Department/Service	Adult Services	**Equality Impact Assessment Form Template**	
Ref **See Appendix 1**	**ADU**	Officer responsible for the assessment	Alison McCudden
Name of policy procedure function being assessed	**Adult Services Transport Policy**	Start date of assessment	04/02/11

Are there are any other policies or procedures associated or linked with this one.	• Personalisation - Assessment
Briefly describe the aims, objectives and outcomes of the policy / procedure / function	April 2010 review: • Introduce Personalisation for Transport for those with an eligible unmet need only. • Move away from strategically commissioned Transport by 2012/13 unless in exceptional cases.
Who is intended to benefit from this policy –procedure – function?	The change in policy is required under the Personalisation agenda and will bring about cost savings. As such it will benefit the citizens of Cheshire East as well as service users by giving them greater choice and control.
What factors could contribute to or detract from the outcomes?	▪ Culture change required within Adult Services to move away from commissioned transport. ▪ Service User/carer expectations. ▪ Availability of suitable alternative transport provision across CEC and rural borders. ▪ Suitable discretionary concessionary travel policy to support personalisation. ▪ Resources available for individual reviews to support users through change. ▪ Independent Travel Training use. ▪ Risk of corporate cost implcations. ▪ Saving targets in Places Directorate for Integrated Transport Service.

	▪ Saving targets in Adult Services for commissioned Transport.
Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy – procedure- function? (Please consider key equality groups)	• Service Users and Carers • LD Partnership Board and Forum • Carers Interagency Group • Older People Forum and Senior Voice, • North West Ambulance Service and PCT • External provider services. • Disability Information Bureau • Staff and Members
Who is responsible for the policy – procedure – function?	• Adult Services Senior Management Team.
Please indentify any impact (Positive / Negative) this policy, procedure, function or service will have on the following protected characteristics:	

Age - Is there an impact?	Yes		Comments/Actions: Cheshire East has a larger elderly population than both England and the North West. There are 68,400 people aged 65+ in Cheshire East or 18.9% in comparison to an average of 16.6% for the North West and 16.3% for the country. Correspondingly, Cheshire East has a small percentage of young people; 22.9% aged under 20, compared to 24.3% for the North West and 23.9% for England. Within Cheshire East in general the rural areas show the greatest proportion in both losses of young people and gains in older people. The Macclesfield area has the largest population and highest number of people aged 65+. The major issues for people of different ages with regards to the

			transport policy tend to involve issues regarding physical condition such as ability to get on transport, safety on transport. As such these are dealt with under the disability section of this EIA. Economic issues which are often a problem for older people are dealt with in the economic deprivation section.
Carers – Is there an impact?	**Yes**		Comments/Actions: The Office of National Statistics estimates that 10% of the population are likely to be carers i.e. 36,500 people in Cheshire East. There are 70,100 people over the age of 65 in Cheshire East and 8,016 of these may be carers. Of these approx 1,300 are likely to be in poor health themselves and 2,400 may be providing 50 or more hours of care per week. Only 740 carers are recorded as having had an assessment with Cheshire East Council of their needs as carers during the last year (Cheshire East Carers Strategy 2010). It may bring about health and safety concerns for the carer regarding the service user for instance concerning whether they have arrived safely at an establishment (by use of public transport, taxi or minibus etc). Proposed action include: - Ensuring that carer's are not put under undue pressure to provide transport to a service user. - Ensuring sufficient measures are in place e.g. check-in system that health and safety concerns are managed within an acceptable level of risk - Travel Training programme - Safeguarding awareness and training for operators.
Disability - Is there an impact?	**Yes**		Comments/Actions:

The majority of service users in Cheshire East Adult Services are those with a Physical Disability (55.3%). The next largest group is those with a Mental Health Disability which is almost half as much (23.9%). Learning Disability clients make up only 14.6% of community service users. 6.4% of customer's have a Visual Impairment [note older people are no longer taken to be a separate client group].

