

Equality impact assessment (EIA) form: evidencing paying due regard to protected characteristics

(Form updated October 2025)

Savings in Disabled Children's Service (DCS)

An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) form is a document that proves paying due regard by considering protected characteristics. EIAs that accompany reports presented to Councillors for decision-making are published with the committee papers on our website and are also available in hard copy at the relevant meetings.

Section 1: Initial Equality Impact Assessment Screening

This section documents the equality screening process of actual or potential impacts of the proposed activity on a specific protected characteristic, along with NYC's additional agreed-upon characteristics, to determine whether a full Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is necessary or appropriate.

Basic Details	
Directorate	CYPS
Service area	Disabled Children
Proposal being screened	Savings in Disabled Children Service
Officer(s) carrying out screening	Kate Reid
Lead Officer and contact details	Kate Reid
Date of the assessment	17.12.25
Please describe briefly what this EIA is about. (e.g. are you starting a new service, changing how you do something, or stopping doing something?)	Make savings within Disabled Children Service - £250k for 26/27. Further £250k in 27/28.
What does the authority hope to achieve by it? (E.g. to save money, meet increased demand, do things in a better way.)	We are proposing these savings as part of the council's wider financial sustainability plan. The Disabled Children's Service is a significant area of spend, and we need to ensure resources are used efficiently while continuing to meet statutory duties and deliver high-quality support. This proposal aims to identify efficiencies that do not compromise safety or essential outcomes for children and families.
Further Details	
1.1 How have stakeholders been involved in this policy/ decision/ proposal? (e.g. a consultation exercise)	Disabled Children's Service were consulted via HR process following service restructure.

<p>1.2 Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Please explain briefly</p>	<p>The proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on how other organisations operate. However, there may be some impact on commissioned providers and partners, as we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase scrutiny of commissioned services and Direct Payments to ensure value for money and compliance. • Review children’s plans more rigorously to explore the most cost-effective options for meeting needs. • Improve assessment quality using the new Toolkit, which may require providers to adapt to clearer, evidence-based specifications.
---	---

1.3 Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYC’s additional agreed characteristics

As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions:

- To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics?
- Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important?
- Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to?

If for any characteristic, it is considered that there is likely to be an adverse impact or you have ticked ‘Don’t know/no info available’, then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your directorate representative for advice if you are in any doubt.

Tick and indicate which protected characteristics are identified as relevant to the proposal (positive, negative, neutral or don’t know).

Protected characteristic	Impact				Comments
	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Don't know	
Age	x	x			
Disability	x	x			
Sex			x		It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as because of their sex.
Race (including GRTS)			x		It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific ethnic groups because of the proposals.
Gender reassignment			x		It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to gender reassignment as a result of the proposals.
Sexual orientation			x		It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to sexual orientation as a result of the proposals.
Religion or belief			x		It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on those with religion or beliefs because of the proposals.

Pregnancy or maternity			x		It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to pregnancy or maternity as a result of the proposals.
Marriage or civil partnership			x		It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to marriage or civil partnership as a result of the proposals.

NYC's additional characteristics

People in rural areas		x			The proposals are unlikely to impact on those living in rural areas.
People on a low income			x		The proposals are unlikely to impact on those on low incomes.
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		x			The proposals are likely to impact on people who are carers.
Are from the Armed Forces Community (including veterans)			x		The proposals are unlikely to impact on the armed forces community.

1.4 To which Part(s) of the Public Sector Equality Duties is the Policy/decision/proposal relevant? Tick and briefly describe.

General Duties	Yes	No	Details
Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes – potential to create disproportionate disadvantage due to possible reduction in service capacity – though the intention is to streamline processes and ensure quality needs-led assessment and planning.
Advance equality of opportunity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes – savings have the potential to reduce opportunities for disabled children to achieve the same outcomes as their peers.
Foster good relations between different groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes – savings could reduce inclusion of disabled children within communities and risks undermining public confidence in the council's commitment to inclusion and equality.

1.5 Decision (Please tick one option)

Decision to recommend this policy/ decision for an Equality Impact Assessment?

Yes



No



If the answer is “Yes”, or you indicate a negative impact on any of the characteristics mentioned in the table above, please continue to Section 2 and complete the full Equality Impact Assessment. If the answer is “No”, please give a brief reason here.

Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)

Date

17.12.25

Section 2: Equality Impact Assessment

This section aims to provide a full assessment of the actual or potential impacts on specific protected characteristics, along with NYC's additional characteristics. It will also identify the proper actions to mitigate these impacts, if needed.

2.1 Evidence, Consultation and Data: What data or evidence source(s) has/ have been used to inform this assessment? Select the relevant source (s):

- Demographic data x
- Service usage data x
- Consultation feedback
- National/local research and report
- Expert opinion
- Others

2.2 Stakeholder Engagement: What engagement has been done regarding the proposal and what are the results?

- Who has been consulted? Disabled children's team following restructure
- How were they consulted? HR process
- What feedback was received? All feedback was received, reviewed and considered

2.3 What positive impact will this proposal have on the council budget, people, community, economic growth and environment, etc? Please explain briefly

The proposal will have a positive impact in the following ways:

Council Budget:

- Savings in a high-spend area, such as DCS, will have a positive impact on the overall financial position of the council.
- Making targeted savings in one part of the system can avoid more severe cuts to other essential areas.
- Support long-term sustainability – savings help stabilise the financial environment to ensure the council can continue to meet statutory duties.

People and Community:

- More targeted support for those children and families with the highest needs.
- Improved efficiency, clearer pathways and simpler processes – embed the new Toolkit to support assessment and planning.
- Stronger community-based and preventative support – which builds resilience and not dependence.
- Increased opportunities for voluntary and local organisations – more flexible, creative and locally rooted provision.

Economic Growth and Environment:

- Supports overall financial stability – helps council maintain a balanced budget.
- Reduces long-term crisis spending.
- Creates opportunities for local providers and strengthens community resilience.
- Reduced travel and emissions if more localised provision is used.
- Low carbon footprint through more efficient service delivery.
- Potential for 'greener' commissioning.

2.4 Please briefly describe how will this proposal affect people with protected characteristics? Only those who are identified as relevant to the proposal in section 1.

protected characteristics	Negative	Don't know	Why will it have this effect? Provide evidence from engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information, etc.
Age	x		<p>Disabled Children and young people may experience changes to how support is delivered but statutory duties under the Children Act remain unchanged.</p> <p>The proposal aims to improve the efficiency and quality of assessment and planning therefore children should benefit from getting the right support at the right time.</p> <p>The potential negative impact is if there is reduced access to early help / preventative support which may lead to later escalation of need.</p>
Disability	x		<p>Disabled Children are the primary users of this service and so are most directly impacted by any change. Disabled Children are legally defined as 'Child in Need.'</p> <p>The aim is that savings will streamline processes, improve the quality of assessment and planning leading to improved commissioning and more reliance on community support. Children will therefore benefit from more consistent, needs-led support, clearer eligibility pathways and better use of resources for the highest needs. A focus on early help and community-based support will also reduce reliance on crisis-intervention.</p> <p>There is the potential for disabled children to be negatively impacted by any reduction in provision, capacity or flexibility – this in turn could result in reduced opportunities for independence, social inclusion or short breaks. This risk however should be mitigated by the implementation of the new Toolkit, which supports needs-led assessment. There are no plans to reduce support to disabled children where there is a clear, identified unmet need.</p>
Sex		x	It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact as because of their sex.
Race (including GRTS)		x	It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific ethnic groups because of the proposals.
Gender reassignment		x	It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to gender reassignment as a result of the proposals.
Sexual orientation		x	It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to sexual orientation as a result of the proposals.
Religion or belief		x	It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on those with religion or beliefs because of the proposals.

Pregnancy or maternity		x	It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to pregnancy or maternity as a result of the proposals.
Marriage or civil partnership		x	It is anticipated there would be no identifiable impact on specific groups in relation to marriage or civil partnership as a result of the proposals.
NYC's additional characteristics			
People in rural areas	x		Disabled children who live in more rural locations in North Yorkshire may be at a disadvantage due to lack of local resource however this is not a direct result of the proposal.
People on a low income		x	The proposals are unlikely to impact on those on low incomes.
Carer (unpaid family or friend)	x		Carers of disabled children are directly impacted by this proposal. Carers will benefit from clearer processes, more predictable, needs led support, and an increase in community-based or preventative services. Carers may experience increased stress, pressure or caring responsibilities if support is reduced or delayed; this can have an overall impact on their health, wellbeing and ability to work. The proposal, however aims to provide clear needs-led support at the right time. The Local Authority will continue to have a statutory duty to support carers of disabled children.
Are from the Armed Forces Community (including veterans)		x	The proposals are unlikely to impact on the armed forces community.

