

NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Equality Impact Assessment Tool

Equality Impact Assessment is a legal requirement as set out in the Equality Act (2010) and the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties)(Scotland) regulations 2012 and may be used as evidence for cases referred for further investigation for compliance issues. Evidence returned should also align to Specific Outcomes as stated in your local Equality Outcomes Report. Please note that prior to starting an EQIA all Lead Reviewers are required to attend a Lead Reviewer training session or arrange to meet with a member of the Equality and Human Rights Team to discuss the process. Please contact Equality@ggc.scot.nhs.uk for further details or call 0141 2014560.

Name of Policy/Service Review/Service Development/Service Redesign/New Service:

Specialist Children's Services Single Service Alignment

Is this a: Current Service ☐ Service Development ☐ Service Redesign ☐ New Service ☐ New Policy ☐ Policy Review ☐

Description of the service & rationale for selection for EQIA: (Please state if this is part of a Board-wide service or is locally driven).

What does the service or policy do/aim to achieve? Please give as much information as you can, remembering that this document will be published in the public domain and should promote transparency.

Within the GG&C Health Board it has been agreed that there should be a single system management arrangement for Specialist Children's Services (SCS) which includes CAMHS and Specialist Community Paediatrics Teams. This will bring together, into a single management and financial structure, the currently delegated Tier 3 HSCP SCS services and the Board wide Hosted Tier 4 services.

The current arrangements, whereby Tier 4 CAMHS and Community Paediatrics services are aligned to the Chief Officer for East Dunbartonshire and Tier 3 CAMHS and Community Paediatrics services are hosted across the other 5 HSCPs, are intended to be consolidated under a formal hosting arrangement within East Dunbartonshire HSCP. This will include consolidation of all the budgets supporting the delivery of these services and a refresh of the associated governance and reporting arrangements through East Dunbartonshire IJB, and through other IJBs as part of regular performance reporting.

A single system management arrangement is a development that Scottish Government are keen to see progressed and it has been raised within the CAMHS performance support meetings that are currently in place. It is seen as critical to the improvement of the co-ordination and management of services across GG&C and the performance of CAMHS and community paediatrics across the health board area.

The main principles that will guide the transition is as follows:

- Services will continue to be delivered locally, and by existing teams

- Services will remain located within their current HSCPs
- Services will continue to work closely in partnership with HSCP colleagues

Change will be guided by a project plan which will be developed and will include a consultation and engagement plan. Work will be inclusive of all key stakeholders and staff partnership colleagues. An Oversight Group will be put in place to support the work, with representation from all HSCPs within the GGC area.

Why was this service or policy selected for EQIA? Where does it link to organisational priorities? (If no link, please provide evidence of proportionality, relevance, potential legal risk etc.). Consider any locally identified Specific Outcomes noted in your Equality Outcomes Report.

This EQIA has been undertaken to demonstrate transparency of process and evidence that due regard has been shown in meeting the 3 parts of the Public Sector Equality Duty in any decisions proposed. The 3 parts are:

- Eliminate Discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not

As this change of service relates exclusively to a change of management arrangements with no anticipated impact on patient experience of service design or delivery, we do not anticipate risk of legislative breach.

Who is the lead reviewer and when did they attend Lead reviewer Training? (Please note the lead reviewer must be someone in a position to authorise any actions identified as a result of the EQIA)

Name: Karen Lamb, Supported by Lesley Boyd	Date of Lead Reviewer Training: 2019
---	---

Please list the staff involved in carrying out this EQIA

(Where non-NHS staff are involved e.g. third sector reps or patients, please record their organisation or reason for inclusion):

