

Appendix 'B'

Section 4

# Equality Analysis Toolkit

**Floating Support**  
For Decision Making Items

November 2011

## **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 - [EHRC - New public sector equality duty guidance](#)

Document 2 "Equality Analysis and the Equality Duty: Guidance for Public Authorities" may also be used for reference as necessary.

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 Directorate 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 in funding for generic floating support services from £2.8 million to £1.3 million

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

Reduction in funding for generic floating support services from £2.8 million to £1.3 million through:

- reconfiguring the services to provide a greater emphasis on short term interventions
- having a more joined up approach with other preventative services and community resources so that individuals can access support for lifestyle and behaviour type issues from other services (e.g. Integrated Wellbeing Service) and local community resources

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.

This is a county wide service serving a large range of groups/populations across all districts. The impact is not likely to be greater in any one area of Lancashire.

**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.

<b>Yes</b>
------------

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.

### **Client Record Data 2013/14**

Client record data provides a profile of every service user who has accessed the service. The data can be broken down by age, disability, gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, nationality, religion or belief, marriage or civil partnership status where a service user has disclosed the information.

A summary data report outlining the profile of people accessing provision across Lancashire is embedded below



Client Record Data  
Floating Support La

The most accurate comparison would be between the profile of people accessing services and the profile of people within Lancashire with a need for floating support services. However, as this data is not available, we have used the population of Lancashire as our comparator group.

<b>Ethnic Origin</b>	<b>Lancs (16+)</b>	<b>Floating Support</b>
White	93.52%	94.44%
Mixed/multiple ethnic group	0.74%	1.04%
Asian/Asian British	5.14%	2.53%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	0.37%	0.74%
Other ethnic group	0.23%	0.94%

<b>Sex</b>	<b>Lancs. (16+)</b>	<b>Floating Support</b>
Males:	49%	31.76%
Females:	51%	68.19%

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Lancs. (16+)</b>	<b>Floating Support</b>
Disabled	23.71%	39%
Not disabled	76.29%	61%

The above tables show that we are supporting

- A greater proportion of people with disabilities than the comparator group
- A marginally smaller proportion of people from minority ethnic groups than the comparator group
- A greater proportion of women than the comparator group

## 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 on the proposed reduction in funding and proposals for the re-shaping of floating support has taken place with the following groups of stakeholders between August and October 2014:-

- **Internal and External Stakeholders- including District Local Authority Housing Leads** (550 organisations/key stakeholders were emailed the proposals and notified of the dates of the consultation event). The online questionnaire was available between 4/8/2014 and 8/10/14. A total of 20 responses were received from stakeholders with additional feedback from districts leads on the draft proposals. In addition two stakeholder consultation events were held in Preston on 11/9/14 (32 people attended) with a follow up event held on 2/10/14 at which the draft proposals, which incorporated feedback from the first event, were presented (40 people attended). Most of those who attended were either current providers, members of local advice agencies or district housing leads.
- **Current and Former Service Users-** 1,100 people were consulted by questionnaire which was circulated in the middle of September 2014.

In the case of service users, information currently available has been used to inform this Equality Analysis (i.e. information from 99 service users)

A full report outlining the consultation responses is attached.





One of the respondents to the stakeholder consultation did say that they thought that the proportion of cuts was disproportionate and that it would have been better if the short term accommodation based proposals had also been available at the same time as there could have been opportunities to deliver floating support into sheltered accommodation and short term accommodation based services.

There are still 600k savings to be identified. Consequently, we are now working with districts to identify how we can reconfigure short term accommodation based services to achieve greater efficiencies and meet strategic priorities. However, this needs to be done in an individual service by service basis.

Initially, the current split of savings was proposed as there were thought to be more opportunities to reconfigure sheltered housing services and to find alternative ways to deliver floating support through working with the integrated well-being services and making links with asset based approaches.

The future service model for floating support has been developed following two consultation events with stakeholders, responses to the electronic stakeholder questionnaire and service user feedback. The first workshop focussed on generating ideas and the second event focussed on consulting on a more detailed service model

### **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.

Given the high level of proposed savings, it is predicted that overall there will be a significant impact on people in need of housing related support services.

However, it is anticipated that the impact of reduced funding will likely lead to similar proportions of people with protected characteristics accessing services as occurs now. This means that there will be a higher proportion of people with disabilities and a higher number of women than the general population affected by the proposals as these groups are currently receiving a greater proportion of services than the local population.

We are assuming that the profile will be similar on the basis that currently the needs of applicants are assessed and prioritised in line with providers' policies, which gives greater priority to people in housing need, and this will continue to be the case in the future.

#### **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.

Yes. Given the high proportion of people who are not working and dependent on benefits, it is possible that the decision could combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on particular groups. (e.g. welfare reforms)

However, we are seeking to reconfigure the service in such a way that we will mitigate some of the impact of the reduction in funding for floating support service (see section 6)

### **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 recommendation is to continue with the proposal to reduce the level of funding for services to £1.3 million.