Client Type	Total Service Users	%
Physical Disability	3331	55.3
Mental Health	1441	23.9
Learning Disability	879	14.6
Other Vulnerable	206	3.4
Null	148	2.5
Substance Abuse	17	0.3
Visual Impairment	*384*	*6.4*
Total	**6022**	100.0

Note for table and graph: all categories are mutually exclusive except visual impairment. The data also shows the main client type so if a person also has other needs, these are not included in these statistics.

- The Government Report, "Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People", states that disabled people experience a number of areas of disadvantage. This includes that; they are more likely to live in poverty, they are less likely to have educational qualifications, they are more likely to be economically inactive, more likely to experience problems with housing and more likely to experience problems with transport.

| | | | Transport is listed as disabled people's biggest challenge in this document. It also states there should be, "increased local authority accountability for making sure that all aspects of disabled people's transport needs are taken into account." "Disabled people travel a third less often than the general public and over a third of those who do travel experience difficulties, the most common being getting on or off trains or buses."
- The Government 'Putting People First' document set out the pathway for all Councils to move towards the personalisation of social care. It is a consequence of this approach that the Council is reconsidering its provision of fleet transport. This is because in order for individuals to have greater choice over how their care needs are met there must be flexibility of transport. However, the aim of this policy is to react to predicted future demand and grow the external transport market. Current demand is not there at present for alternative services. In the longer term this approach may mean greater choice and control for people who are disabled. This may significantly positively impact on their lives.

Major issues from transport consultation:

- Impact: 81% of respondents to the survey felt that a change in provision would have a major impact on their lives. 11.4% felt that moving away from fleet transport would make travelling easier for them.
- Ability for disabled to arrange transport: 11.4% of respondents indicated that this was important. However 68.8% of respondents in the survey indicated that they would not be able to finance or arrange their own transport even with assistance. |

			The Council expects to invest to develop assistance for the public with transport planning and accessing the appropriate transport to meet their need. It will be important to ensure that these resources are sufficient to assist those lacking in capacity. Transport is considered within a review of care.
			- Cost of transport: e.g. public transport, taxis. Note: 45.7% of those who completed the survey said they understood why transport costs might need to be increased which was exactly balanced by those who disagreed with the increase. It is expected that with the change in provision that the service user will incur increased costs e.g. use of minibus, taxi, public transport. However, these increased costs will be factored into the individual's personal budget less the contribution the customer is able to make.
			Service users currently pay £2 to receive transport to and from a day centre. Many service users stated that they would not be able to afford an increase in transport costs due to their already stretched budgets. However, some also expressed the view that they would be prepared to pay more.
			The Council expects that people with mobility income will be able to use it to meet their transport needs. If there is a shortfall the Council has a duty to meet eligible unmet transport needs through a personal budget where the customer has critical or substantial care or transport needs. Where someone has a mobility vehicle their needs should be met by that resource.
			- Availability of transport: Concerns were expressed at the consultation events that it might be difficult to obtain transport to care services particularly from rural locations.

The Council wishes to use a range of transport options for service users and develop the market over a 2 year period. However, it has acknowledged that provision is not currently available and that the market must develop. The Council must ensure that there is a 'phasing out' of the fleet system as capacity is built..

- Ability of transport to cater for people with disability: (101 service users indicated that this was necessary for buses in the survey).

Transport companies must have a commercial interest in adapting their vehicles to cater for disabled people. These vehicles must also be available at the appropriate times e.g. when transport to day centres is required. A scoping study is required of interest of companies in adaptations. The Council must also ensure that there is a gradual 'phasing out' of the fleet system as capacity is built elsewhere.

- Staffing: Loss of staff who understand the needs of service users. Attendees at the events expressed concerns as to whether staff from other transport options would be sufficiently well trained to support service users. For instance, in seeing them to their door, in operating a key safe. One example quote was ""*Taxi drivers do not have the right training and knowledge i.e. first aid".* There were also concerns over whether staff would be CRB checked.