Karen Lamb, Lesley Boyd, Alastair Low

		Example	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
1.	What equalities information is routinely collected from people currently using the service or affected by the policy? If this is a new service proposal what data do you have on proposed service user groups. Please note any barriers to collecting this data in your submitted evidence and an explanation for any protected characteristic data omitted.	<i>A sexual health service collects service user data covering all 9 protected characteristics to enable them to monitor patterns of use.</i>	<p>As this service change does not impact on direct service experience for our patients and poses no additional requirements of staff (either physically moving, travelling or changing job role) there is no requirement to assess risk against disaggregated data by protected characteristic of either employee or patient groups.</p> <p>Ethnicity and other protected characteristics data can be recorded within the electronic health record system used within SCS. Collection of this information is dependent on clinicians asking children, young people and families, and can be difficult to prioritise in a busy appointment. Activity is underway to improve recording of these. Given the age and development stage of the patients seen by SCS, some characteristics (sexual orientation and marital status) are not routinely collected.</p>	
		Example	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
2.	<p>Please provide details of how data captured has been/will be used to inform policy content or service design.</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination,</p>	<i>A physical activity programme for people with long term conditions reviewed service user data and found very low uptake by BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) people. Engagement activity found promotional material for the interventions was not representative. As a result an adapted range</i>	<p>As per above, though specialist child and adolescent mental health services have access to desegregated patient and employee data by some protected characteristics, the nature of the service change is limited and does not impact directly or indirectly on protected characteristic groups.</p> <p>Data on demographics and deprivation has been analysed previously to identify patterns of access to services, and determine instances of inequalities of access. This has been shared with staff and used to inform changes to practice, including adjusting approaches to referral screening and acceptance.</p>	

	harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Not applicable	<i>of materials were introduced with ongoing monitoring of uptake. (Due regard promoting equality of opportunity)</i>		
		<i>Example</i>	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
3.	How have you applied learning from research evidence about the experience of equality groups to the service or Policy? Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes). 1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Looked after and accommodated care services reviewed a range of research evidence to help promote a more inclusive care environment. Research suggested that young LGBT+ people had a disproportionately difficult time through exposure to bullying and harassment. As a result staff were trained in LGBT+ issues and were more confident in asking related questions to young people. (Due regard to removing discrimination, harassment and victimisation and</i>	<p>A single system management approach has been supported by the Scottish Government as the most effective way to operationally and strategically meet the demands of complex specialist children's services.</p> <p>This model is currently in operation in all other Health Board areas within Scotland.</p> <p>Following on from the analysis of routinely collected administrative data noted in item 2, additional research is underway to collect more in depth data on experiences of attending and engaging with CAMH Services. Furthermore, a model has been developed from published literature on factors influencing engagement with services. Factors in this model include sexuality and ethnicity. The research will be used to review and supplement the model. This will then be used to inform future service developments on improving attendance and engagement with SCS.</p> <p>CAMHS in NHS GGC has the foundation level charter for LGBT Youth Scotland, and has a staff working group considering policy and literature on LGBT+ equity issues in service delivery.</p>	

	4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>fostering good relations).</i>	<p>Further liaison with young people through LGBT Youth Scotland will be a planning objective for CAMHS in NHSGGC. The group will continue to link with the Health Board's LGBT+ group.</p> <p>An Ethnic Equalities Working Group was established in NHSGGC CAMHS to consider equity issues for patients, families and staff in the service.</p>	
		<i>Example</i>	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
4.	<p>Can you give details of how you have engaged with equality groups with regard to the service review or policy development? What did this engagement tell you about user experience and how was this information used? The Patient Experience and Public Involvement team (PEPI) support NHSGGC to listen and understand what matters to people and can offer support.</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>A money advice service spoke to lone parents (predominantly women) to better understand barriers to accessing the service. Feedback included concerns about waiting times at the drop in service, made more difficult due to child care issues. As a result the service introduced a home visit and telephone service which significantly increased uptake.</i></p> <p><i>(Due regard to promoting equality of opportunity)</i></p> <p><i>* The Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017 requires organisations to take actions to reduce poverty for children in households at risk of</i></p>	<p>As this decision does not impact on direct service experience for our patients there is no tangible change in service to engage with our patient group on. This decision relates solely to the management of services and proposed changes to currently devolved arrangements, In line with this, recognised processes have been followed to engage with staff-side representation.</p> <p>Service users are routinely asked to rate their experience of SCS via paper or digital Experience of Service Questionnaires (ESQ). These are collated centrally and reported back to teams annually.</p> <p>Research undertaken with Glasgow Caledonian University highlighted the need to provide accurate young person friendly information about CAMHS. In 2022, SCS commissioned SAMH to consult with young people on what they require from a NHSGGC CAMHS website. The consultation gathered the views and experiences of young people, parents/carers, and professionals via consultation meetings and an online survey. Participants were drawn from a number of local authorities in GGC, and included young people and adults from the BME (black and minority ethnic) and neuro-divergent communities.</p> <p>Key content for young people was identified as providing information on: CAMHS; mental health and neuro-divergent conditions; strategies for managing mental health and wellbeing;</p>	

