

# Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.12]



Title: <b>2425 ASC – 7 Focused Reviews</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Function <input type="checkbox"/> Service <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other [please state] <i>Savings Proposal</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Already exists / review <input type="checkbox"/> Changing
Directorate: Adults and Communities	Lead Officer name: Mette Le Jakobsen
Service Area: Adult Social Care	Lead Officer role: Director – Adult Social Care

## Step 1: What do we want to do?

The purpose of an Equality Impact Assessment is to assist decision makers in understanding the impact of proposals as part of their duties under the Equality Act 2010. Detailed guidance to support completion can be found here [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](#).

This assessment should be started at the beginning of the process by someone with a good knowledge of the proposal and service area, and sufficient influence over the proposal. It is good practice to take a team approach to completing the equality impact assessment. Please contact the [Equality and Inclusion Team](#) early for advice and feedback.

### 1.1 What are the aims and objectives/purpose of this proposal?

Briefly explain the purpose of the proposal and why it is needed. Describe who it is aimed at and the intended aims / outcomes. Where known also summarise the key actions you plan to undertake. Please use plain English, avoiding jargon and acronyms. Equality Impact Assessments are viewed by a wide range of people including decision-makers and the wider public.

#### **Budget context**

Every year, the council must agree an annual budget which balances the money we spend with the money we are expecting to receive. Councils across the country are continuing to face financial challenges and based on our current forecasts, we face a funding gap over the next five years (to 2028/29) of up to £81.2 million dependent on the severity of factors such as inflation, funding changes, and unavoidable service pressures. This is in addition to the £17.7 million of savings and efficiencies proposals for 2024-2028 outlined in the 2023/24 budget and assumed delivery of 2023/24 savings in the current year.

The Council has defined statutory responsibilities, but deliver against a far broader agenda, providing universal services benefiting the whole community, and targeted services aimed at individuals, communities with particular needs, and businesses – administered by our workforce, city partners, stakeholder organisations and commissioned services.

To address these challenges, we must look again across all of our services to find where we can do things differently to reduce costs, be more efficient in how we do things and, in some cases, stop doing some things entirely.

#### **This proposal**

Reviews form part of our statutory responsibilities under the Care Act (2014). We need to prioritise this area of practice to ensure that we undertake planned Care Act reviews for people who are receiving different forms of care and support services (e.g. homecare, care home placements, Extra Care Housing, Supported Living, Outreach Services) to ensure we are helping people to maximise their independence and achieve agreed outcomes, access the right support, making best use of community resources and Technology Enabled Care and are getting value for money from care and support services.

In January 2024, there are 2575 people who are classed as being overdue a review (12 months+ since their last support plan review or assessment). Through undertaking planned reviews we will help people access more

meaningful support and enable better outcomes for people, e.g. helping people to move out of care homes to live more independently, helping people access their community, access employment, or make use of Technology Enabled Care. This also leads to more cost-effective support. We are also working in partnership with care providers to ensure that their pricing methodology is effective and offering best value.

Reviews are a statutory requirement under the Care Act and we will be undertaking them in line with Care Act requirements and will have a responsibility to meet any identified eligible needs.

We will not target individuals or attach savings to specific packages or cohorts of service users. Savings will be realised through more cost-effective, appropriate support opportunities which enable people to live more independently.

This affects all service users and will be carried out yearly in line with statutory duties.

## 1.2 Who will the proposal have the potential to affect?

<input type="checkbox"/> Bristol City Council workforce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service users	<input type="checkbox"/> The wider community
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Commissioned services	<input type="checkbox"/> City partners / Stakeholder organisations	
Additional comments:		

## 1.3 Will the proposal have an equality impact?

Could the proposal affect access levels of representation or participation in a service, or does it have the potential to change e.g. quality of life: health, education, or standard of living etc.?

If 'No' explain why you are sure there will be no equality impact, then skip steps 2-4 and request review by Equality and Inclusion Team.

If 'Yes' complete the rest of this assessment, or if you plan to complete the assessment at a later stage please state this clearly here and request review by the Equality and Inclusion Team.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	[please select]
--	------------------------------------	-----------------

Focussed reviews will not disproportionately affect people with protected characteristics as we are not targeting specific individuals or attaching savings to specific packages or cohorts of service users, however, some protected characteristics such as Disabled people are over-represented in service-users, compared to the Bristol average population.