### **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.

The following table shows how we are trying to mitigate the impact through reconfiguration of services. It is proposed that:

- the service is refocused to provide shorter intervention for about 60% of people accessing services;
- the floating support service works in a more joined up way with the integrated well-being service, so that support in relation to linking with local communities and behavioural or lifestyle changes can be accessed through the Integrated Well Being Framework

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Current Model</b>	<b>Proposed Future Service Model</b>
<b>Service Model</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stand alone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the targeted services under the Integrated Well Being Service in order to facilitate more joined up approach and greater efficiencies</li> </ul>
<b>Aim</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To promote independence, social inclusion and improved quality of life (from contract)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To prevent homelessness and to prevent crises leading to homelessness</li> </ul>
<b>Elements of service</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short to medium term floating support</li> <li>• Outreach</li> <li>• Resettlement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phone/email advice only (Signposting)</li> <li>• Crisis intervention</li> <li>• Pre-tenancy work</li> <li>• Resettlement</li> <li>• Short to medium term floating support</li> <li>• Maintenance in the community</li> </ul>
<b>Access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access via two provider gateways</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder (e.g. districts) - direct access to providers</li> <li>• Member of the public – via the information and signposting element of the IWB Service</li> </ul>
<b>Proportion of service users</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not specified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signposting, crisis, resettlement, pre-tenancy: 60%</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short term floating support: 30%</li> <li>• Maintenance in the community: 10%</li> </ul>
<b>Duration of support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 2 years</li> <li>• The average duration is 4 to 5 months</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signposting: one off/up to a week</li> <li>• Crisis intervention: 4-6 weeks</li> <li>• Pre-tenancy work: 4 weeks</li> <li>• Resettlement: 4 weeks</li> <li>• Short to medium term floating support: 3-6 months</li> <li>• Maintenance in the community: periodic (e.g. quarterly, maintenance checks, facility for rapid re-engagement)</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic well being</li> <li>• Enjoy and achieve</li> <li>• Being healthy</li> <li>• Stay Safe</li> <li>• Positive Contribution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic wellbeing</li> <li>• Staying safe (maintenance of accommodation or securing accommodation)</li> <li>• May have some other outcomes for 40% receiving a longer term services but this will be subject to negotiation with provider and districts once we are clear about the profile of people accessing these services and the service required to best meet their needs</li> </ul>

In addition, we are seeking to make efficiencies through introducing amendments to the way in which the services are contracted and monitored.

Therefore, although the reduction in funding will undoubtedly have a negative effect on the people of Lancashire with a need for housing related support, the current profile of people with protected characteristics accessing service is likely to remain similar

Although the capacity of the service will reduce, the proposed re-focusing of the service to deliver more short term interventions will offset some of the

potential impact that might have otherwise resulted.

### **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.

There is a need to achieve budget savings. In seeking how to best target the reduced funding, the objectives of the service have been more narrowly defined as prevention of homelessness and the prevention of crisis that might lead to homelessness.

In order to achieve this objective, we are proposing to re-configure the floating support service so that it can be accessed by the largest number of service users possible, but for a shorter period. This will result in a greater focus on support to stop evictions etc. and less focus on longer term interventions aiming at behavioural change. We are seeking to refer people for help with these issues to the Wellbeing Services and community resources. However, the capacity of those services to respond to these referrals is still unclear.

### **Question 8 – Final Proposal**

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

The final proposal is to reduce funding by £1.5 million (from £2.8 million

to £1.3 million) and to reconfigure services in line with the model developed in conjunction with stakeholders. This will be refined and finalised in the light of any further feedback from service users or stakeholder. This proposal will then form the basis for the service specification for the future tender

This model is being adopted with the aim of preventing homelessness and the prevention of a crisis that might lead to homelessness by maximising the opportunity to support individuals who require a short intervention to prevent homelessness and to offer additional support to some people who still appear to be at risk of homelessness without additional support.

In addition, we are proposing to have a more joined up approach with other preventative services, and community resources, so that individuals can access support for lifestyle and behaviour type issues from other services (e.g. Integrated Wellbeing Service) and local community resources

As a greater proportion of people who are disabled and who are female access services, they are likely to be most affected.

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

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

A range of measures will be used to manage implementation and review and monitor the effects of the proposal. These include:-

- Development of a service specification that fully outlines the requirements of the future
- Effective tender evaluation to appoint the most suitable provider(s)
- Development of KPI's, outcome measures and a period of service development to ensure that the new service(s) achieve their objectives



- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Monitoring of service users/referral data by protected characteristic</li></ul> |
|---|

Equality Analysis Prepared By Cathryn McCrink, Contract Officer, and Sarah McCarthy, Head of Supporting People

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

**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 Directorate's contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team.

Directorate 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 & Community Services Directorate

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

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

Contact for Environment Directorate, Lancashire County Commercial Group and One Connect Limited

Saulo Cwerner – Equality & Cohesion Manager

[Saulo.cwerner@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:Saulo.cwerner@lancashire.gov.uk)

Contact for Children & Young Peoples Directorate

Pam Smith – Equality & Cohesion Manager

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

Contact for Office of the Chief Executive and the County Treasurer's Directorate

Thank you