The Council aims to develop a robust accreditation system and training to provide a like for like quality of staffing by transport providers. However, some key issues remain. These include increased costs to ensure assistance 'to the

			door and other safeguards. There is also a lack of knowledge of the commercial interest firms will have in taking on this work and the associated costs that may go with it. Further research needs to be done to gauge these factors - Health and Safety: Concerns were expressed that people lacking in mental capacity might have their safety compromised by using alternative transport methods. For instance, if a service user was taken by taxi and deposited outside their home with no way for them to get into it, how a service would react to an unusual event in their day to day public transport journey e.g. getting on the wrong bus accidentally. Safeguarding measures are to be factored into each individual solution. The Council aims to carefully assess the capabilities of each service user to gauge which method of transport is most suitable. However, the other aspect of ensuring safety is the training of transport staff e.g. bus drivers. It should be recognised that risk cannot be eliminated nor is this desirable because service users would miss out on the many benefits greater independence can bring. For instance, building confidence, better integration into the community etc. It is expected that each service user will have their transport options reviewed as a result of this process and that careful monitoring will occur of how the user's suitability for this option.
Gender (Including pregnancy and Maternity, Marriage)?		No	Comments/Actions: According to the Mid-2009 population estimates from the Office for National Statistics the current resident population of Cheshire East is circa 362,700. This is split between 184,500 females and

178,200 males (50.9% and 49.1%). This is approximately the same as the gender split in the North West and for England as a whole.

There is a much larger ratio of females to male service users in Cheshire East. This can largely be explained by the differences in life expectancy between the sexes.

Service Users by Gender

Sex	Total:	%
M	2206	36.6
F	3816	63.4
Total:	**6022**	**100**

This impact on this protected characteristic is neutral. No issues were uncovered through research or at the consultation events.

Gypsies & Travellers - Is there an impact?		**No**	Comments/Actions:

 Cheshire East Caravans - July 2010 (source LILAC)

All Caravans	139
Authorised Sites	119
Unauthorised Sites	20

Due to the transient nature of the Gypsy and Traveller community it is difficult to ascertain the exact numbers of this section of the community within Cheshire. It is considered an important and significant minority group however.

			The change in transport provision would not impact on the gypsy and traveller community because of the location of traveller sites in rural locations. Taxis and minibuses must be available for appropriate service users. Cost of transport must also be factored into the financial assessment process.
Race – Is there an impact?		**No**	Comments/Actions: White people are the overwhelming racial group within Cheshire East. Nevertheless, there is a significant proportion of people who are neither white British or Irish. This amounts to a total of 20,800 people or (6.1%), with 13,000 (3.8%) being non white. Ethnic Minorities (estimated for 2009 ONS)

Ethnic Minorities table:

	Cheshire East	England	Cheshire East %	North West %	England %
	Unitary Authority	Country	Unitary Authority	Region	Country
All Ethnic Groups	360,700	51,092,000	100.0	100.0	100.0
White	347,600	45,082,900	96.4	92.1	88.2
Mixed	3,300	870,000	0.9	1.2	1.7
Asian or Asian British	5,000	2,914,900	1.4	4.4	5.7
Black or Black British	2,000	1,447,900	0.6	1.1	2.8
Chinese or Other Ethnic Group	2,700	776,400	0.7	1.1	1.5

This impact on this protected characteristic is neutral. No issues were uncovered through research or at the consultation events.

Religion & Belief- Is there an Impact?		**No**	Comments/Actions:

Cheshire East as a whole has a far greater percentage of people who stated that they were Christian in the census than in England as a whole. This is a pattern which is a feature of much of the North West of England. Perhaps, the main reason for this is the lack of racial diversity apparent in the general population. Cheshire East has an equal amount of Buddhists to the North West average, half as many Hindu's and Jewish people and significantly less Muslims.