## Step 2: What information do we have?

### 2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

Please use this section to demonstrate an understanding of who could be affected by the proposal. Include general population data where appropriate, and information about people who will be affected with particular reference to protected and other relevant characteristics: [How we measure equality and diversity \(bristol.gov.uk\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/equality-diversity)

Use one row for each evidence source and say which characteristic(s) it relates to. You can include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data e.g. from national or local research, available data or previous consultations and engagement activities.

Outline whether there is any over or under representation of equality groups within relevant services - don't forget to benchmark to the local population where appropriate. Links to available data and reports are here [Data, statistics and intelligence \(sharepoint.com\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/data-statistics-intelligence). See also: [Bristol Open Data \(Quality of Life, Census etc.\); Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\); Ward Statistical Profiles.](#)

For workforce / management of change proposals you will need to look at the diversity of the affected teams using available evidence such as [HR Analytics: Power BI Reports \(sharepoint.com\)](#) which shows the diversity profile of council teams and service areas. Identify any over or under-representation compared with Bristol economically active citizens for different characteristics. Additional sources of useful workforce evidence include the [Employee Staff Survey Report](#) and [Stress Risk Assessment](#)

<b>Data / Evidence Source</b> [Include a reference where known]	<b>Summary of what this tells us</b>
<a href="#">Census 2021</a>	The Census details the demographic profile of Bristol and demonstrated that the population of the city is increasingly diverse in comparison to previous data.
<a href="#">The population of Bristol</a>	Updated annually. The report brings together statistics on the current estimated population of Bristol, recent trends in population, future projections and looks at the key characteristics of the people living in Bristol. This report shows that Bristol has more than 287 different ethnic groups in the city, more than 185 countries of birth represented, at least 45 religions and more than 90 languages spoken by people living in the city.
<a href="#">Ward Profile Data</a>	The Ward Profiles provide a range of data-sets, including Population, Life Expectancy, health and education disparities etc. for each of Bristol’s electoral wards. The data shows us that Frome Vale ward is uniquely in the top 4 for people receiving a service from adult social care for all ages.
<a href="#">Quality of Life Report 22-23</a>	The Quality of Life (QoL) survey is an annual randomised sample survey of the Bristol population. There was mixed picture with some improvement but 30 indicators were significantly worse in 2022 – with most negative changes in in the Themes: Health & Wellbeing (8); Sustainability & Environment (7); Transport (5); Community and Living (4). One of the largest deteriorations was the percentage of people whose financial circumstances prevent them from leaving their home when they want to.
<a href="#">JSNA Data Profiles</a>	The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment reports on the health and wellbeing needs of the people of Bristol. It brings together detailed information on local health and wellbeing needs and looks ahead at emerging challenges and projected future needs. The JSNA is used to provide a comprehensive picture of the health and wellbeing needs of Bristol (now and in the future); to inform decisions about how we design, commission and deliver services, and also about how the urban environment is planned and managed; to improve and protect health and wellbeing outcomes across the city while reducing health inequalities; and to provide partner organisations with information on the changing health and wellbeing needs of Bristol, at a local level, to support better service delivery.
Power BI - Internal link only	In January 2024, there are 2575 people who are classed as being overdue a review (12 months+ since their last support plan review or assessment). This is equivalent of 46.8% of the total amount of people that

Bristol City Council commissions an individual adult care service for. This data includes people who are 1 day past the 12 month period. The longer the waiting period for review, the lower the percentage is of people overdue.

In terms of reviews for people in receipt of commissioned adult social care services, 49.2% of adults under the age of 65 are overdue an annual review of their support plan in comparison to 43.4% of adults aged 65 or over.

In terms of reviews for people with disabilities in receipt of commissioned adult social care services, 46.3% are overdue an annual review of their support plan.

The data with regard to reviews of support plans for people in receipt of commissioned adult social care services shows that people who are non-white are more likely to be overdue an annual review. Within this data there are 384 people where ethnicity is recorded as 'unknown'.

**2.2 Do you currently monitor relevant activity by the following protected characteristics?**

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Reassignment |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy/Maternity | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation  |

**2.3 Are there any gaps in the evidence base?**

Where there are gaps in the evidence, or you don't have enough information about some equality groups, include an equality action to find out in section 4.2 below. This doesn't mean that you can't complete the assessment without the information, but you need to follow up the action and if necessary, review the assessment later. If you are unable to fill in the gaps, then state this clearly with a justification.