	<p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<i>low incomes.</i>	<p>mental health helplines & crisis support; challenges of being a young person; and communicating with others about mental health.</p> <p>The final report from SAMH was shared in early 2023, and actions in response to the recommendations are being reviewed.</p> <p>Information about child development and a range of health conditions, including neurodevelopment conditions is available via the KIDS - Kids Independently Developing Skills.</p>	
		<i>Example</i>	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
5.	<p>Is your service physically accessible to everyone? If this is a policy that impacts on movement of service users through areas are there potential barriers that need to be addressed?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected</p>	<p><i>An access audit of an outpatient physiotherapy department found that users were required to negotiate 2 sets of heavy manual pull doors to access the service. A request was placed to have the doors retained by magnets that could deactivate in the event of a fire. (Due regard to remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation).</i></p>	<p>The management realignment of SCS will not have any direct impact on existing buildings or bases. No service will be relocated as a result of the realignment and all staff, service users and services will remain as they are prior to the process.</p> <p>The scope of the decision being made does not cover any changes to physical access to existing services but limits itself to management arrangements of services.</p> <p>There may in future be base changes for services as part of wider accommodation and facilities projects (not related to the SCS Management Realignment) and all usual processes including risk assessment, organisational change processes and equality impact assessments will be completed as required at that point.</p>	

	characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
		<i>Example</i>	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
6.	<p>How will the service change or policy development ensure it does not discriminate in the way it communicates with service users and staff?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The British Sign Language (Scotland) Act 2017 aims to raise awareness of British</p>	<p><i>Following a service review, an information video to explain new procedures was hosted on the organisation's YouTube site. This was accompanied by a BSL signer to explain service changes to Deaf service users.</i></p> <p><i>Written materials were offered in other languages and formats.</i></p> <p><i>(Due regard to remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation and promote equality of opportunity).</i></p>	<p>Changes to current management arrangements will be discussed in partnership through staff-side representation and direct engagement with staff currently employed within service. As previously stated, there is no anticipated change to roles and responsibilities or the physical location of staff that poses a risk if breaching our responsibilities as outlines in the Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>An Ethnic Equalities Working Group meets to review potential service improvements. The group is about to launch a staff Training Needs Analysis survey regarding equalities practice and awareness. This will be used to inform future training provision, and thereby improve how staff work with service users in routine practice.</p>	

	<p>Sign Language and improve access to services for those using the language. Specific attention should be paid in your evidence to show how the service review or policy has taken note of this.</p>			
7	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required	
(a)	<p>Age</p> <p>Could the service design or policy content have a disproportionate impact on people due to differences in age? (Consider any age cut-offs that exist in the service design or policy content. You will need to objectively justify in the evidence section any segregation on the grounds of age promoted by the policy or included in the service design).</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No anticipated impact. Proposed changes to services are limited to realigning management structures and will not pose a risk of detrimental impact to the protected characteristics of staff or patients.</p>		

(b)	<p>Disability</p> <p>Could the service design or policy content have a disproportionate impact on people due to the protected characteristic of disability?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No anticipated impact. Proposed changes to services are limited to realigning management structures and will not pose a risk of detrimental impact to the protected characteristics of staff or patients.</p>	
	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
(c)	<p>Gender Reassignment</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on people with the protected characteristic of Gender Reassignment?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p>	<p>No anticipated impact. Proposed changes to services are limited to realigning management structures and will not pose a risk of detrimental impact to the protected characteristics of staff or patients.</p>	

	1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
(d)	<p>Marriage and Civil Partnership</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the protected characteristics of Marriage and Civil Partnership?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> 1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/> 2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> 4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No anticipated impact. Proposed changes to services are limited to realigning management structures and will not pose a risk of detrimental impact to the protected characteristics of staff or patients.	

(e)	<p>Pregnancy and Maternity</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the protected characteristics of Pregnancy and Maternity?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>While there is no anticipated impact on patients or staff, any planned changes to management structure will be communicated to staff absent from the workplace due to pregnancy, maternity or paternity leave in line with protections afforded under the Equality Act (2010).</p>	
	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
(f)	<p>Race</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on people with the protected characteristics of Race?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and</p>	<p>No anticipated impact. Proposed changes to services are limited to realigning management structures and will not pose a risk of detrimental impact to the protected characteristics of staff or patients.</p>	