2.5 Geographic impact: Please detail where the impact will be (please tick all that apply)

North Yorkshire wide	x
Craven	
Hambleton	
Harrogate	
Richmondshire	
Ryedale	
Scarborough	
Selby	

If you have ticked one or more areas, will specific town(s)/ village(s) be particularly impacted? If so, please specify below.

Disabled children who live in more rural locations in North Yorkshire may be at a disadvantage due to lack of local resource however this is not a direct result of the proposal.

2.6 Will the proposal affect anyone more because of a combination of protected characteristics? (e.g. older women or young gay men) State what you think the effect may be and why, citing evidence from Q2.1 & Q2.2, e.g. engagement, consultation and/or service user data or demographic information, etc.

N/A

2.7 Mitigation and Actions: List the actions that will be taken to reduce or eliminate any negative impact identified above and how positive impacts will be enhanced. Briefly describe the action you defined.

Actions	Lead	By when
Toolkit to be embedded across all teams to support needs-led assessment and planning for all disabled children and their families.	Kate Reid / Carla McAleese	End Feb 2026
Request for care packages over and above what is determined within the Toolkit to be presented to Funded Support Request Group (FSRG) for Senior Management consideration – ensures children are receiving the most appropriate package of support.	Kate Reid / Carla McAleese	Monthly

2.8 Monitoring and Review: If the proposal is to be implemented, how will the impact be monitored? Briefly describe the monitoring arrangements/systems that will be put in place to find out how the expected outcomes have been achieved in practice.

- Monthly performance monitoring – to include number of referrals, assessments completed, number of children accessing short breaks, number of children in care, use of APL and external provision.
- Quality Assurance and Case Audits – to consider use of Toolkit and quality.
- DCS restructure post-implementation review.
- Parent / Carer feedback
- Contract Board

2.9 Conclusion: Please summarise the findings of your EIA, including impacts, recommendations in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

The proposal to make savings within DCS contributes positively to the Council's financial sustainability and helps avoid deeper cuts across other services. Savings are focused on improving efficiency, assessment quality and commissioning rather than reducing statutory support. This approach supports long-term stability while maintaining duties under the Children Act.

Disabled children, as the primary users of the service, will experience changes in how support is assessed and delivered. The intended impact is improved, needs-led decision-making so children receive the right support at the right time, with clearer pathways and more consistent outcomes. A greater emphasis on early help, community-based and preventative provision is intended to build resilience and reduce reliance on crisis intervention and high-cost care.

There is a potential risk that any reduction in early help capacity or service flexibility could lead to escalation of need, reduced access to short breaks, or impact on independence and social inclusion for some children. Carers may also experience increased pressure or stress if support is delayed or reduced, with potential impacts on wellbeing and employment.

Mitigation and Safeguards

These risks are mitigated through the embedding of a needs-led Toolkit across all teams, ensuring consistency and proportionality in assessment and planning. There are no plans to reduce support where a clear unmet need is identified. Requests for support beyond Toolkit recommendations will be considered

through the Funded Support Request Group, providing senior management oversight and assurance. Statutory duties to disabled children and their carers remain unchanged.

Monitoring and Review

The impact of the proposal will be monitored through regular performance reporting, quality assurance activity, post-implementation review of the DCS restructure, parent and carer feedback, and ongoing contract oversight. This will ensure any emerging negative impacts are identified early and addressed.

2.10 Sign off section

This full EIA was completed by:

Name: Kate Reid
Job title: Head of Child Permanence & Family Reunification
Directorate: CYPS
Signature:

Completion date: 6.1.26

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature):

Date: 06.01.25

Once this has been signed off, please send it to webteam@northyorks.gov.uk for publication on the appropriate webpage.

Publication:

To help people find completed EIAs, we publish them in the Equality and Diversity section of the NY Council [website](#).

Contact details

If you need further support and guidance about carrying out EIA, please contact your directorate equality representative as listed in Stage 4 on our Intranet: [Paying due regard to equality using equality impact assessments](#)

Or contact North Yorkshire Council's equality team on email Equality@northyorks.gov.uk