For workforce related proposals all relevant characteristics may not be included in HR diversity reporting (e.g. pregnancy/maternity). For smaller teams diversity data may be redacted. A high proportion of not known/not disclosed may require an action to address under-reporting.

Although our corporate approach is to collect diversity monitoring for all relevant characteristics, there are gaps in the available local diversity data for some characteristics, especially where this has not always historically been included in census and statutory reporting e.g. for sexual orientation.

There are some gaps in diversity monitoring for service users where this has not been recorded on our Liquid Logic Adultcare System (LAS), e.g. for Sexual orientation

**2.4 How have you involved communities and groups that could be affected?**

You will nearly always need to involve and consult with internal and external stakeholders during your assessment. The extent of the engagement will depend on the nature of the proposal or change. This should usually include individuals and groups representing different relevant protected characteristics. Please include details of any completed engagement and consultation and how representative this had been of Bristol's diverse communities.

Include the main findings of any engagement and consultation in Section 2.1 above.

If you are managing a workforce change process or restructure please refer to [Managing a change process or restructure \(sharepoint.com\)](#) for advice on consulting with employees etc. Relevant stakeholders for engagement about workforce changes may include e.g. staff-led groups and trades unions as well as affected staff.

We launched a public consultation on our budget proposals between 09th November 2023 to the 21st December 2023. This consultation set out all the savings proposals we had identified to produce a balanced budget in the context of reduced available funding and increasing financial pressures.

## 2.5 How will engagement with stakeholders continue?

Explain how you will continue to engage with stakeholders throughout the course of planning and delivery. Please describe where more engagement and consultation is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. Include any targeted work to seek the views of under-represented groups. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification. You can ask the Equality and Inclusion Team for help in targeting particular groups.

All responses to the Budget Consultation will be analysed and included in the Council's Budget report that will be published on the Bristol City Council website in early 2023. We will take Budget consultation responses into account when developing this and other final proposals to put to the Cabinet and a meeting of the Full Council for approval. The final decision will be taken by Full Council at its budget setting meeting in February / March 2024.

Following the setting of the overall budget envelope there will be extensive engagement, consultation and co-design with affected communities on particular proposals which will inform future decision making prior to implementation. Our approach to public engagement and consultation will proactively target under-represented respondents to increase the participation of people from equality groups and their local representative organisations. This will help to ensure that our services and actions are informed by the views and needs of all our citizens.

We have scheduled a workshop with people with lived expertise in January 2024 to co-produce a vision for adult social care – this will relate to our approach around reviews.

## Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts of the proposal in this section, referring to evidence you have gathered above and the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010. Also include details of existing issues for particular groups that you are aware of and are seeking to address or mitigate through this proposal. See detailed guidance documents for advice on identifying potential impacts etc. [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](#)

### 3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Consider sub-categories and how people with combined characteristics (e.g. young women) might have particular needs or experience particular kinds of disadvantage.

Where mitigations indicate a follow-on action, include this in the 'Action Plan' Section 4.2 below.

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS** (highlight any potential issues that might impact all or many groups)

Even when we plan to consult in more detail on specific service delivery proposals at a later time, we must ensure that any budget setting decisions that are likely to affect future services are informed by sufficient consultation and proper analysis. This is so that decision makers can have due regard to any likely disproportionate or negative impact on the basis of their protected and other relevant characteristics at the time the budget is approved – not afterwards.

Decision makers will have the ability to make changes to the individual spending plans following further consultation as appropriate and detailed evaluation of the impact of specific proposals. Within the proposed budget envelope there will be financial mitigation put aside for any non-delivery or amendments to proposals which may occur due to future consideration of equalities issues or other factors.

As well as identifying whether budget changes will have a disproportionate impact on particular groups (e.g., because they are over-represented in a particular cohort), we need to pay particular attention to the risk of indirect discrimination: when an apparently neutral decision puts members of a given group at a particular disadvantage compared with other people because of their different needs and circumstances.

We are also aware of existing structural inequalities and particular considerations, issues, and disparities for people in Bristol based on their characteristics, which we will take into account.

**This proposal:**

As people’s needs change over time there will be significant positive impacts on people who receive a package of care. This is because they will get a package of care that is in line with their current needs. The review will make sure that support plans are proportionate to need and also build in the current model of delivering adult social care. Adult social care seeks to enable maximum independence where possible and appropriate, and the use of community resources wherever possible as a way of building resilience and self-reliance. More people will be diverted to tier 1 support which will increase their independence and wellbeing and avoid them becoming dependent on funded services which reduce their independence. We are mindful of the resources available in the community and will ensure that the resources for individuals to utilise are available where people take up tier 1 support.

