

INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT PRO FORMA

Section: Democracy (Electoral Services)	Names of those undertaking assessment: Simon Collingwood, Lena Shuttlewood, Sue Gibson	
Name of Policy to be assessed: Review of polling districts and places	Date of Assessment: 14 February 2008	Is this a new or existing policy?: New legal requirement: Electoral Administration Act 2006
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy: To complete a thorough review of all polling districts and places to ensure all electors have reasonable facilities for voting and that they are accessible to all electors having regard to the accessibility needs of disabled persons.		
2. What are the key performance indicators? None agreed at present.		
3. Who will be affected by this policy? All electors within the district of South Kesteven.		
4. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way? All electors. To allow all electors, regardless of disability, to exercise their democratic right.		
5. Are there any other organisations involved in the delivery of the service? No		
6. What outcomes are required from this policy and for whom? As 1. above		
7. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes? Failure to consult and to ensure an open and transparent process could detract from the outcome.		
8. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy? The electorate of South Kesteven district.		
9. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy? The District Council (polling places) and the Returning Officer (polling stations).		
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? Yes, in relation to potential language barriers. Empirical evidence from direct customer enquiries.		
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? Yes but the process seeks to mitigate any differential impact on the disabled by implementing reasonable adjustments.		

<p>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?</p> <p>No.</p>
<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>No.</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>No.</p>
<p>17. Are there any obvious barriers to accessing the service eg language, physical access?</p> <p>Yes, in relation to potential language barriers. There are legal requirements for nomination papers and ballot papers to be produced in English.</p> <p>The review seeks to address physical access barriers.</p>
<p>18. Where do you think improvements could be made?</p> <p>The purpose of the review seeks to identify improvements in the facilities used and their accessibility.</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>None at present. However, longer term we need to ensure all polling places are compliant with the law regard regarding accessibility.</p>
<p>20. Is there a complaints system? Corporate complaints system.</p>
<p>21. Do we monitor complaints by race, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religious belief?</p> <p>No</p>
<p>22. Do we have feedback from managers or frontline staff?</p> <p>Yes in relation to polling station staff.</p>
<p>23. Is there any feedback from voluntary/community organisations?</p> <p>No (but consultation process involved such groups)</p>
<p>24. Is there any research or models of practice that may inform our view?</p> <p>No</p>
<p>25. Could the differential impact identified in 10 – 16 amount to there being unlawful discrimination in respect of this policy?</p> <p>Potentially – only if the barriers identified are not addressed.</p>
<p>26. Could the differential impact identified in 10-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy?</p> <p>Yes – see no. 25 above</p>

27. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?

N/A

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

The action plan developed following the review will incorporate findings from the initial impact assessment and address any issues identified. It is suggested that a further impact assessment is carried out when the review is implemented.

29. Date on which Full assessment to be completed by

N/A

Signed (Lead Officer): Lena Shuttlewood, Democracy Service Manager

Date: 14th February 2008