



# Appendix M

# Equality

# Analysis Toolkit

Young People and Teenage Parents  
Supported Accommodation Services

For Decision Making Items

## **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](mailto: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](mailto:Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk)

## **Name/Nature of the Decision**

Reduction of Supporting People (SP) funding from £2.45 Million to £1.35 million for housing related support within supported accommodation for young people and teenage parents from 31st March 2017

## **What in summary is the proposal being considered?**

Lancashire County Council needs to make savings of £262m by 2020/21. This extremely difficult financial position is due to continued cuts in Government funding, rising costs and rising demand for our key services.

As part of its plan to achieve the overall level of savings required, LCC is proposing to:

- cease SP funding for non-statutory services from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017, but
- retain £1.35 million of funding to enable LCC to meet its statutory duties to young people (16/17 year olds).

Given that the total funding which was previously available for services for people between the ages of 16 and 25 and teenage parents was £2.45 million, the proposed reduction is £1.1 million.

Consequently this EA focuses on the proposal to withdraw funding for support from the following services:

- Supported accommodation and supported lodgings for young people
- Supported accommodation for teenage parents

As services are jointly funded with rental/housing benefit income we don't know what this will mean for each service, however there is a possibility for any or some of the following to take place:

- the service closes;
- the service continues with major changes (e.g. reduction in number of staff);
- the service continues with little change as your provider has managed to obtain other funding (e.g. from charities not Supporting People)

As part of the consultation, we asked providers to give us details of their current plans. The responses received have been included within Question 2.

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.

As the services affected cover every district local authority area the decision is likely to affect people across the county in a similar way.

**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. The services concerned cater for young adults aged 16-25. As the services are targeted at vulnerable young people the profile of service users does include a higher than average number of people with protected characteristics.

A detailed breakdown illustrating the characteristics of young people who have used services during the financial year 2015/16 has been included as part of the response to question 1.

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

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.

77 units of supported housing are commissioned for young people and 15 units for teenage parents. The number of units of supported housing commissioned in each district is shown below

The service provides short term housing and support to young people who are vulnerable and unable to live independently in the community, thereby enabling them to develop some of the skills required to move on successfully to more independent living or to return home to family where this is a safe and appropriate outcome. Currently the accommodation and housing management is funded from rents and housing benefit and the support is funded from the SP Budget. The annual spend is £2.45 million

### Young People

District Council	Number of Units
Lancaster	47
Fylde	12
Wyre	24
Supported Lodgings North	9

Preston	27
Chorley	18
South Ribble	23
West Lancs	10
Supported Lodgings Central/South	14
Burnley	22
Pendle	19
Rossendale	14
Hyndburn	11
Ribble Valley	7
Burnley Pendle, Rossendale, Hyndburn (dispersed units)	85
Supported Lodgings East	13

### Teenage Parents

<b>District Council</b>	<b>Number of Units</b>
Chorley	6
East	9

During the financial year 2015/16, 616 young people and 27 teenage parents entered supported accommodation in Lancashire. Support is short term in nature and accessed by a range of vulnerable adults inclusive of all protected characteristics. Demographic information is collected by the service provider when the service commences delivery. However the data availability is subject to service user willingness to disclose and therefore information in relation to some of the protected characteristics is unavailable.

Information on marital status/civil partnership and pregnancy/maternity is not collected under the existing system of data collection and is therefore not included below.

<b>Client Age</b>	<b>Teenage Parents Services</b>		<b>Young people at risk Services</b>		<b>Total</b>
16-17	8	30%	223	36%	231
18-21	15	56%	297	48%	312
22-25	3	11%	71	12%	74
Other ages	1	3%	25	4%	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>643</b>



Is the client a disabled person?	Teenage Parents Services		Young people at risk Services		Total
Don't Know			2		2
No	25	93%	524	85%	549
Yes	2	7%	90	15%	92
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>643</b>

Client Gender	Teenage Parents Services		Young people at risk Services		Total
Female	26	96%	262	43%	288
Male	1	4%	354	57%	355
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>643</b>