Some people who are reviewed may find their package of support has reduced. However there will not be a significant negative impact as any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need. Decision making will be fair and based on Care Act statutory guidance. We will not be changing any of the decision making processes around assessing care needs or allocating care. Whilst there may be savings attached to this proposal, we will be using a person centred approach and will ensure that the appropriate level of care is provided at all times.

**PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS**

<b>Age: Young People</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	We have not identified any disproportionate negative impact on young people at this stage. We will take a person-centred approach to reviews and any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need.
Mitigations:	See general comments above.
<b>Age: Older People</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 43.4% of the cohort are adults aged 65 or over</li> <li>• Older people in Bristol are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ less likely to be comfortable using digital services</li> <li>○ more reliant on public and community transport</li> <li>○ more likely to be an unpaid carer</li> <li>○ more likely to help out or volunteer in their community</li> <li>○ less likely to have formal qualifications</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Bristol Ageing Better estimated at least 11,000 older people are experiencing isolation in the city.</li> <li>• We must factor aging and the needs of older people into long term budgeting and service design</li> </ul>
Mitigations:	We will take a person-centred approach to reviews, any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need. Where we are using Technology Enabled Care to support independence, we will ensure we train and support people to use the technology based on their needs, and ensure they are confident in using technology before transitioning over. The use, and confidence levels of technology enabled care will be monitored at each review to ensure people are content with using equipment. Any changes to care will be communicated in an accessible way, dependent on the service-user.
<b>Disability</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of reviews for people with disabilities in receipt of commissioned adult social care services, 46.3% are overdue an annual review of their support plan.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 17% of Bristol’s population are disabled. There are more disabled women than men living in Bristol.</li> <li>• A higher proportion of disabled people rent from a social provider (local authority or housing association)</li> <li>• Disabled people experience higher rates of hate crime and domestic abuse compared to the general population</li> <li>• Disabled people should be empowered to make independent living choices and have a say in access to service provision.</li> <li>• Budget setting needs to provide sufficient resource and flexibility to meet our legal duty to make anticipatory and responsive reasonable adjustments for disabled people including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ changing the way things are done e.g. opening / working times;</li> <li>○ changes to overcome barriers created by the physical features of premises.</li> <li>○ providing auxiliary aids e.g. extra equipment or a different or additional service.</li> <li>○ is ‘anticipatory’ so we must think in advance and ongoing about what disabled people might reasonably need.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Disabled people must not be charged for their reasonable adjustments, accessible formats or other adaptations. It is a legal requirement under the Equalities Act to ensure information is accessible to disabled employees and service users.</li> </ul>
Mitigations:	A high proportion of Disabled people are overdue a review in comparison with the Bristol average. We will take a person-centred approach to reviews, any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need. Any changes to care will be communicated in an accessible way, dependent on the service-user. We hope this proposal will have a positive impact on Disabled people, by increasing reviews we hope that people will be better assessed to ensure they are receiving the support that is appropriate to them. We will ensure staff undertaking reviews have a good understanding of Disability equality and empowered to support Disabled peoples needs.
<b>Sex</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	We have not identified any disproportionate negative impact on sex at this stage. We will take a person-centred approach to reviews and any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need.
Mitigations:	See general comments above.
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	We have not identified any disproportionate negative impact on sexual orientation at this stage. We will take a person-centred approach to reviews and any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need.
Mitigations:	See general comments above.
<b>Pregnancy / Maternity</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	We have not identified any disproportionate negative impact on pregnancy and maternity at this stage. We will take a person-centred approach to reviews and any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need.
Mitigations:	See general comments above.
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	We have not identified any disproportionate negative impact on gender reassignment at this stage. We will take a person-centred approach to reviews and any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need.
Mitigations:	See general comments above.
<b>Race</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• people in receipt of commissioned adult social care services shows that people who are non-white are more likely to be overdue an annual review. Within this data there are 384 people where ethnicity is recorded as ‘unknown’.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organisations may lack cultural competence because minoritised ethnic staff are under- represented.</li> <li>• Just over a quarter of people of Black ethnicity report below average mental wellbeing, higher than the city average</li> <li>• People from Black African, Other, and Black Caribbean groups have persistently high levels of unemployment and almost all ethnic minority groups in Bristol experience employment inequality when compared to White British people.</li> <li>• People from minoritised ethnic backgrounds are underrepresented in political and civic leadership.</li> <li>• People who do not speak English as a main language may require information in plain English and community language translations or videos etc.</li> </ul>
Mitigations:	A high proportion of non-white people are overdue a review in comparison with the Bristol average. We will take a person-centred approach to reviews, any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need. Any changes to care will be communicated in an accessible way, dependent on the service-user. We hope this proposal will have a positive impact on people, by increasing reviews we hope that people will be better assessed to ensure they are receiving the support that is appropriate to them. We will ensure staff undertaking reviews have a good understanding of health equity, and the need for a tailored approach.
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	We have not identified any disproportionate negative impact on religion at this stage. We will take a person-centred approach to reviews and any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need.
Mitigations:	See general comments above.
<b>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	We have not identified any disproportionate negative impact on marriage and civil partnership at this stage. We will take a person-centred approach to reviews and any change to a support plan will be in line with their assessed need.
Mitigations:	See general comments above.
<b>OTHER RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>	
<b>Socio-Economic (deprivation)</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	See general comments above.
Mitigations:	See general comments above.
<b>Carers</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	See general comments above.
Mitigations:	See general comments above.
<b>Other groups</b> [Please add additional rows below to detail the impact for any other relevant groups as appropriate e.g. asylum seekers and refugees; care experienced; homelessness; armed forces personnel and veterans]	
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	

