

## Community Impact Assessment Form (CIA)

The council's vision is to promote **equal life outcomes**<sup>1</sup> **for everyone** living, working and visiting York, through inclusive design in everything the council does. This is to ensure that noone is unintentionally excluded in York because of specific personal characteristics. In the council, we call these characteristics "Communities of Interest or Identity" – "Cols" for short.

To help realise the vision, council officers are required by Cabinet to assess the impact of council policies, processes and behaviours on customers and staff from the Communities.

This process was previously called Equality Impact Assessment (EIA). To stress the importance of assessing the impact of everything we do on people from the Communities, starting June 2012, we have renamed the process Community Impact Assessment (CIA).

The assessment **should be done at the development stage** of any policy, review, project, service change etc, **before any decision is taken.** It should also be done every time there are changes to policies and practices, **before the changes are finally agreed** by decision makers.

In addition, the Equality Act 2010 came into force on the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010. Under the Act the council has a legal duty to show that our policies, practices etc further the aims below:

- Actively and proactively eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share an identity and those who do not
- Foster good relations between people who share an identity and those who do not.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In health, safety and security, personal freedom and choice, housing, education and lifelong learning, jobs and leisure activities and the infrastructure that supports these outcomes.

In completing **Community Impact Assessments (CIAs)** officers are also required to state how what they are assessing meets and contributes to these aims.

1	Name and Job Title of person completing assessment	Debbie Mitchell
2	Name of service, policy, function or criteria being assessed	Customer Contributions Policy ("Fairer Contributions Policy for Non Residential Care Services")
3	What are the main objectives or aims of the service/policy/function/criteria?	To provide a consistent and fair charging/ financial contribution towards care costs framework for all customers who receive non- residential care services following an assessment of their individual needs, and their individual financial circumstances.
4	Date	21/11/12

	Stage 1: Initial Screening					
5	What evidence is available to suggest that the proposed service, policy, function or criteria could have a negative or positive effect <b>on quality of life outcomes</b> <sup>2</sup> for people (both staff and customers) from the communities? Document the source of evidence in the columns below. You can find evidence via:					
	<ul> <li>Data from the Business Intelligence Hub - <u>http://colin.york.gov.uk/beSupported/business_intelligence_hub/</u></li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Council Consultation and Engagement Calendar – contact Sophie Gibson, 551022.</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Council consultation - <u>http://colin.york.gov.uk/beSupported/inhouse_services/research_cons</u> <u>ultation/</u></li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Workplace Wellbeing Survey – contact the Health and Safety team</li> </ul>					

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See appendix 1

	<ul> <li>for more info – 554131. CaN results are here: <u>http://colin.york.gov.uk/beConnected/about_CYC/structure/CAN/can_healthwellbeing_results/</u></li> <li>Staff Equalities Reference Group – See feedback reports here - <u>http://colin.york.gov.uk/beSupported/equalities_inclusion/SERG/</u></li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Equality Advisory Group (a customer group) - <a href="http://democracy.york.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=445">http://democracy.york.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=445</a></li> </ul>				:?ID=445
	<ul> <li>EIA Fairs Feedback Newsletters - <u>http://colin.york.gov.uk/beSupported/equalities_inclusion/EIAs/consult</u> <u>ation_feedback/</u></li> <li>Previous EIAs – see annual EIA lists - <u>http://colin.york.gov.uk/beSupported/equalities_inclusion/EIAs/</u></li> </ul>				
Community of Interest/Identity		Source of <b>evidence</b> that there is or is likely to be a <b>negative or positive</b> impact:			
inte	restricentity	Staff		Customers/Public	
		Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative
Race		N/A	N/A	No evidence	No evidence
Religion / Spirituality /Belief		N/A	N/A	No evidence	No evidence
Gender		N/A	N/A	No evidence	No evidence

Disability	N/A	N/A	Consultation indicates positive impact in having consistent and transparent approach for all disabled people. Estimated reduced contributions for 32% of residents using support	Negative impact on estimated 4% assessed as being able to pay full cost for support
Sexual Orientation	N/A	N/A	No evidence	No evidence
Age	N/A	N/A	Consultation indicates positive impact in having consistent and transparent approach for all disabled people. Estimated reduced contributions for 32% of residents using support	Negative impact on estimated 4% assessed as being able to pay full cost for support
Pregnancy/maternity	N/A	N/A	No evidence	No evidence
Gender Reassignment	N/A	N/A	No evidence	No evidence

Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/A	N/A	No evidence	No evidence
Carers of older and disabled people	N/A	N/A	Consultation indicates positive impact in having e consistent and transparent approach for all disabled people Estimated reduced contributions for 32% of residents using support	Negative impact on estimated 4% assessed as being able to pay full cost for support
If there is <b>no</b> ovidence the convice/policy/function will affect <b>any of the</b>				

If there is **no** evidence the service/policy/function will affect **any of the communities**, please proceed to section 9.