	Cheshire East	England	Cheshire East	England
	Unitary Authority	Country	Unitary Authority%	%
All People	351,817	49,138,831	100.0	100.0
Christian	282,432	35,251,244	80.3	71.7
Buddhist	551	139,046	0.2	0.3
Hindu	617	546,982	0.2	1.1
Jewish	562	257,671	0.2	0.5
Muslim	1,375	1,524,887	0.4	3.1
Sikh	170	327,343	0.0	0.7
Any other religion	593	143,811	0.2	0.3
No religion	42,757	7,171,332	12.2	14.6
Religion not stated	22,760	3,776,515	6.5	7.7

Religious requirements may mean a service user requires increased flexibility in transport arrangements e.g. to coincide with trips to places of workshop, to ensure transport occurs at appropriate times (e.g. not interfering with times of prayer). The

			change in transport provision is likely to benefit this protected characteristic in the longer term as the market grows and caters for a greater range of individual needs.
Sexual Orientation -Is there an impact?		**No**	Comments/Actions: In the NWDA's Report (North West Development Agency) "Improving the Region's Knowledge Base on the LGB&T population in the North West" it was estimated that 34,500 LGB's were living in the County of Cheshire. When adjusted for predicted population growth and split proportionately for the Cheshire East area, the number can be stated as being 12,311 for 2009. This equates to circa 3.4%. If this ratio is also adopted for Cheshire East service users (which is currently 6022 - 30 September 2010), this would be 205. This impact on this protected characteristic is neutral. No issues were uncovered through research or at the consultation events.
Transgender - Is there an impact?		**No**	Comments/Actions: The North West Development Agency has estimated that the number of transsexual people in the North West in 2009 as between 600-700. Using this proportion for Cheshire East means that there would be circa 32-37 transsexual people. Although the NWDA does note that this is a, "conservative estimate because it covers only those who are seeking, those who intend to seek and those who have undergone gender re-assignment and gender recognition (i.e. transsexuals), and does not include those not seeking recognition". There are no current service users who are known to be transgender. This impact on this protected characteristic is neutral. No issues

			were uncovered through research or at the consultation events.
Other socio-economic disadvantaged groups (including white individuals, families and communities) Is there an impact?		No	Comments/Actions: The areas with the lowest average household income, Cheshire East, 2007 Some attendees at the events felt that Personalisation was a mechanism in which the Council forced service users both to contribute more to their care and spend more time planning it. Service users currently pay £2 to receive transport to and from a day centre. Many service users stated that they would not be able to afford an increase in transport costs due to their already stretched budgets. However, some also expressed the view that they would be prepared to pay more.

Region (Lower Super Output Area)	Ward	Paycheck – Average Income
Central & ValleyL1	Delamere	£21,900
East CoppenhallL3	Maw Green	£22,200
West Coppenhall & GrosvenorL4	Grosvenor	£23,100
Macclesfield Town EastL5	Macclesfield Hurdsfield	£23,600
AlexandraL1	Alexandra	£23,700
West NantwichL1	Barony Weaver	£23,800
Wilmslow Town Dean Row & HandforthL4	Handforth	£23,900
Congleton EastL3	Congleton North	£24,200
St BarnabasL4	St Barnabas	£24,300
East CoppenhallL2	Maw Green	£24,400

			It is likely that the effect of the transport policy is to put pressure on those who can afford to pay, to pay more. However, service users are financially assessed according to ability to pay (under Government Fairer Charging Guidance) and so should not ever be asked to contribute more than they can afford to do. This means although there will be an impact on service user's particularly just about the Council threshold this should not be extreme. The assessment process must take into account the cost of transport in a particular area e.g. costs in rural locations may be significantly higher.
Please give details of any other potential impacts of this policy (i.e. Poverty & deprivation, community cohesion, environmental)	**Yes**		Comments/Actions: It is likely that this policy will bring about increased road traffic as individuals make a variety of ways to day centres rather than by using fleet vehicles.
Could the impact constitute unlawful discrimination in relation to any of the Equality Duties		**No**	Comments:
Does this policy – procedure – function have any effect on good relations between the council and the community	**Yes**		Comments: This policy has proved highly contentious and may have a significant impact on relations between the community and the council
Do you require further data/information/intelligence to support decision making?	**Yes**		Comments: A phased programme of transition is proposed, including a detailed analysis of current service users and individual reviews. No eligible person will have their commissioned transport service removed without an appropriate

				alternative transport solution being in place. (please note if you answer yes or no you will still be required to complete the Data Methods/Collection to Support Decision Making Section)
Please specify any question(s)/issues/concerns/actions identified as a result the assessment. What needs to be done?				Comments • Measure and review market developments • Ensure costs of alternative transport are moderate for service group. • Safeguarding referral pathways, training, advice and support. • Robust accreditation including enhanced CRB