	<p>victimisation</p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		
(g)	<p>Religion and Belief</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the protected characteristic of Religion and Belief?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No anticipated impact. Proposed changes to services are limited to realigning management structures and will not pose a risk of detrimental impact to the protected characteristics of staff or patients.</p>	
	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
(h)	<p>Sex</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the protected characteristic of Sex?</p>	<p>No anticipated impact. Proposed changes to services are limited to realigning management structures and will not pose a risk of detrimental impact to the protected characteristics of staff or patients.</p>	

	<p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		
(i)	<p>Sexual Orientation</p> <p>Could the service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on the people with the protected characteristic of Sexual Orientation?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No anticipated impact. Proposed changes to services are limited to realigning management structures and will not pose a risk of detrimental impact to the protected characteristics of staff or patients.</p>	

	Protected Characteristic	Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
(j)	<p>Socio – Economic Status & Social Class</p> <p>Could the proposed service change or policy have a disproportionate impact on people because of their social class or experience of poverty and what mitigating action have you taken/planned?</p> <p>The Fairer Scotland Duty (2018) places a duty on public bodies in Scotland to actively consider how they can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making <u>strategic</u> decisions. If relevant, you should evidence here what steps have been taken to assess and mitigate risk of exacerbating inequality on the ground of socio-economic status. Additional information available here: Fairer Scotland Duty: guidance for public bodies - gov.scot (www.gov.scot)</p> <p>Seven useful questions to consider when seeking to demonstrate ‘due regard’ in relation to the Duty:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What evidence has been considered in preparing for the decision, and are there any gaps in the evidence? 2. What are the voices of people and communities telling us, and how has this been determined (particularly those with lived experience of socio-economic disadvantage)? 3. What does the evidence suggest about the actual or likely impacts of different options or measures on inequalities of outcome that are associated with socio- 	<p>No anticipated impact. Proposed changes to services are limited to realigning management structures and will not pose a risk of detrimental impact to people through further reducing inequality of outcome caused by socio-economic disadvantage.</p>	

	<p>economic disadvantage?</p> <p>4. Are some communities of interest or communities of place more affected by disadvantage in this case than others?</p> <p>5. What does our Duty assessment tell us about socio-economic disadvantage experienced disproportionately according to sex, race, disability and other protected characteristics that we may need to factor into our decisions?</p> <p>6. How has the evidence been weighed up in reaching our final decision?</p> <p>7. What plans are in place to monitor or evaluate the impact of the proposals on inequalities of outcome that are associated with socio-economic disadvantage? ‘Making Fair Financial Decisions’ (EHRC, 2019)²¹ provides useful information about the ‘Brown Principles’ which can be used to determine whether due regard has been given. When engaging with communities the National Standards for Community Engagement²² should be followed. Those engaged with should also be advised subsequently on how their contributions were factored into the final decision.</p>		
(k)	<p>Other marginalised groups</p> <p>How have you considered the specific impact on other groups including homeless people, prisoners and ex-offenders, ex-service personnel, people with addictions, people involved in prostitution, asylum seekers & refugees and travellers?</p>	No anticipated impact. Proposed changes to services are limited to realigning management structures and will not pose a risk of detrimental impact to marginalised groups currently accessing services.	
8.	<p>Does the service change or policy development include an element of cost savings? How have you managed this in a way that will not disproportionately impact on protected characteristic groups?</p> <p>Your evidence should show which of the 3 parts of the</p>	There is no anticipated cost saving from the proposed realigned management arrangements. A single management structure is expected to bring a more effective co-ordination of service provision which may lead to greater efficiencies within services.	

	<p>General Duty have been considered (tick relevant boxes).</p> <p>1) Remove discrimination, harassment and victimisation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2) Promote equality of opportunity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3) Foster good relations between protected characteristics. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4) Not applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		
		Service Evidence Provided	Possible negative impact and Additional Mitigating Action Required
9.	<p>What investment in learning has been made to prevent discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and foster good relations between protected characteristic groups? As a minimum include recorded completion rates of statutory and mandatory learning programmes (or local equivalent) covering equality, diversity and human rights.</p>	<p>All staff groups will continue to receive role specific training required to undertake respective roles in specialist children's mental health services. This will include completion of the Statutory and Mandatory Equality and Human Rights e-learning module.</p> <p>In addition, as noted above a training needs analysis is planned to review equalities awareness and practice. This will be used to inform training requirements.</p>	

10. In addition to understanding and responding to legal responsibilities set out in Equality Act (2010), services must pay due regard to ensure a person's human rights are protected in all aspects of health and social care provision. This may be more obvious in some areas than others. For instance, mental health inpatient care or older people's residential care may be considered higher risk in terms of potential human rights breach due to potential removal of liberty, seclusion or application of restraint. However risk may also involve fundamental gaps like not providing access to communication support, not involving patients/service users in decisions relating to their care, making decisions that infringe the rights of carers to participate in society or not respecting someone's right to dignity or privacy.