Ethnic origin of client	Teenage Parents Services		Young people at risk Services		Total
Asian/Asian British:		0%	2	0.32%	2
Asian/Asian British:		0%	3	0.49%	3
Asian/Asian British: Indian		0%	3	0.49%	3
Asian/Asian British: Other		0%	4	0.65%	4
Asian/Asian British:		0%	9	1.46%	9
Black or Black British:		0%	2	0.32%	2
Black or Black British:		0%	2	0.32%	2
Black or Black British:		0%	3	0.49%	3
Mixed: Other		0%	1	0.16%	1
Mixed: White & Asian		0%	9	1.46%	9
Mixed: White & Black		0%	8	1.30%	8
Other: Other		0%	2	0.32%	2
White British	27	100%	568	92.21%	595
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>643</b>

What is the client's religion?	Teenage Parents Services		Young people at risk Services		Total
Buddhist		0%	3	0%	3
Christian (All Denominations)	12	44%	85	14%	97
Does not wish to disclose		0%	45	7%	45
Muslim		0%	14	2%	14
None	7	26%	382	62%	389
Not Known	7	26%	81	13%	88
Other	1	4%	6	1%	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>643</b>

<b>What is the client's sexual orientation?</b>	<b>Teenage Parents Services</b>		<b>Young people at risk Services</b>		<b>Total</b>
Bisexual	1	4%	20	3%	21
Does not wish to disclose		0%	28	5%	28
Gay Man		0%	12	2%	12
Heterosexual	26	96%	542	88%	568
Lesbian		0%	14	2%	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>643</b>

<b>Does the client consider themselves transgender?</b>	<b>Teenage Parents Services</b>		<b>Young people at risk Services</b>		<b>Total</b>
Don't Know		0%	18	3%	18
No	26	96%	597	97%	623
Yes	1	4%	1	0%	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>643</b>

## **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)

### **Consultation Process**

#### **Meetings**

- A separate meeting was held with district councils (commissioners) and providers on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2015 to inform them of the proposal to cease SP funding from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017.
- Eleven out of twelve district council (commissioners) attending the above meeting.
- Approximately 60 providers attended the provider meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2015
- LCC staff attended the Wyre and Fylde Health and Wellbeing Task Group on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016 and discussions were held with providers and stakeholders
- Meeting held with district councils on 4<sup>th</sup> July to consider interim consultation findings
- A number of meetings have been held with district councils and young people's service providers regarding the future shape of services

## Questionnaire

Paper questionnaires with a reply slip were either posted directly to service users or sent to providers for them to hand out to individual residents of young people's and teenage parent's accommodation. This included 227 young people and 24 teenage parents.

An online version of the questionnaire could also be accessed from [www.lancashire.gov.uk](http://www.lancashire.gov.uk)

The fieldwork ran for twelve weeks from 11 April until 17 July 2016. In total, 163 completed questionnaires were returned. 158 responses were received from service users of supported accommodation for young people and 5 responses were received from service users of supported accommodation for teenage parents.

Three other separate online questionnaires were made available to Lancashire's 12 district councils, other stakeholders and providers of young people's and teenage parents' supported accommodation. The questionnaire for each group was designed to give each an opportunity to outline what they think the impact of the proposal will be on service users, on their respective organisations and on the wider community.

**Summaries of service user, district, stakeholder and provider responses have been provided in the Consultation Findings (see Appendix N).**

Key issues highlighted by the 8 providers who responded included:-

- There was concern around future funding with many providers considering alternative delivery methods, funding routes or closure resulting in job losses
- General concerns around projected increase in homelessness, rough sleeping and sofa surfing among young people
- A belief that demand on other statutory services eg children's services, health, primary care, substance misuse services would increase if the needs of vulnerable young people could not be met in future
- An expected increase in crime and anti-social behaviour with consequent impact on communities and the police

Key issues highlighted by stakeholders including district councils included:-

- Impact on service users- concerns around increased homelessness/rough sleeping/sofa surfing; reduction in supported accommodation/levels of support needed to meet needs and develop life/tenancy skills and increased mental health issues
- Impact on organisation- concerns around increased pressure on district

homeless teams,/increased levels of homeless presentations; increased homelessness and increased use of unsuitable temporary accommodation at greater cost

- Impact on community- concerns again centred around a projected increase in homelessness/rough sleeping/sofa surfing; increased pressure on emergency acute services eg NHS, police and increased levels of crime and anti-social behaviour in the community. In addition several respondents commented on the potential impact on children's social care of the proposed reduction in funding, particularly in respect of teenage parents services.

