

## Cumulative Equality Impact Assessment


The Cumulative Equality Impact Assessment detailed in this Appendix is based on 70 Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) completed in August 2023. As these EIAs continue to be reviewed or updated, the Cumulative EIA may be further revised.

Of the 70 EIAs:

- 21 (30%) indicated that proposals could have a neutral impact on people from key characteristic groups, with no potential positive or negative impacts noted
- 7 (10%) suggested changes could have a solely positive impact
- 42 (60%) highlighted proposals with at least one possible negative impact (high, medium or low). Of these, three proposed changes (4% of the total) were reported as potentially having both positive and negative impacts

The chart below provides a summary of the anticipated impacts by characteristic. It shows that the key characteristics most likely to be negatively impacted are disability (28 negative impacts), age (20 negative impacts), sex (17 negative impacts), and poverty (17 negative impacts). The high proportion of negative impacts relating to disability and age reflect that 38 of the 70 EIAs were in relation to proposed changes to services in Adults' Health and Care and Children's Services, that most frequently support young, older and disabled people. These services account for over 68% of the County Council budget<sup>1</sup>.

### Level and type of impact per protected characteristic



<sup>1</sup> <https://www.hants.gov.uk/aboutthecouncil/budgetspendingandperformance/budgetandcounciltax>

Of the 42 EIAs that identified potential negative impacts, 27 of these identified negative impacts on more than one group. The table below shows how often two characteristics appear together (with percentages as a proportion of the total 70 EIAs). Combinations that appear at least five times are shaded in grey.

This demonstrates that the most frequent combinations of impacts involve age, disability, sex, and poverty.

	Age	Disability	Gender reassignment	Pregnancy and maternity	Race	Religion or belief	Sex	Sexual orientation	Marriage or civil partnership	Poverty	Rurality
Rurality	<b>9</b> (13%)	<b>10</b> (14%)	-	<b>5</b> (7%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	<b>7</b> (10%)	-	-	<b>12</b> (17%)	13 (19%)
Poverty	<b>10</b> (14%)	<b>10</b> (14%)	-	<b>5</b> (7%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	<b>6</b> (9%)	-	1 (1%)	17 (24%)	
Marriage or civil partnership	1 (1%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 (1%)		
Sexual orientation	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	-	-	1 (1%)	-	1 (1%)	1 (1%)			
Sex	<b>11</b> (16%)	<b>10</b> (14%)	-	<b>10</b> (14%)	<b>5</b> (7%)	2 (3%)	17 (24%)				
Religion or belief	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	-	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)					
Race	<b>6</b> (9%)	<b>5</b> (7%)	-	3 (4%)	6 (9%)						
Pregnancy and maternity	<b>7</b> (10%)	<b>6</b> (9%)	-	10 (14%)							
Gender reassignment	-	-	-								
Disability	<b>16</b> (23%)	28 (40%)									
Age	20 (29%)										

Number of EIAs with multiple impacts including this characteristic	20 (29%)	18 (26%)	-	10 (14%)	6 (9%)	2 (3%)	15 (21%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	14 (20%)	13 (19%)
--	-------------	-------------	---	-------------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------

Within the 28 EIAs that referenced negative impacts on disability there were references to potential impacts on:

- people with mental health issues (ten mentions)
- people with learning disabilities (nine mentions)
- people with physical disabilities (eight impacts)
- staff with a disability, people with visual or mobility impairments, and people with a disability that impairs their ability to use technology (one mention each)

Within the 20 EIAs that referenced negative impacts on age there were references to potential impacts on:

- older service users (11 mentions)
- younger service users (seven mentions)
- older staff (five mentions)
- younger staff (one mention)

Within the 17 EIAs that referenced negative impacts on sex there were references to potential impacts on:

- female staff (nine mentions)
- female service users (seven mentions)
- male service users (one mention)

Within the 17 EIAs that referenced negative impacts on poverty there were references to potential impacts on:

- communities where deprivation is high (four mentions)
- people without access to transport (three mentions)
- people in receipt of benefits (two mentions)
- people digitally excluded as a result of poverty (two mentions)
- people on lower incomes, and staff who may be at risk of redundancy (one mention each)

Within the 13 EIAs that referenced negative impacts on rurality there were references to potential impacts on:

- smaller communities (four mentions)
- areas with poor local access to services (three mentions)
- rural areas with roads in poor condition (two mentions)
- people with poor access to transport or who rely on the use of a car (two mentions)
- people requiring on emergency care, and poorly connected communities (one mention each)