The Human Rights Act sets out rights in a series of articles – right to Life, right to freedom from torture and inhumane and degrading treatment, freedom from slavery and forced labour, right to liberty and security, right to a fair trial, no punishment without law, right to respect for private and family life, right to freedom of thought, belief and religion, right to freedom of expression, right to freedom of assembly and association, right to marry, right to protection from discrimination.

Please explain in the field below if any risks in relation to the service design or policy were identified which could impact on the human rights of patients, service users or staff.

This decision will not impact on the human rights afforded to either patients or staff.

Please explain in the field below any human rights based approaches undertaken to better understand rights and responsibilities resulting from the service or policy development and what measures have been taken as a result e.g. applying the PANEL Principles to maximise Participation, Accountability, Non-discrimination and Equality, Empowerment and Legality or FAIR* .

This decision will not impact on the human rights afforded to either patients or staff. However, staff within the service will be fully engaged with all developments of the decision making process.

*

- **Facts:** What is the experience of the individuals involved and what are the important facts to understand?
- **Analyse rights:** Develop an analysis of the human rights at stake
- **Identify responsibilities:** Identify what needs to be done and who is responsible for doing it
- **Review actions:** Make recommendations for action and later recall and evaluate what has happened as a result.

Having completed the EQIA template, please tick which option you (Lead Reviewer) perceive best reflects the findings of the assessment. This can be cross-checked via the Quality Assurance process:

☒

Option 1: No major change (where no impact or potential for improvement is found, no action is required)

☐

Option 2: Adjust (where a potential or actual negative impact or potential for a more positive impact is found, make changes to mitigate risks or make improvements)

☐

Option 3: Continue (where a potential or actual negative impact or potential for a more positive impact is found but a decision not to make a change can be objectively justified, continue without making changes)

☐

Option 4: Stop and remove (where a serious risk of negative impact is found, the plans, policies etc. being assessed should be halted until these issues can be addressed)

11. If you believe your service is doing something that 'stands out' as an example of good practice - for instance you are routinely collecting patient data on sexual orientation, faith etc. - please use the box below to describe the activity and the benefits this has brought to the service. This information will help others consider opportunities for developments in their own services.

N/A

Actions – from the additional mitigating action requirements boxes completed above, please summarise the actions this service will be taking forward.

Date for completion

Who is responsible?(initials)

N/A

Ongoing 6 Monthly Review please write your 6 monthly EQIA review date:

6 month review post alignment to check that there hasn't been an impact

Lead Reviewer:

EQIA Sign Off:

Name

Job Title

Signature

Date

Karen Lamb/Lesley Boyd

Head of Specialist Children's Services

15-02-2023

Quality Assurance Sign Off:

Name

Job Title

Signature

Date

Alastair Low

Planning Manager

Alastair Low

29/03/23

NHS GREATER GLASGOW AND CLYDE EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TOOL
MEETING THE NEEDS OF DIVERSE COMMUNITIES
6 MONTHLY REVIEW SHEET

Name of Policy/Current Service/Service Development/Service Redesign:

--

Please detail activity undertaken with regard to actions highlighted in the original EQIA for this Service/Policy

		Completed	
		Date	Initials
Action:			
Status:			
Action:			
Status:			
Action:			
Status:			
Action:			
Status:			

Please detail any outstanding activity with regard to required actions highlighted in the original EQIA process for this Service/Policy and reason for non-completion

		To be Completed by	
		Date	Initials
Action:			
Reason:			
Action:			
Reason:			

Please detail any new actions required since completing the original EQIA and reasons:

		To be completed by	
		Date	Initials
Action:			
Reason:			
Action:			
Reason:			

Please detail any discontinued actions that were originally planned and reasons:

Action:	
Reason:	
Action:	
Reason:	

Please write your next 6-month review date

--

Name of completing officer:

Date submitted:

If you would like to have your 6 month report reviewed by a Quality Assuror please e-mail to: alastair.low@ggc.scot.nhs.uk