

Equality Analysis

This Equality Analysis should be attached to any policy, strategy or business case for decision.

<i>Name of the policy, strategy or business case:</i>	Interim High Risk Emergency Surgical Clinical Strategy
---	--

Details of person completing the Analysis

Name	Ruth Mount and Bruce Campion-Smith
Job Title	Strategic Development Manager Head of Equality and Engagement
Division/Directorate	Strategic Development and Corporate Services
Telephone Number	01227 - 868682 01227 - 864077 Ext : 73947

What are the main aims, purpose and outcomes of the policy, strategy or business case?	The purpose of this paper is to detail a serious clinical risk that has arisen in general surgery and to look at the implications of a set of interim options that remedy the issue.
--	--

Does it relate to our role as a service provider and/or an employer?	Both as a service provider and an employer.
--	---

Information and research:

- Outline the information and research that has informed the decision.
 - Include sources and key findings.
- Include information on how the decision will affect people with different protected characteristics.

Recent national evidence has identified how safe surgical service should be delivered in the future, which includes the following documents;

- Francis inquiry report (Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust) February 2013;
- The higher risk general surgical patient, Royal College of Surgeons and Department of Health 2011; and
- Major trauma care in England, National Audit Office, February 2010.

This was further emphasised by the Royal College of Surgeons invited review, commissioned by the Trust in late 2012. Following this the Trust has delivered a program of work to improve general surgical services and implement sustainable models of care to support current service provision.

Detailed consideration has been given to area demographics, patient characteristics such as deprivation data and travel times which have not resulted in any evidence of discrimination resulting from this decision.

Equality Analysis

<p>Consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has there been specific consultation on this decision? What were the results of the consultation? Did the consultation analysis reveal any difference in views across the protected characteristics? <p>Can any conclusions be drawn from the analysis on how the decision will affect people with different protected characteristics?</p>	<p>No consultation has taken place due to the urgency of this matter. However, a full consultation on the clinical strategy will take place and will consider the implications of this interim solution.</p>	
<p>Is the policy, strategy or business case relevant to the aims of the equality duty?</p> <p>Guidance on the aims can be found in the EHRC's PSED Technical Guidance.</p>		
Aim	Yes/No	
Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation	Yes	
Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it	No	
Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it	No	
<p>Assess the relevance of the decision to people with different protected characteristics and assess the impact of the decision on people with different protected characteristics.</p> <p>When assessing relevance and impact, make it clear who the assessment applies to within the protected characteristic category. For example, a decision may have high relevance for young people but low relevance for older people; it may have a positive impact on women but a neutral impact on men.</p>		
Protected characteristic	Relevance to decision High/Medium/Low/None	Impact of decision Positive/Neutral/Negative
Age	<p>Generally older people have more difficulty with transport than others. The change of location identified in options C,D and E is not likely to increase the disadvantage but will change depending on the home location.</p> <p>LOW RELEVANCE</p>	Neutral

Equality Analysis

Disability	Generally people with disabilities also have more difficulty with transport than others. The change of location identified in options C,D and E is not likely to increase the disadvantage but will change depending on the home location. LOW RELEVANCE	Neutral
Gender reassignment	None	Neutral
Marriage and civil partnership	None	Neutral
Pregnancy and maternity	None	Neutral
Race	None	Neutral
Religion or belief	None	Neutral
Sex	None	Neutral
Sexual orientation	None	Neutral
Mitigating negative impact: Where any negative impact has been identified, outline the measures taken to mitigate against it.	The Trust has already in place mechanisms to support patients attending our hospitals such as access to NSL Patient Transport Services (PTS) and SECamb. There is also a number of Kent wide volunteer driver services which anyone can access for a small fee of 50p per mile plus £2.00 admin fee. These services are advertised locally in community areas as well as the internet.	
Conclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider how due regard has been had to the equality duty, from start to finish. There should be no unlawful discrimination arising from the decision (see PSED Technical Guidance). Advise on the overall equality implications that should be taken into account in the final decision, considering relevance and impact.	<p>The urgent nature of the situation requires a decision to be made immediately. However these issues have been considered over a far longer period as part of Trust's overall clinical strategy. Due regard to the equality duty has been given throughout that process.</p> <p>In our view there will be no unlawful discrimination arising from a decision to implement any of the options.</p> <p>It is the view of the authors of this report that no adverse impact will be experienced by specific protected characteristic groups</p>	

Equality Analysis

Signature of person completing the Analysis	
Name	Ruth Mount and Bruce Campion-Smith
Signed	
Date	13 th February 2014
Approval and sign-off Head of Department/Director	
Name	Liz Shutler
Signed	
Date	14 th February 2014
Chair of decision making Board/Group/Committee approval and sign-off	
Name	
Signed	
Date	