

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00373 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Corporate & Housing Services Governance	Lead Officer Name:	David Keenan
		Team:	Policy & Development
		Tel:	01324501
		Email:	David.Keenan@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	The proposal is for the Integration Joint Board and its Committees to meet using a hybrid format, whereby some members will be able to attend in-person and others will be able to join online. It will not be mandatory for members to attend either in-person or online.	Reference No:	

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	No	Yes	No	No

Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	No	No	No	No

Other, please specify: Members of the Integration Joint Board

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):

18/11/2022	The Integration Joint Board will be asked at its meeting on 18 November to meet on a hybrid basis in 2023.

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:		Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average	
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:		
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:		
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:		
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:		
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)

A - Quantitative Evidence This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.

In total, there were 13 responses to the survey on meeting arrangements. There are currently 19 members of the IJB, however there is regular turnover in membership. 60% of members who responded to the survey ranked a hybrid meeting format as their first preference. 20% ranked in-person (fully physical) meetings as their first preference and 20% ranked a virtual format as their preference.

3 members indicated that they consider themselves to have a disability or health condition - 2 members stated that having a disability or health condition impacts their daily activities 'a little' and one member stated that their daily activities are impacted 'a lot'.

2 members stated that they are the primary carer of a disabled adult, 1 member is a primary carer of an older person, and 2 members are secondary carers.

All 13 members stated that adjustments or considerations are not required for them to be able to participate in any of the meeting arrangements.

Respondents did not express any further written comment regarding the impact of the proposed arrangements.

B - Qualitative Evidence This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.

Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other

Best Judgement:

Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	No
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	Not applicable.

What gaps in data / information were identified?	Given the limited scope of the survey, members were not asked if any of the proposed meeting arrangements would have a positive impact. Therefore, this impact assessment cannot assess any positive impact. However, given that no member indicated that adjustments and considerations would need to be made for them to participate in meetings and that no member expressed any further written comment regarding the impact of the proposed arrangements, then this assessment can satisfy that there will be a neutral impact on the protected characteristic.
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	The results of the survey were conclusive, and no further research is required at this stage. However, there is regular turnover in the membership of the IJB and the EHRC advise that EPIAs should be kept under regular review, therefore further research/consultation will be conducted regularly.

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT

Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	Yes	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.	Members of the Falkirk Integration Joint Board.	
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.		
How was the engagement carried out?	What were the results from the engagement? Please list...	
Focus Group	No	

Survey	Yes	<p>In total, there were 13 responses to the survey on meeting arrangements. There are currently 19 members of the IJB, however there is regular turnover in membership. 60% of members who responded to the survey ranked a hybrid meeting format as their first preference. 20% ranked in-person (fully physical) meetings as their first preference and 20% ranked a virtual format as their preference.</p> <p>7 respondents identified as male and 6 identified as female.</p> <p>1 respondent is aged 35-44, 3 are aged 45-54, 7 are aged 55-64 and 2 are aged 65+.</p> <p>10 respondents identified as being heterosexual, 2 identified as being lesbian and 1 identified as being 'other'.</p> <p>5 respondents identified as having no religion or belief, 6 identified as Christian, and 2 respondents did not wish to disclose their religion or belief.</p> <p>12 respondents identified as 'white' and 1 respondent did not state their ethnicity.</p> <p>3 members indicated that they consider themselves to have a disability or health condition - 2 members stated that having a disability or health condition impacts their daily activities 'a little' and one member stated that their daily activities are impacted 'a lot'.</p> <p>2 members stated that they are the primary carer of a disabled adult, 1 member is a primary carer of an older person, and 2 members are secondary carers.</p> <p>All 13 members stated that adjustments or considerations are not required for them to be able to participate in any of the meeting arrangements.</p> <p>Respondents did not express any further written comment regarding the impact of the proposed arrangements.</p>
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify		

Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	No
Is further engagement recommended?	No

