

## INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT PRO FORMA

Section: Chief Executive		Names of those undertaking assessment: Duncan Kerr, Simon Collingwood, Hilary Lovell	
Name of Policy to be assessed: Draft Local Code of Governance	Date of Assessment: 29 <sup>th</sup> January 2008	Is this a new or existing policy?: New	
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy: To deliver high standards of governance as defined in the proposed code			
2. What are the key performance indicators? Satisfaction of residents overall (from residents' survey) Auditor judgements			
3. Who will be affected by this policy? Members, staff, all stakeholders, officers and residents			
4. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way? All residents of the district will benefit from an effectively run organisation.			
5. Are there any other organisations involved in the delivery of the service? Contractors would be required to adhere to the principles in the code.			
6. What outcomes are required from this policy and for whom? Effective governance and service provision for the benefit of all residents, protection of reputation for the council and the staff			
7. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes? Inappropriate behaviours, corruption, non-adherence to the code.			
8. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy? As at 3 – and to include contractors and partners.			
9. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy? Council responsible, every member and officer responsible for implementation			
10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on different racial groups? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Requirement to engage (principle 6) needs to reflect the racial composition of the District. The definition of governance has therefore been redefined to address this. To ensure the principles are working they will be reviewed after 12 months.			
11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on men and women? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? No			
12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on disabled people? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? See comments at 10 above. This applies to disabled people as well.			
13. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on the grounds of sexual orientation? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? See comments at 10 above. This can apply on the grounds of sexual orientation.			

<p>14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on the grounds of age? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No</p>
<p>15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on the grounds of religious belief? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>See comments at 10 above. This can apply on the grounds of religious belief.</p>
<p>16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on any other groups of people eg those with dependants/caring responsibilities, those with an offending past, those with learning difficulties, transgendered or transsexual people. If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>Possibly difficulties in communicating the code to people with learning difficulties. A review of the principles after 12 months will highlight any issues.</p>
<p>17. Are there any obvious barriers to accessing the service eg language, physical access? Can be produced in various formats and languages if required. Code of governance will also be published on the website.</p>
<p>18. Where do you think improvements could be made?</p>
<p>19. Are there any unmet needs or requirements that can be identified that affect specific groups. If yes, please give details.</p> <p>See 16 above.</p>
<p>20. Is there a complaints system?</p> <p>Council's corporate complaints system</p>
<p>21. Do we monitor complaints by race, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religious belief?</p> <p>Complaints procedure being reviewed – not currently monitoring by race, gender etc.</p>
<p>22. Do we have feedback from managers or frontline staff?</p> <p>New policy</p>
<p>23. Is there any feedback from voluntary/community organisations?</p> <p>New policy</p>
<p>24. Is there any research or models of practice that may inform our view?</p> <p>CIPFA and SOLACE national guidelines which we have taken account of.</p>
<p>25. Could the differential impact identified in 8 – 16 amount to there being unlawful discrimination in respect of this policy?</p> <p>No</p>
<p>26. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy?</p> <p>Could do but 12 month review will highlight this.</p>
<p>27. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?</p> <p>Yes</p>

28. Should the policy proceed to a full impact assessment?

Not at this stage – to be looked at again once code has been in place for 12 months

29. Date on which Full assessment to be completed by

Signed (Lead Officer): ... ..Duncan Kerr.....

Date: .....29<sup>th</sup> January 2008.....