



Police Scotland
Screening and Equality Impact Assessment Form

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------|------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| EIA Author's Name: | Brian Shaw | Designation: | Chief Inspector | Date: | 20/03/13 |
| Version Number of Policy: 0.1 | | | | | |
| Name of Policy | Police Scotland Argyll & Bute Local Policing Plan 2013-2014 | | | | |

Note: This form should be completed in line with the attached guidance and in conjunction with Equality and Diversity resources working within Police Reform. Completed EIAs must be retained with other project paperwork and the outcomes must be reported to project leads/decision makers to be considered when making decisions.

The term Policy refers to: Policies; Provisions; Criteria; Functions; Practices; and Activities hereafter referred to as 'policy'.

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Name of Policy | Police Scotland Argyll & Bute Local Policing Plan 2013-2014 |
|-----------------------|--|

STAGE 1: SCREENING FOR POTENTIAL IMPACT(S)

Use this section to identify and document the potential impact of your policy and note the action planned or taken to eliminate (or justify) any potentially adverse impact. This section may also be used as an evidence log.

1.1 What is the main aim(s) or purpose of the policy?

To communicate to the people of Argyll & Bute the key strategic priorities for policing Argyll & Bute

1.2 What outcome(s) are you trying to achieve?

To communicate to the people of Argyll & Bute that policing priorities have been set by taking account of a range of information sources and by consulting with local communities and partner agencies so that priorities are focused on policing local communities in Argyll & Bute.

1.3 Collect Information: what evidence is available on how this policy might affect equality groups and what does this tell you? Consider inspections/audit recommendations, surveys, monitoring data, research. Are there any gaps in the evidence? (attach relevant research/evidence/monitoring)

| Source/Title of evidence | Gaps in evidence remaining | Further evidence to be gathered |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Scottish Policing Assessment 2013-2015 | | |
| August 2012 Consultation across A&B with 856 people in Argyll & Bute | | |
| Strathclyde E&D Consultation Feedback 2012-14 | | |
| Police Scotland E&D Consultation & Equality Outcomes 2013 | | |
| (Continue rows as necessary) | | |

1.4 Is there any potential for the policy or practice to discriminate, directly or indirectly, or disadvantage any particular group/s?

If yes, who is affected and how? / If no, state what evidence is available to support this?

No, the policing plan explicitly prioritises the needs of vulnerable people groups, vulnerable children, vulnerable adults, domestic abuse victims, victim of hate crime and victims of anti social behaviour. It also prioritises ongoing local/ public engagement. In the the light of the findings of specific Equality & Diversity consultation, the priorities include the needs of marginalised groups even though those needs did not always emerge as top priorities through ‘mainstream’ KIN consultation.

1.5 Is there any opportunity to advance equality for any group/s by removing an existing inequality/disadvantage? Yes/No

If yes, please provide details / If no, state what evidence is available to support this?

Yes –the opportunities have been identified in the policing plan: the plan explicitly prioritises protection of vulnerable people and victims of hate crime and ASB.

1.6 Is there any potential for impact (negative or positive) on relations between different groups? E.g. Can it lead to tension between any groups and cause damage to relations or will it help to foster good relations? Yes/No

If yes, please provide details / If no, state what evidence is available to support this?

No – The priorities have been formed to be broadly inclusive of all communities and all vulnerable people/groups

1.7 Which of the protected groups is the potential impact relevant to and to what level?

| | High | Medium | Low | No Relevance | Reasons |
|------------------------------------|------|--------|-----|--------------|--|
| Age | x | | | | Positive impact because vulnerability of this targeted area has been an issue that has explicitly recognised and prioritised by the plan |
| Disability | x | | | | Positive impact because vulnerability of this targeted area has been an issue that has explicitly recognised and prioritised by the plan |
| Gender | x | | | | Positive impact because vulnerability of this targeted area has been an issue that has explicitly recognised and prioritised by the plan |
| Gender Reassignment | x | | | | Positive impact because vulnerability of this targeted area has been an issue that has explicitly recognised and prioritised by the plan |
| Marital / Civil Partnership Status | | | | x | Not an HR document |
| Pregnancy & Maternity Leave | | | | x | Not an HR document |
| Race | x | | | | Positive impact because vulnerability of this targeted area has been an issue that has explicitly recognised and prioritised by the plan |
| Religion or Belief | x | | | | Positive impact because vulnerability of this targeted area has been an issue that has explicitly recognised and prioritised by the plan |
| Sexual Orientation | x | | | | Positive impact because vulnerability of this targeted area has been an issue that has explicitly recognised and prioritised by the plan |

Note: If the impact of the policy is considered to be of no relevance to **any** equality group/s, then there is no need to progress to a full equality impact assessment. However if the screening above has high, medium or low against any of the aims of the public sector general equality duty, then a full impact assessment should be done.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

In a very few cases where the relevance is considered to be low, it may be necessary to postpone the full impact assessment – if this is decided the reasons should be recorded and the date for reviewing this decision inserted below.