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age	✓			All respondents to the survey stated that no considerations or adjustments would need to be made for them to participate in any of the meeting formats. No written comments were left which would indicate a negative impact on this protected characteristic. However, given the limited scope of the survey, members were not asked about any possible positive impact the proposals may have. Therefore, the impact on this protected group is assessed as being neutral.
Disability	✓			All respondents to the survey stated that no considerations or adjustments would need to be made for them to participate in any of the meeting formats. No written comments were left which would indicate a negative impact on this protected characteristic. However, given the limited scope of the survey, members were not asked about any possible positive impact the proposals may have. Therefore, the impact on this protected group is assessed as being neutral.
Sex	✓			All respondents to the survey stated that no considerations or adjustments would need to be made for them to participate in any of the meeting formats. No written comments were left which would indicate a negative impact on this protected characteristic. However, given the limited scope of the survey, members were not asked about any possible positive impact the proposals may have. Therefore, the impact on this protected group is assessed as being neutral.
Ethnicity	✓			All respondents to the survey stated that no considerations or adjustments would need to be made for them to participate in any of the meeting formats. No written comments were left which would indicate a negative impact on this protected characteristic. However, given the limited scope of the survey, members were not asked about any possible positive impact the proposals may have. Therefore, the impact on this protected group is assessed as being neutral.

Religion / Belief / non-Belief	✓			All respondents to the survey stated that no considerations or adjustments would need to be made for them to participate in any of the meeting formats. No written comments were left which would indicate a negative impact on this protected characteristic. However, given the limited scope of the survey, members were not asked about any possible positive impact the proposals may have. Therefore, the impact on this protected group is assessed as being neutral.
Sexual Orientation	✓			All respondents to the survey stated that no considerations or adjustments would need to be made for them to participate in any of the meeting formats. No written comments were left which would indicate a negative impact on this protected characteristic. However, given the limited scope of the survey, members were not asked about any possible positive impact the proposals may have. Therefore, the impact on this protected group is assessed as being neutral.
Transgender	✓			All respondents to the survey stated that no considerations or adjustments would need to be made for them to participate in any of the meeting formats. No written comments were left which would indicate a negative impact on this protected characteristic. However, given the limited scope of the survey, members were not asked about any possible positive impact the proposals may have. Therefore, the impact on this protected group is assessed as being neutral.
Pregnancy / Maternity	✓			This mostly relates to employment and was not applicable for the purpose of this survey.
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			This mostly relates to employment and was not applicable for the purpose of this survey.
Poverty	✓			All respondents to the survey stated that no considerations or adjustments would need to be made for them to participate in any of the meeting formats. No written comments were left which would indicate a negative impact on this protected characteristic. However, given the limited scope of the survey, members were not asked about any possible positive impact the proposals may have. Therefore, the impact on this protected group is assessed as being neutral.
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.	✓			All respondents to the survey stated that no considerations or adjustments would need to be made for them to participate in any of the meeting formats. No written comments were left which would indicate a negative impact on this protected characteristic. However, given the limited scope of the survey, members were not asked about any possible positive impact the proposals may have. Therefore, the impact on this protected group is assessed as being neutral.

Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)

--

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	Members' views have been taken into account and the proposed meeting arrangements will not unlawfully discriminate against any of the protected characteristics. Members did not indicate that the proposals would deny them access to meetings or make them unable to participate as a result of their protected characteristic.
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	A hybrid model will give members full flexibility in how they access and participate in meetings. This means that people who have caring responsibilities or who have disabilities will have the flexibility of being able to join the meeting remotely.
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	No	
Councils	No	
Education Sector	No	
Fire	No	
NHS	No	
Integration Joint Board	Yes	This proposal directly affects members of the Integration Joint Board.
Police	No	
Third Sector	No	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

All respondents to the survey stated that they do not require any considerations or adjustments for them to be able to participate in Board/Committee meetings.

Are actions being reported to Members?	No
If yes when and how ?	

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	Yes	The Members' survey informed the proposal. Members indicated a preference for a hybrid meeting format; therefore, the proposal is to have a hybrid meeting format for the IJB.
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	No	
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:	<i>David Keenan</i>	Date:	08/11/2022
------------	---------------------	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA:	Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	Yes
------------------------------------	---	-----

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS	Consultation completed	
If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA		
If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA		

Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	Yes / No	If YES, please describe:

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA

LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	No	
MEDIUM	No	
LOW	Yes	

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:	<i>Colin Moodie</i>	Date:	09/11/2022