Data Methods/Collection to Support Decision Making		
Please indicate what methods of research, information and intelligence will be/have been used e.g. consultation, reports, comparisons with similar organisations	Internally	Externally
Please state who will be/who was involved/engaged/consulted	Internal (Staff/Members/Service/Dept)	External (stakeholders/service users/partners)
Please indicate any significant expected costs & resource requirements for completing the data collection		

Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) Action Plan: Making Changes

REF	Action	Responsible Person/s	Action Deadline	Tasks	Progress
1	To ensure that sufficient resources are put into transport planning for service users. This should meet the needs of a full range of audiences e.g. those with learning disabilities, those with hearing impairments etc.	Chris Williams	From April 2011 to March 2013		
2	Ensuring that transport needs are fully factored into the financial assessment process. This includes ensuring that the location/needs of each individual are carefully assessed. This is of particular importance to those in rural locations. Taking account of motorbility or mobility resources available to the customer.	Jacqui Evans	From April 2011 to March 2013		
3	To ensure procedures are in place to carefully identify an individual's option for travel and that	Jacqui Evans	From April 2011 to March 2013		

	this is reviewed regularly to ensure it still fits in with their capabilities and wishes			
4	To ensure if the policy is implemented that a transition from fleet transport happens in a gradual way only removing supports when suitable alternatives are available for the individual. This includes both in staff training, quantity of vehicles and facilities of vehicles for disabled people	Places and Adult Services Jointly	From April 2011 to March 2013	
5	For procedures to be put in place to guarantee training of external transport staff and CRB checking. Accreditation should be regularly reviewed on the basis of inspection and incident reporting.	Places and Adult Services Jointly	From April 2011 to March 2013	
6				
Please state the date the policy/procedure/function will be reassessed? (generally 1-3 yrs)		Comments/Date:		

Signed (Service Manager) ……………………………………….   Date………………….

Signed (Head of Section)   …………………………………..   Date…………………

Once you have completed this section please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team. The Equality and Inclusion Team will convene a quarterly meeting of the Fairness and Inclusion Group (FIG) who will quality check our EIA's to ensure we have considered everyone. We plan to send approximately 2-5% of our completed EIAs Forms to the (FIG).

Quarterly Progress and monitoring

REF	Action	Progress	Completed

Once you have completed your progress report, please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team. Make a copy of the progress report template so you can present an update in three months time.

Once you have completed your quarterly progress report, please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team

Measuring Impact & Reporting

Ref	Action	Impact	Outcome	Review Date
	The changes that you have made to remove the gaps you have Identified (simply cut and paste these from the action plan).	What has been the overall impact of making the particular changes? (could include wider community involvement in policy development or greater use of service by	What are the concrete results of having changed your policy or service? Could include improved service use, reductions in complaints or increased satisfaction. These will be based on detailed data and should outline how the changes have	

			diverse communities).	brought about improvements for different communities and groups	

Once you have completed your impact report, please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team. The Equality and Inclusion Team will prepare an annual report for Corporate Management Team and Cabinet on our progress.

Appendix 1

Service Reference Index

Service Reference Index			
Safer & Stronger – **SSC**	Regeneration – **REG**	Planning & Policy – **PAH**	Legal & Democratic Services – **LAD**
Children & Families – **CHI**	Adults – **ADU**	Health & Wellbeing – **HWB**	Human Resources & Organisational Development – **HROD**
Policy & Performance – **PAP**	Corporate Improvement - **CI**	Environmental – **ENV**	Borough Treasurer & Head of Assets – **BTA**