Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

Deciding what needs to be assessed

In theory all policies, decisions, services, projects and programmes should be impact assessed. The most practical approach is to assess as the proposal is being developed or as processes, services and policies come up for review making the EQIA part of the development process. Do not be put off by the list below, it does not mean that long and detailed assessments are required every time you are engaged in one of the activities. However, it does mean that you should always consider the equalities implications of your proposals.

Policy

- New policy development
- Substantial revision of an existing policy or process
- Any change which may have a disproportionate impact on a particular group

Decision

- Key decision
- Decision for management board/cabinet
- Budget change decision

Service

- New service
- Service review, including the decommissioning of services
- Any service change which may have a disproportionate impact on a particular group

Projects and programmes

• All, at planning stage

Further information: Equality Impact Assessments - a user's guide

Section one

| No. | Question | Response |
|-----|--|---|
| 1.1 | Name of policy/decision/service/ project/programme being assessed | Creating Homes for Swindon's Children |
| 1.2 | Summary of aims and objectives of the policy/decision/service/ project/programme | A Children's residential home for 12-16-year-olds. This will involve purchasing a property, renovation of the property and a full tender to providers for the support element. |
| 1.3 | Who is affected by the policy/decision/service/ project/programme? (For example, employees/service users/supplier/contractor) | All wards |
| 1.4 | What involvement and consultation has been done in relation to this proposal? (For example, with relevant groups and stakeholders) | Case studies of Residential Children's Homes in other LAs have been explored. Consultation with Finance has been key in identifying the most beneficial target group for the Council. |
| 1.5 | What are the arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the actual impact of the policy/funding activity/event? | Initially this decision will come back to a future cabinet in 6 months after a soft market testing exercise. If not, then decision goes to Cllr Dixon & Cllr Small. |

Section two – protected characteristics

| Protected characteristic group | Is there a potential for positive or negative impact? Is the impact neutral? | Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used | Action to address negative impact (for example, adjustment to the proposal) |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Disability | | | |
| Gender reassignment | | | |
| Marriage or civil | | | |
| partnership | | | |
| Pregnancy and maternity | | | |
| Race | | | |
| Religion or belief | | | |
| Sexual orientation | | | |
| Sex (gender) | | | |
| Age | | | |
| Children in care and | Positive impact on the | Somerset CC – | |
| care leavers | young people placed | example of a strategic | |
| | in the home. Long | partnership with | |
| | term saving at the 12- | residential childrens | |
| | 16 age group. | homes. | |

Section three – evaluation

| No. | Question | Explanation/justification |
|-----|--|---------------------------|
| 3.1 | Is it possible the proposed policy or activity or change in policy or activity could discriminate or unfairly disadvantage people? | No |

| No. | Final Decision | Tick the relevant | Include any explanation / justification required |
|-----|---|-------------------|--|
| | | box | |
| 1 | No barriers identified, therefore | | |
| | activity will proceed | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 2 | Stop at some point because the data | | |
| | shows bias towards one or more | | |
| | groups | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 3 | Adapt or change the event in a way | | |
| | which you think will eliminate the bias | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 4 | Barriers and impact have been | | |
| | identified, however having considered | | |
| | all available options carefully, there | | |
| | appear to be no other proportionate | | |
| | ways to achieve the aim of the policy | | |
| | or practice (for example, in extreme | | |
| | cases or where positive action is | | |
| | taken). Therefore, proceed with | | |
| | caution with this knowing that it may | | |
| | favour some people less than others, | | |
| | providing justification for this decision | | |

Section four – record keeping

| Question | Response |
|---|------------|
| Will this EqIA be published* (*EqIA's should be published alongside relevant event paperwork including cabinet papers): | Yes |
| Date completed | 05/02/2025 |
| Review date (if applicable) | |

Change log

| Name | Date | Version | Change made |
|------|------|---------|-------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Responsibilities

| Question | Response | Date completed |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Name of person leading this EqIA | Dave Chapple | 05/02/2025 |

| Question | Response |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Names and roles of people | Dorne Kanareck – Head of Children's Commissioning |
| involved in the consideration | Lisa Arthey – Corporate Director of Children's Services |
| of impact | Paul Dixon – Councillor & Cabinet Member for CS |
| | Paul Smith – Head of Finance (S151) |

| Question | Response | Date signed |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Name of Director signing EqIA | Seth Harris-White | 05/02/2025 |