a key aim of the service.</p> <p>‘those with physical health problems, long-term</p>	<p>Mitigation and monitoring as outlined above.</p>

		<p>conditions or disability are two times more likely to report severe loneliness than the general population.’ <i>Source: NHS Health Scotland: Social isolation and loneliness in Scotland</i></p> <p>52% of Day Care service users live alone.</p>	
	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 type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Limited information was available. However there may be higher risk of social isolation and lack familial care support.</p>	
	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
(d)	Marriage and Civil Partnership	No disproportionate impact envisaged.	

	<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>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 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>	No disproportionate impact envisaged.	

	4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/>		
	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 type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Race Profile</u></p> <p>96% of service users identify as White British which is representative of the demographic profile of the wider community/age group.</p> <p>Woodside, Orchard Grove and Hawthorn House Day Centres were originally established to support services to Asian communities of Glasgow. Currently the service user profile of these services support 17 individuals who identify with an Asian ethnicity (3% of overall attendees).</p> <p>Importantly, Hawthorn was established to support people from the Chinese community, but currently does not provide a service to anyone identifying with this ethnic grouping.</p>	<p>This requires further examination and engagement with the Chinese community to understand the reasons why previous service users have opted not to return or join the service.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that no disproportionate impact is envisaged, is acknowledged that within this protected characteristic, there may be individuals whose first language is not English and who require additional communication 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>No disproportionate impact envisaged.</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 type="checkbox"/></p>		
	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
(h)	<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 type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Sex Profile</u></p> <p>Female – 70% Male – 30%</p> <p>Given the current profile of service users, there is more likely to be an impact on females.</p> <p>It is also recognised that a disproportionate number of carers are female, potentially on low incomes. A reduction in provision or increase in waiting list will have an impact on service users as well as carers.</p> <p>During the engagement, a Carer highlighted that the reduction in weekend provision will have an impact on their respite.</p> <p>A Carer’s assessment was discussed as part of the engagement, but none of the current service users currently require this.</p>	<p>Cognizance will be taken of the fact that a disproportionate number of carers are female, potentially on low incomes. Opportunities will therefore be taken to explore if people may be entitled to other benefits or income, with referrals made to appropriate agencies.</p> <p>Carers engaged in the consultation process, and their needs taken into account.</p> <p>Refer Carers for assessment, where appropriate.</p>
(i)	<p>Sexual Orientation</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the protected characteristic of Sexual Orientation?</p>	<p>Limited information was available. However there may be higher risk of social isolation</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 type="checkbox"/></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>Seven useful questions to consider when seeking to demonstrate ‘due regard’ in relation to the Duty:</p>	<p>There is a direct correlation between disability and low income or reliance on state benefits. Accordingly there is a higher proportion of people with a disability living in areas of deprivation.</p> <p>It is also recognised that carers are likely to experience significant financial challenges that may have a negative impact on their health and wellbeing.</p> <p>It therefore follows that any potential reduction to a care package budget may have a greater impact on people on lower incomes who are unable to supplement their support by other financial means if they wished to do so.</p>	

	<p>1. What evidence has been considered in preparing for the decision, and are there any gaps in the evidence?</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>4. Are some communities of interest or communities of place more affected by disadvantage in this case than others?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>6. How has the evidence been weighed up in reaching our final decision?</p> <p>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 into the final decision.</p>		
(k)	<p>Other marginalised groups</p> <p>How have you considered the specific impact on other groups including homeless people, prisoners and ex-</p>	<p>Limited information was available for marginalised groups accessing the service.</p> <p>The particular needs of marginalised will be taken</p>	

	<p>offenders, ex-service personnel, people with addictions, people involved in prostitution, asylum seekers & refugees and travellers?</p>	<p>into account during individual assessments and reviews.</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 characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>This EQIA aligns with the IJB Financial Allocations and Budgets 2023-24 paper, presented to IJB members in March 2023. This proposal will reduce Older People Day Care Services to Monday to Friday Only.</p> <p>This service is directly targeted at vulnerable groups. The service is currently provided to 31 people, on weekends; 72% are 80 years old or above and 100% are aged 60 or above. 13% are wheelchair users, 16% have a significant visual impairment, 15% have a significant hearing impairment, 10% have been diagnosed with a mental health issue and 65% have a dementia diagnosis. Therefore, older disabled people are most likely to be impacted by any reduction in service.</p> <p>It is noted that current weekend provision is underutilised and has been since pre Covid-19, despite actively encouraging uptake. Due to underutilisation, current service users are offered transport arrangement to venues outwith their catchment area. However, there will be an impact for service users, and their carers, currently using the weekend services.</p> <p>The assessment is based on the current practice, it is recognised that mitigation is dependent upon other supports and services and any changes or reductions in these interrelated services should be considered as part of the ongoing review process.</p>	<p>To mitigate impact on service users, we engaged with service users individually and aligned them to available days during the week. For existing service users this has been accommodated within the service currently being accessed.</p> <p>20% of service users identified that they would require alternative care at the weekend and have been referred to Care at Home, as required.</p> <p>Ongoing work will be required to monitor the impact of this reduction, including future service users and supporting service users and their carers.</p>
	<p>Service Evidence Provided</p>	<p>Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action</p>	

			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.	All HSCP staff are encouraged to complete the Equality Training on GOLD (Council Staff) and Learnpro (NHS Staff) there are also monthly emails promoting current equality training to all staff.	

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.

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* .

Compliance with GCHSCP's Participation and Engagement Strategy will meet PANEL principles

*

- **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.

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)

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)
---------------------	-------------------------------

Ongoing work will be required to monitor the impact of this reduction, including future service users and supporting service users and their carers.	October 2023	
--	--------------	--

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

Lead Reviewer:
EQIA Sign Off:

Name Robin Wallace
Job Title Head of Older People, Residential and Day Care Services



Signature
Date 04/05/23

Quality Assurance Sign Off:

Name Alastair Low
Job Title Planning Manager
Signature
Date 04/05/23

**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:			

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