### 3.2 Does the proposal create any benefits for people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Outline any potential benefits of the proposal and how they can be maximised. Identify how the proposal will support our [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) to:

- ✓ Eliminate unlawful discrimination for a protected group
- ✓ Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't
- ✓ Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't



The support that people receive will better reflect their individual support needs, including their cultural needs or any needs that are specifically related to their protected or other relevant characteristic. The more frequently we undertake reviews with people we can be more confident that any impacts of having a protected characteristic is taken into account in the way they receive and manage their support.

## Step 4: Impact

### 4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?

What are the main conclusions of this assessment? Use this section to provide an overview of your findings. This summary can be included in decision pathway reports etc.

If you have identified any significant negative impacts which cannot be mitigated, provide a justification showing how the proposal is proportionate, necessary, and appropriate despite this.

#### Summary of significant negative impacts and how they can be mitigated or justified:

There are no significant impacts with this proposal. We will however monitor to ensure that this continues to be the case.

#### Summary of positive impacts / opportunities to promote the Public Sector Equality Duty:

Need to ensure that planned reviews enable people with protected characteristics to meet assessed needs and maximise their outcomes.

### 4.2 Action Plan

Use this section to set out any actions you have identified to improve data, mitigate issues, or maximise opportunities etc. If an action is to meet the needs of a particular protected group please specify this.

Improvement / action required	Responsible Officer	Timescale
Ensure service user identity reporting is updated by practitioners on LAS through case auditing.	Maria Hamood	Ongoing
All relevant EqIAs will be published on the Council's website <a href="https://www.bristol.gov.uk/council-spending-performance/council-budgets">https://www.bristol.gov.uk/council-spending-performance/council-budgets</a> and continue to be updated as appropriate.	BCC SROs	Ongoing

### 4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured?

How will you know if you have been successful? Once the activity has been implemented this equality impact assessment should be periodically reviewed to make sure your changes have been effective your approach is still appropriate.


Power BI data is able to show us:

- Numbers of people with different protected characteristics who are awaiting a review
- Cost change outcomes of reviews alongside group identity
- Reviews outcome forms are completed after each review in our planned reviews team (Citywide Communities Review Team) which ensure the impact for the service user, family, carer, and provider is captured (often in their own words if possible). We can quality assure our reviews utilising these alongside a range of measures.

## Step 5: Review

The Equality and Inclusion Team need at least five working days to comment and feedback on your EqIA. EqIAs should only be marked as reviewed when they provide sufficient information for decision-makers on the equalities

impact of the proposal. Please seek feedback and review from the [Equality and Inclusion Team](#) before requesting sign off from your Director<sup>1</sup>.

<b>Equality and Inclusion Team Review:</b> <i>Reviewed by the Equality and Inclusion Team</i>	<b>Director Sign-Off:</b> 
Date: 10/01/24	Date: 10/1/24

---

<sup>1</sup> Review by the Equality and Inclusion Team confirms there is sufficient analysis for decision makers to consider the likely equality impacts at this stage. This is not an endorsement or approval of the proposal.