Key issues highlighted by service users included:-

- The most commonly used aspects of the service were those concerned with claiming the right benefits , learning how to budget, setting up home and help with accessing training and education
- The most valued aspects of the service was overwhelmingly the provision of the accommodation itself; the availability of the dedicated support within the accommodation plus all of the issues mentioned above
- If the service was no longer available many young people and teenage parents feared that they would be homeless or placed in unsuitable accommodation. Many said that they would have to approach family/friends and the district councils for help
- Respondents made some other more general comments about the role the service played in preventing homelessness; the value of the support they received and the impact on their mental health in particular if the service was no longer available

### **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.

The demographic information outlined in the response to question 1 seems to suggest that some people with protected characteristics will be disproportionately affected by the proposal:-

#### **Age Profile**

By virtue of the targeted age range of the service, young people aged 16-25 will be disproportionately affected by the proposal to reduce funding. Moreover the proposal to use any reserved funding to meet LCC's statutory duty to 16/17 year olds may disproportionately impact more heavily on young people aged 18 plus if eligibility for service is restricted.

#### **Gender**

A majority of those who used the young people services in 2015/16 are male (57%) while 26 out of 27 users of the teenage parent's services in 2015/16 were female (96%). This contrasts with 51% of the population in Lancashire being female and 49% being male. Accordingly it would appear that males will be disproportionately affected by the proposal to reduce funding in young people's services and females will be disproportionately affected in services for teenage parents.

#### **Disability**

15% of service users who used the young people's services and 7% of those using the teenage parent's services considered themselves to be disabled. Whereas in Lancashire (2011 census) 9.8% of the population said their activities were limited a

lot and 10.2% said they were limited a little by a disability or health condition. This would suggest that there are less people accessing services who are disabled than the wider population, however this is to be expected given that disability tends to increase with age. People who are disabled would not appear to be negatively disproportionately impacted

### **Ethnicity**

The race/ ethnicity profile of service users appears to be broadly representative of the wider population as 92.3% are white British and 7.79 from BME communities compared to 92% of the Lancashire population being White British and 7.7% from BME communities. No ethnic groups appear to be disproportionately impacted.

### **Religion**

The religious profile of service users appears to show that a much higher number of young people and teenage parents have no religious belief (62% and 26% respectively) compared to the wider population where 19% are identified as having no religion. There appears to be a lower proportion of Christians and Muslims than the wider population. Consequently, no religious group appears to be disproportionately impacted.

### **Sexual Orientation**

The sexual orientation profile of service users appears to show that 7% of service users in young people's services identified as LGBT. Stonewall have estimated about 5-7% of the Lancashire population is LGB whilst ONS had a figure around 1%. This suggests that based on the census, young people who are LGBT are likely to be disproportionately impacted.

### **Gender Reassignment**

The gender re-assignment profile of service users appears to be lower in young people's services than the figures identified in other consultation exercises. Whilst the % appears higher in teenage parents supported accommodation, this is largely due to the low numbers of service users

### **Marriage**

Of the people who responded to the consultation: 1% said that they were in a civil partnership, none of the respondents said that they were married and 98% preferred not to say or didn't provide a response or said it was none of the options. Other consultations have included around 50-60% of respondents as married, 30-40% as not married and around 1-2% as being in civil partnerships. Consequently it is not possible to draw any conclusions.

### **Pregnancy**

6% of the respondents to the consultation are pregnant and do not have children which is higher than other consultations which have a figure of 2%. We cannot identify from either the SP data or other consultations, the number of women who were pregnant who also had children. Consequently, it is not possible to draw any

conclusions

Proposals to mitigate the impact of the proposals on protected groups, which appear to impact most heavily in respect of age and gender, have been included in response to question 6.

