



## Equality Impact Assessment Toolkit

Publication code (leave blank – comms will complete this)

### Equality Impact Assessment Toolkit – Initial Screening

<b>Stage 1</b>	<b>IDENTIFY POLICY AIMS &amp; NEED FOR EIA</b>
<b>Title of Policy</b>	Strategic Intelligence & Risk Frameworks, and Key Deliverables for 2012/13
<b>Is this a new policy or changes to an existing policy?</b>	New frameworks were developed in 2011/12 and introduced from 2012/13
<b>Officer(S) responsible for carrying out EIA process</b>	Ingrid Gilray & Christina Naismith Overall responsibility – Gill Ottley

<b>What are the Aims and objectives of the policy?</b>	To provide frameworks for creating an internal culture of intelligence-based, risk-led working, and create the capacity to deliver this, within the Care Inspectorate.			
<b>Which protected characteristic(s), if any, will be affected by this policy?</b>	Protected characteristic	Yes	No	Don't Know
	Age	X		
	Disability	X		
	Gender Reassignment		X	
	Marriage / Civil Partnership		X	
	Pregnancy / maternity		X	
	Race		X	
	Religion or belief		X	
	Sex		X	
Sexual orientation		X		

**COMPLETION OF STAGE 1 & INITIAL SCREENING PROCESS**

If the policy (guidance, procedures, etc) will affect or impact negatively on any protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010, you should continue on and complete the full EIA template.

If there is no direct impact on any of the protected characteristics, this form should be signed below by the responsible officer to confirm a full EIA is not required. The form should then be authorised by a Senior Manager.

<b>Date of Initial Assessment</b>	
<b>This policy will have no impact on people from any of the protected characteristics above and a full Equality Impact Assessment is not required.</b>	<b>Name:</b>  <b>Position:</b>  <b>Date:</b>
<b>Authorised By (Senior Manager):</b>	<b>Name:</b>

**Full Equality Impact Assessment**

<b>Stage 2</b>	<b>COLLECT DATA AND CONSULT TO INFORM THE EIA</b>
<b>What do we already know about these groups?</b>	<p>Although the main focus of these frameworks is to improve how the Care Inspectorate works, there are aspects of the Frameworks and the Deliverables that could impact on groups of people with protected characteristics both within, and outwith the CI. As this work progresses, it will be important to ensure that this impact is positive and enabling, and does not discriminate against any of these groups.</p> <p>We believe that there is some potential to discriminate on the basis of age and or disability, and that we must take steps to guard against that.</p>
<b>Where are the gaps?</b>	
<b>What involvement or consultation have the Care Inspectorate carried out and what are the results?</b>	<p><b>In summer 2012, we conducted a survey of our staff to identify any potential for discrimination arising from the frameworks or the deliverables. The following is a summary of our findings.</b></p> <p><b>Summary of Equalities survey feedback</b></p> <p>Overall - 24 responses in total and all 24 didn't answer <b>every</b> question. This is a low response level, however it reflects the considerable time that respondents had to spend to read through the frameworks and deliverables before completing the survey. The 24 responses were well considered, and raised some important issues that have been taken into account.</p>

People were asked if they thought the 2 frameworks and the deliverables would have an impact on equalities, and responded to each of them in turn. If they answered "yes" to any of these questions, they were asked to describe the impact. A summary of these descriptions is provided below.

**Intelligence framework** - 23 responded, 5 (22%) thought it would have an impact on equalities.

The descriptions given about the potential impact focus on the positive impact the framework will have on equalities. For example, by using the intelligence available to us to target risks we will better protect people who use care services, including those with protected characteristics.

One respondent expressed concern about the impact that reducing routine scrutiny activity in services where there is deemed to be less risk may leave some people who have protected characteristics (age and disability) more exposed to poor quality care.

On a practical level, one respondent noted the need to think about how we present statistical publications so they can be widely understood and used.

One identified gap in the intelligence Framework was enough detailed consideration had not been given as to how we gather information about the most vulnerable, and they have suggested that we consider the use of independent agents, including advocacy, to help gather people's views.

**Risk Framework** - 24 responded, 6 (25%) thought it would have an impact on equalities.

Again, there were comments about the positive impact that the framework will have on equalities, by its clear emphasis on a "person centred" approach, and the benefits of deploying our resources based on where the greater risks are.

One respondent noted a concern about confidentiality and handling sensitive information in relation to serious incident reviews and deaths of looked after children.

One respondent noted a concern about the impact on protected groups should the Framework fail to become operational.

**Key Deliverables** - 24 responded, 5 (21%) thought it would have an impact on equalities.

Focus again was on the positive benefits these deliverables would bring about.

**Agenda item 6.5**  
**Appendix 2**

	<p>There were some comments about taking up further opportunities to collect equalities data, and two respondents noted that we should consider how we consider equalities issues when we are handling soft data.</p> <p>There was a comment about communicating our plans and outputs with people, especially with those with protected characteristics.</p> <p><b>Other concerns</b> No-one identified any other aspects of the frameworks or deliverables that they thought would have an impact on equalities, but there was a comment that the frameworks, and the deliverables document in particular, had too many abbreviations.</p>
<p><b>What changes did those consulted with suggest?</b></p>	<p>From the responses we should consider the following within the key deliverables/longer term action plan for Intelligence and Risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revise the Key Deliverables to ensure that the language is clear, and provide a summary of acronyms if required.</li> <li>- Consider ways to make any statistical publications accessible to all.</li> <li>- When considering the gaps that exist in the questionnaires for people who use services (CSQs), consider which protected groups may be excluded from this type of tool, and whether there is scope to engage independent help for them to share their views with us.</li> <li>- Ensure that information held about serious incident reviews and deaths of looked after children is obtained, held and used appropriately, and confidentiality is maintained.</li> <li>- Look for further appropriate opportunities to expand our intelligence about people with protected characteristics.</li> <li>- Consider how we handle soft information in relation to equalities.</li> </ul>

<b>Stage 3</b>	<b>OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION AND INVOLVEMENT</b>
<p><b>Set out what changes or improvements have been made to the policy as a result of the consultation / involvement activities.</b></p> <p><b>What impact will the changes have?</b></p>	<p>Care Standard Questionnaires (CSQs). We will continue to work with our staff, and with the involving people group to identify service types and client groups that the CSQs do not currently target, and fill these gaps. We will investigate the possibility of independent support to help people tell us about the services they use.</p> <p>Handling soft information. Our proposals for handling soft information must consider any impact of people with protected characteristics.</p>

