Redesign of the Liquidlogic Adults System LAS) forms to reflect the introduction of strengths based practice in Adult Social Care

Redesigning the assessment, support plan and review forms to make them fit for strengthsbased recording.

Redesigning the output documents that residents receive after their assessment, support plan and review.

Commissioning

In addition to this some core support functions will be affected, including the Business Intelligence Team and the Information Quality Team.

The data and information analysed as part of this review was sourced from:

Tableau Workforce Dashboards Review of other Local Authorities who use LAS, including East Sussex and Suffolk

(*as identified in the Surrey COVID Community Impact Assessment and the Surrey Health and Well-being Strategy)

Disability

Describe here the considerations and concerns in relation to the programme/policy for the selected group.

As of 17 May 2021, the total number of open cases* (*people known to Adult Social Care (ASC) who have an open referral) in Adult Social Care across Surrey County Council was 20,079. The below data shows the number of people supported by Adult Social Care by Client Category. Based on the below, 7,158 people are receiving support for either a physical disability or learning disability. This is around 35% of the total number of open cases in Adult Social Care.

Primary Client Category	Total number of All Open Cases as of 17 May 2021
Physical Disabilities	3,295
Learning Disabilities	3,863
Older People	8,054
Carers	2,653
Mental Health	2,212
Missing Data	2
Grand Total	20,079

Source: Surrey's Adults Social Care LAS system (Data sourced: May 2021 by SCC Business Intelligence team)

Making content more accessible means it is easier to use and works better on a range of

What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decision makers need to be aware of?

Not applicable

Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated?

None

What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decision makers need to be aware of?

Not applicable

Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated?

None

3. Staff

Age

Describe here the considerations and concerns in relation to the programme/policy for the selected group.

The breakdown of all staff within Surrey County Council within Adult Social Care (ASC) by age group shows that the largest age group is 50 to 59 at over 31% of ASC staff from this age group.

Under 30 – 10.93% 30 to 39 – 19.84% 40 to 49 – 22.56% 50 to 59 – 31.39% 60 to 69 – 13.73% Over 70 – 1.55%

(Source: Tableau Workforce Dashboards, June 2021)

The data below shows front-line Social Care posts by age range. We know that front line staff use LAS regularly as the main purpose of LAS is to record client data at contact, assessments, support planning, reviews, and case notes. The data below suggests that the highest age bracket of staff in these front-line positions, is between 50 to 59 at 30.76%.

		Age groups			
Post	Under 30	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	

Please note, some of the staff members listed above (Care Assistants and Integrated Reablement Workers/Assistants) do not have access to LAS as it is not part of their day to day role.

Staff of all ages will need to start using the new LAS forms from November 2021 and become confident in using new functionalities introduced as part of the project. Most changes however are to the content and layout within forms and are not changes to functionality and the way in

Within Adult Social Care, 2.80% of staff are recorded as 'registered disabled' as of June 2021 (Source: Tableau Workforce Dashboards, June 2021).

The below breaks this down further by job post, particularly front-line staff who use LAS more regularly. A breakdown of the frontline Social Care roles within Adult Social Care.

Job post	Has a disability (or previously had one)	Not informed/unknown
Care Assistants	0%	100%
IntegratedRbImtWorkers and RbImtAssistants	0.99%	99.01%
MHSocialWorkers(InclSnr)andAMHPs	3.13%	96.88%
OccupationalTherapists(InclSnr)	5.26%	94.74%
ResidentialSupportWorkers	0.85%	99.15%
Social Care Assistants	2.90%	97.10%
SocialWorkers(InclSnr)	3.40%	96.60%
Grand Total	2.02%	97.98%

(Source: Tableau Workforce Dashboards, June 2021).

Staff using screen readers Dragon and Jaws should find the new forms easier to navigate.

Describe here suggested mitigations to inform the actions needed to reduce inequalities.

The redesigned forms have been streamlined with less use of tables and more simple text boxes. This will enable staff to use screen readers such as Dragon and Jaws more easily.

What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decision makers need to be aware of?

Not applicable

Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated?

None

What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decision makers need to be aware of?

Not applicable

Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated?

None

4. Recommendation

Based your assessment, please indicate which course of action you are recommending to decision makers. You should explain your recommendation below.

Outcome One: No major change to the policy/service/function required. This EIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or negative impact, and all opportunities to promote equality have been undertaken

Outcome Two: Adjust the policy/service/function to remove barriers identified by the EIA or better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers you identified?

Outcome Three: Continue the policy/service/function despite potential for negative impact or missed opportunities to advance equality identified. You will need to make sure the EIA clearly sets out the justifications for continuing with it. You need to consider whether there are:

Sufficient plans to stop or minimise the negative impact

Mitigating actions for any remaining negative impacts plans to monitor the actual impact.

Outcome Four: Stop and rethink the policy when the EIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination. (For guidance on what is unlawful discrimination, refer to the <u>Equality and Human Rights Commission's guidance and Codes of Practice on the</u> <u>Equality Act</u> concerning employment, goods and services and equal pay).

Recommended outcome:

Outcome two

Explanation:

5. Action plan and monitoring arrangements

Insert your action plan here, based on the mitigations recommended.

Involve you Assessment Team in monitoring progress against the actions above.



	Initiat Dat		Person Actioning	Target Completion Date
--	----------------	--	---------------------	------------------------------

6a. Version control

Version Number	Purpose/Change	Author	Date
Version 1	Initial Draft document	Marina Misaljevic	18/06/2021
Version 2	Draft updated	Julie McPherson	02/09/2021
Version 3	DEG meeting	Marina Misaljevic	14/09/2021
Version 4	Updated version for review	Marina Misaljevic/Julie McPherson/Claire White	01/11/2021
Version 5	Final changes made	Marina Misaljevic/Julie McPherson/Tracey Pope-Warren	09/11/2021
Version 6	Reformatted to new template only and shared for approval Approved 02/03/2022	Marina Misaljevic/Julie McPherson/Claire White/Toni Carney	02/02/2022

The above provides historical data about each update made to the Equality Impact Assessment.

Please include the name of the author, date and notes about changes made – so that you can refer to what changes have been made throughout this iterative process.

6b. Approval

SMS: 07860 053 465

Email: contact.centre@surreycc.gov.uk