If there **is** evidence the service/policy/function will affect **one or more of the communities**, continue to Stage 2, Full Impact Assessment.

	Stage 2: Full Impact Assessment				
6	How could different communities be affected by the proposed or reviewed service/policy/function/criteria? Record negative and positive effects below. <b>Expand the boxes</b> to take up as much room as you need. See the <u>2 EIA Guidance documents</u> on Colin for help about effects to consider.				
A1	Public/customers – positive effects	The new policy will provide a more consistent approach to the way we calculate the costs that customer contribute to, regardless of whether the Council commissions support or the resident takes a Direct payment.			
		Using actual costs rather than standard costs for more services is estimated to reduce the contribution needed for 32% of current customer (496 of 1540) by an average of £10 a week			

		1			
		Residents will be able to understand more easily how much their support costs and this should give them more opportunity to decide how the resources available are used, to exercise more choice and control.			
A2	Public/customers – negative effects	By ensuring that people who need 2 carers to support them have this reflected in the calculation of their 'personal budget', Council will no longer be subsidising the cost of a second carer for those who have been assessed as able to pay the full cost of their support. We know from consultation that this is concerning for people who have been used to the subsidy. Analysis at the end of October indicated 60 people (of 1540 people assessed to contribute to support costs) will be affected, with an average increase in costs of £107 per week.			
B1	Staff – positive effects	N/A			
B2	Staff – negative effects	N/A			
7	<ul> <li>Can any negative effects be justified? For example:</li> <li>As a proportionate means to achieve a legitimate aim</li> <li>In support of improving community cohesion</li> <li>To comply with other legislation or enforcement duties</li> <li>Taking positive action to address imbalances or underrepresentation</li> <li>Because of evidence-based need to target a particular community or group e.g. younger/older people.</li> <li>NB. Lack of financial resources alone is NOT justification!</li> </ul>				

Fairer and more transparent policy will ensure al people needing support from the Council, regardless of age, disability or gender will have more choice and control over how the funding allocated to them is spent and what activities they participate in.

This policy change will remove an inherent inequality in the current policy whereby older people can be charged more for services than working age adults. It will also remove an existing inequality for people who take a Direct Payment whereby they pay the full cost of the support they use, whilst those who have support commissioned by the Council may benefit from some subsidised costs.

The way we assess whether someone can pay the full cost of their support will not change so no one will be asked to pay more than is agreed as fair and affordable in line with Government guidance.

8 What changes will you make to the service/policy/function/criteria as result of information in parts 5 & 6 above?

No changes required

9 What arrangements will you put in place to **monitor impact, positive and negative,** of the proposed service/policy/function/criteria on individuals from the communities?

[fill this in even if you don't currently have any negative issues to deal with] Anyone affected will be regularly reviewed through care management processes and will have a new financial assessment should their circumstances change.

Monitoring of individual accounts will ensure budgets are sufficient to cover needs.

10 List below actions you will take to address any unjustified impact and promote equality of outcome (as in appendix 1) for staff, customers

Annex C

<ul> <li>and the public from the communities. The action could relate to:</li> <li>Procedures</li> <li>Service delivery</li> <li>Training</li> <li>Improvement projects</li> </ul>					
Action	Lead	When by?			
Usual care management processes to review support packages and financial assessments	ACE staff	Already in place			
11 Date CIA completed	21/11/12				
Author: Debbie Mitchell Position: Finance Manager Date: 21.11.12					
12 Signed off by					
I am satisfied that this service/policy/function has been successfully impact assessed. Name: Kathy Clark Position (Head of Service and above) : Assistant Director Assessment and Safeguarding Date: 27.11.12					
Please send the completed signed off document to <u>equalities@york.gov.uk</u> . It will be published on COLIN as well as on the council website.					

## Appendix 1 - Quality of Life Indicators (also known as "the 10 dimensions of equality")

Think about the positive and negative impact in these areas:

- Access to services and employment
- □ Longevity, including avoiding premature mortality.
- Physical security, including freedom from violence and physical and sexual abuse.
- Health, including both well-being and access to high quality healthcare.
- Education, including both being able to be creative, to acquire skills and qualifications and having access to training and life-long learning.
- Standard of living, including being able to live with independence and security; and covering nutrition, clothing, housing, warmth, utilities, social services and transport.
- Productive and valued activities, such as access to employment, a positive experience in the workplace, work/life balance, and being able to care for others.
- Individual, family and social life, including self-development, having independence and equality in relationships and marriage.
- Participation, influence and voice, including participation in decision-making and democratic life.
- Identity, expression and self-respect, including freedom of belief and religion.
- Legal security, including equality and non-discrimination before the law and equal treatment within the criminal justice system.

Indicators from: The Equalities Review 2007 and the Equality Framework for Local Government.