



Section 4

Equality

Analysis Toolkit

BOP051 Welfare Rights

For Decision Making Items

November 2015

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

AskEquality@lancashire.gov.uk

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis is available from your Service contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team or from Jeanette Binns

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Welfare Rights Service

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Welfare Rights is a service aimed at ensuring that people are aware of and receiving their maximum entitlement to state welfare benefits. It has been established when the Council pledged to help the elderly, disabled and disadvantaged groups such as families in poverty. The aim is to advise and help Lancashire citizens with their benefits entitlement as increasing benefit income not only helps individuals but also boosts the local economy.

The service offers free, confidential and impartial and independent advice and support on a whole range of welfare benefits from local bases around the County. In addition to the advice service, pro-active campaigns are developed in partnership with other agencies to obtain huge cash gains for people in hard to reach groups such as the very elderly.

In 2014/15, the Welfare Rights Service supported cases which brought £12.87M extra annual benefits for Lancashire residents.

The proposal is to reduce the capacity of the Welfare rights Service by 20% from 01/4/2016, and integrate the activities within the Health, Equity Welfare and Partnerships Service.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

Yes, the decision will impact on all citizens within the Lancashire County Council area as this is a county wide service.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality

- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes. For the purposes of this equality analysis the team undertook some sampling and established the following:

- Of a sample of 846 cases, 89% were classed as white British
- Of a sample of 3626 cases 37% were classed as either being disabled or enduring a long term illness and 27% were of pensionable age

Based on this albeit limited analysis, we can conclude that elderly, white British, and/or disabled or suffering from long term illness could be negatively affected by the proposal if appropriate mitigating actions are not developed and in place at the time implementation of the proposal.

In terms of the impact on staff outline plans suggest that any staff reductions will be achieved via natural wastage/voluntary redundancies there are no anticipated significant negative implications in terms of their protected characteristic.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

Yes

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

In addition to information provided in question 1 the team also engage on county wide thematic campaigns. In 2014/15 alone the service achieved the following:

Fast tracked 133 claims for cancer patients who have gained a total of £502,250 a year in benefits

Dealt with 28 cases of people suffering Mesothelioma (asbestos related) which led to 66 claims worth £612,000 in cash gains per year

Helped 300 pensioners increase their income totalling almost £550,000 a year.

The Pension Credit Mail shot campaign which is organised jointly with District Council has so far produced benefit gains of £145,000 for people in the seven district areas that participated.

Working with Preston and Lancaster Councils nearly 250 residents were identified as being entitled to Attendance Allowance. £575,000 has been secured in the first few months of that campaign with more people still awaiting outcomes.

Currently there is a campaign on going in partnership with District councils in

relation to ensuring that eligible families are aware of and know how to claim free school meals.

Each of these campaigns potentially benefit groups who fall within the 9 protected characteristic groups however in particular the elderly, disabled and young people benefit so any deviation from the present levels of service would lead to a negative impact.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

Plans are in place to consult with partners and the Voluntary sector (eg Citizens Advice Bureau) by 31 December 2015.

Statutory consultation process with staff and Trades Unions in line with existing county Council procedures will also take place before January 2016.

The results of the consultation will be analysed and taken into account when finalising the implementation of the proposal.

The findings of any consultation will be incorporated into this EA.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

An initial analysis has revealed that this proposal may detrimentally affect the elderly, young people and disabled if the present levels of service are not maintained.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Any changes to the service will need to be carefully managed as the service has a high profile with other agencies and statutory partners who routinely refer clients. In view of various benefit reforms nationally and changes to other county council services service users could easily become confused and bewildered if referrals are not directed and received in a straight forward way.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

The proposal will be reviewed following further analysis and upon results of the consultation

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

Mitigating actions are in the process of being developed and will be informed by the findings of the consultation.
--

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

This proposal has emerged following the need for the County council to make unprecedented budget savings. We acknowledge that there is the potential for the elderly, disabled and young people to be negatively affected however we will strive
--

to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible and by taking into account the views from the consultation. There is suggestion that this service should stop, it seeks to reduce the cost of the service.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

The proposal is to reduce the capacity of the Welfare rights Service by 20% from 01/4/2016, and integrate the activities within the Health, Equity Welfare and Partnerships Service. The proposal will be reviewed in light of any further analysis and results of consultation.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Appropriate monitoring procedures will be developed following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected

Equality Analysis Prepared By Karen Beaumont

Position/Role Equality & Cohesion Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head

Decision Signed Off By **Saeed Sidat**

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

Where specific actions are identified as part of the Analysis please ensure that an EAP001 form is completed and forwarded to your Service contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team.

Service contacts in the Equality & Cohesion Team are:

Karen Beaumont – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Karen.beaumont@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Adult Services ; Policy Information and Commissioning (Age Well); Health Equity, Welfare and Partnerships (PH); Patient Safety and Quality Improvement (PH).

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Community Services; Development and Corporate Services; Customer Access; Policy Commissioning and Information (Live Well); Trading Standards and Scientific Services (PH), Lancashire Pension Fund

Saulo Cwerner – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Saulo.cwerner@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Children's Services; Policy, Information and Commissioning (Start Well); Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help (PH); BTLS

Pam Smith – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Pam.smith@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Governance, Finance and Public Services; Communications; Corporate Commissioning (Level 1); Emergency Planning and Resilience (PH).

Thank you