The consultation shows how supported accommodation:

- has helped people find accommodation, claim benefits and access training and education which fits the advancing equality of opportunity objective;
- helps service users to feel safe and avoid homelessness or being on the streets, which contributes to fostering good relations between communities/community cohesion;
- reduces anti-social behaviour which can increase tension in communities and can sometimes lead into hate crime;
- reduce sexual exploitation and domestic abuse.

Any reduction in funding will affect the above positive impact of services

#### **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.

The effects of the reduction in funding could combine with restrictions in housing benefit eligibility for young people, further planned national welfare reforms and other local proposals to make savings, to exacerbate the impact (e.g. changes in relation to other preventative services, the amount of funding available for statutory packages of care). The combined impact will impact particularly on young people who are over the age of 18.

#### **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

We are proposing to continue with the original proposal to reduce funding for young people and teenage parent's supported accommodation service.

However while the intention is to proceed with the original proposal in terms of reducing the current funding stream with effect from March 2017, the council intends to take steps to mitigate the effect of the funding reduction. This is outlined more fully in the next section of this report.

### **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.

Following the consultation feedback and internal dialogue with Children's Social Care there has been a recognition that we need to develop a more sustainable and planned approach to meeting the needs of care leavers and homeless young people.

Consequently LCC is seeking to explore the possibility of:

- pooling the £1.35m Supporting People funding retained to meet the statutory needs of 16/17 year olds with some of the resources currently being used for emergency placements by Children's Social Care
- reviewing the pathways into services
- reviewing the nature and shape of commissioned services

Pooling budgets and reconfiguring pathways and services is projected to deliver an overall saving to the Council.

Accordingly, in order to provide sufficient time to undertake the above review, the council is proposing to make approximately £500,000 available, of the planned



underspend from the 2016/17 Prevention and Early Help Fund budget, during 2017/18 to fund SP services for young people and teenage parents for an additional period of approximately six months from April 2017 to September 2017

If the outcome of the review is that funding will be withdrawn from specific SP services for young people and teenage parents, Cabinet Member approval will be sought at an appropriate time.

### **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. The Medium Term Financial Strategy reported in the November 2015 forecast that the County Council will have a financial shortfall of £262 million in its revenue budget in 2020/21.

This is a combination of reducing resources as a result of the Government's extended programme of austerity at the same time as the Council is facing significant increases in both the cost (for example as a result of inflation and the national living wage) and demand for its services.

The revised position following the financial settlement for 2016/17 is now a budget gap of £200.507m by 2020/21. This revised gap takes into account the impact of the settlement, new financial pressures and savings decisions taken by Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of Council services.

We acknowledge that some people from protected characteristics groups may 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.

The proposal to reduce funding from £2.45 million to £1.35 million by April 2017 would be likely to lead to the closure, or significant reconfiguration, of some services, including potentially the loss of the only service for young people in some

districts.

This would impact directly on young people with an age protected characteristic i.e. aged 16-25. In terms of gender, males would be disproportionately affected by the decision to withdraw funding from young people's services and females would be disproportionately affected by the decision to withdrawn funding from teenage parents accommodation.

As outlined above, we are seeking mitigate the impact by:

- exploring the opportunity to pool resource and reshape services
- making available transitional funding (from April 2017 – September 2017) to provide sufficient time to reach a decision regarding future funding arrangements and service delivery

If the outcome of the review is to propose that funding will be withdrawn from specific SP services, the Cabinet Member will be provided with details of the review and approval will be sought for the recommendation.

### **Question 8 – Final Proposal**

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

The final proposal is to proceed with the proposed reduction of funding for young peoples and teenage parents supported accommodation services to £1.35 million, whilst mitigating the effect by providing funding from budget underspends, for 6 months, to enable funding, services, and the housing and support pathways to be reviewed and reconfigured by September 2017.

### **Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements**

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

Progress will be monitored internally by the Supported Accommodation Learning Offer Project Board which is charged with overseeing this area of work.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Cathryn McCrink

Position/Role: Contracts Officer Supporting People

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head: Sarah McCarthy

Decision Signed Off By

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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:Pam.smith@lancashire.gov.uk)

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

Thank you