



## Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

### Title of policy/process under consideration

**Access to work**

### Lead department

**Corporate affairs**

Is this policy/process? (Please tick)

New  Existing  Revised

Is this a full EIA? (Please tick)

Yes  No

### Please state the reasons for the above decision.

The policy has no significant impact on any of the protected characteristics.

### What are the policy/process objectives and aims?

The policy outlines the ILF position on providing support during periods in which someone may be eligible for funding from Access to Work.

Whilst the ILF provides financial support for users to employ assistance to live independently within their communities, Access to Work provides funding specifically to enable users to access employment opportunities through PA support, travel or adaptations to the work environment.

In certain circumstances there may be an overlap in the support that is available to someone. The policy therefore identifies how the ILF will approach circumstances where someone requires personal assistance in a workplace environment.

It recommends that in all circumstances users should firstly approach Access to Work but recognises that in certain situations users may not be eligible for the necessary personal care and support. In these circumstances the ILF may continue to provide funding.

Access to work is intended to reduce the barriers that disabled people have in accessing and retaining employment.

### Please state the reasons why the changes are taking place.

By directing users through Access to Work the ILF ensures that they are able to access a specialist-funding stream that will be able to provide them with advice and support that is tailored to their requirements. The ILF is not able to provide equipment, workplace adaptations or travel costs that may be covered by Access to work. Likewise the ILF does not have the in house expertise over what support is available to enable someone in employment.

The policy therefore ensures that the user is able to benefit from the support available. Whilst in some circumstances the take up of assistance from access to work may reduce the requirement for the ILF to provide support the policy is in no way intended to result in the overall reduction in support. This is clarified within the policy, which states that if the request to access to work is declined then the ILF can still consider this.

Key			
-2	Significant negative impact	+1	Mild/moderate positive impact
-1	Mild/moderate negative impact	+2	Significant positive impact
0	Neutral impact		
Protected Characteristic	Impact	Notes	
Age	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to age. Access to work is restricted to people over the age of 16. All ILF users are above this age. There is no upper age limit to either the ILF or access to work.	
Disability	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to disability.	
Gender	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to gender.	
Gender reassignment	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to gender reassignment.	
Marriage and civil partnership	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to marital status.	
Pregnancy and maternity	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to pregnancy or maternity.	
Race	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to race.	
Religion or belief	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to religion or belief.	
Sexual orientation	0	The policy has no significant impact relating to sexual orientation.	

What alternative policy/process options have been considered to reduce or alleviate any identified impact?

We have not identified any significant impact of the policy on any of the protected characteristics.

What research has been gathered/considered when making decisions regarding the Protected Characteristics?

DWP information on access to work has been considered.

Whilst the information captured by access to work is not directly comparable with ILF information there is some overlap of customers. The ILF does not capture information directly regarding the number of users accessing access to work. However within the RTC trailblazer programme up to June 2012, 9 ILF users had been newly referred to Access to Work by ILF assessors following a review. This represents 0.74% of users reviewed. The figures exclude ILF users already accessing Access to Work.

Are any future actions required for example monitoring or review?

The policy is subject to regular review in line with all ILF policies.

EIAB comments/recommendations

The EIAB reviewed the EIA on 30 August 2012 and subject to the minor amendments detailed in the minutes of 30 August 2012 the board agreed to the EIA.

Date form completed 14 August 2012

Signature of EIAB chair Jesse Harris

Date 31 August 2012

## Subsequent amendments to policy/process

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required