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1.8 Quality Assurance and Decision: On completion of Screening for Relevance, seek advice from your Equality and Diversity resources working within police reform | | |
| Comments from the Equality and Diversity Police Reform resource regarding the above screening level: | | |
| I agree with the authors comments and suggested impact levels as identified in the above screening process. The document identifies local issues and priorities to address those, whilst considering the most vulnerable sections of our communities. | | |
| EIA Author's Name: Brian Shaw | Designation: Chief Inspector L669 | Date: 20 March 2013 |
| E&D Resource's Name: Sean Burke | Designation: PS H150 | Date: 08 April 2013 |
| Note: If a full equality impact assessment is not required, the senior manager who is the policy's owner must also sign off the screening, OR if it is decided that a full EIA cannot be done at this time, the reasons given and a date for reviewing this decision given below. | | |
| Reason for postponing full EIA | | Date for reviewing: |
| Policy Owner's Name: | Designation: | Date: |

STAGE 2: GATHERING EVIDENCE INCLUDING CONSULTATION/INVOLVEMENT

Consultation: This section should be used to record **all** consultation conducted by the author in creating **this version** of the policy with a consultation record being developed for every individual or organisation consulted with. **The Owing Department/Author must retain all correspondence (emails, letters, notes, draft/final document versions, etc) during the creation of the procedure, policy, function or activity.** Copy and paste issues raised into 4th column below.

| 2.1 Log on consultation undertaken | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Consultee | Date sent | Date received | Response – issues/concerns raised | Amendments etc. made |
| See 'Scottish Policing Assessment 2013-2015' – Scottish Police Website | | | As summarised in the policing plan | |
| August-Oct 2012 - Consultation across A&B with 856 people from A&B – available from Strathclyde Force Performance Delivery Unit, FHQ | | August 2012 | As summarised in the policing plan | |
| Strathclyde E&D Consultation Feedback 2012-14 – CI Ross Aiken, Head of Diversity, Strathclyde Police/Police Scotland | | 2011-2012 | As summarised in the policing plan | |
| A&B Community Planning Partnership Priorities – LALO, A&B | | | As summarised in the policing plan | |
| 2.2 Evidence/Information from Other Sources (attach relevant research/evidence/monitoring) | | | | |
| Source/Title of evidence | | Further evidence gathered | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

STAGE 3: ANALYSIS

3.1 Analysis of Evidence Obtained: summarise the findings from 2.1 and 2.2 above and what does it tell us.

| Issue/concern raised | Analysis/Comment |
|----------------------|------------------|
| | |
| | |

STAGE 4: DECISION / MITIGATION ACTION / JUSTIFICATION

| 4.1 What is your decision? (see page 11 of guidance) | Please tick only 1 box |
|---|------------------------|
| A. No Change is required (no adverse impact) | x |
| B. Adjust the policy (to remove or minimise the adverse impact) | |
| C. Continue the policy (despite adverse impact being identified – complete 5.1 below) | |
| D. Stop and remove the policy (in case of unlawful discrimination) | |

Note: if options A or D are chosen, then stage 5 (mitigation) is not required.

MITIGATION /JUSTIFICATION

| |
|---|
| <p>4.2 Can any negative impact be justified on a legal or objective ground? If so, please give full details here - attach any EHRC and /or legal guidance or similar received"</p> |
| |

4.3 MITIGATING ACTION PLAN: What mitigating or positive action/s have been or will be taken to minimise/eliminate any potential for adverse impact on our ability to meet the aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty? And, how will this action be monitored to see if it is reducing any adverse impact?

| Issue / Concern identified | Mitigating Action taken/ to be taken | Evaluation/ Monitoring method | Timescale & Updates | Action Owner | Strategic Ownership & Links to Equality Outcomes |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

STAGE 5: IMPLEMENTATION AND REVIEW

| |
|--|
| <p>5.1 What arrangements /systems are / will be in place to monitor the effect of the policy once it is implemented and how will this relate to our duty to advance equality?</p> |
| <p>Performance against this Plan will be scrutinised by the Performance Review and Scrutiny Committee of Argyll and Bute Council, with any issues being reported to the full Council. In addition, as part of the development of the new Argyll and Bute Community Plan, a set of key outcomes for the area will be established, and there will be clear links/actions to show the contribution that each of the Community Planning partners will make in achieving these outcomes, including the key priorities derived from this Policing Plan..</p> |
| <p>5.2 Who will be responsible for the above monitoring?</p> |
| <p>Performance against the key outcomes from the new Community Plan will be scrutinised by the CPP Management Committee</p> |
| <p>5.3 When will the policy be reviewed and who will be responsible for this review?</p> |
| <p>The Council has the option to refer any arising issues to the Audit and Performance Committee</p> |

STAGE 6: PUBLICATION. LEGISLATION REQUIRES THIS TO BE PUBLISHED IN AN ACCESSIBLE FORMAT AND AVAILABLE IN A REASONABLE TIME.

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| <p>Place(s) published:</p> | | <p>Date(s) published:</p> | |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|

STAGE 7: FINAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT SIGN OFF

Statement by Author of the Policy - This policy has been developed in accordance with the EIA guidance notes having considered the impact and effect of this policy against the general equality duty and taken appropriate steps to mitigate, reduce, eliminate, or provide justification for any adverse impact it may have.

Name: Brian Shaw

Designation: Chief Inspector L669

Date: 10 April 2013

Quality Check: Full Impact Assessment Checked by Police Reform Equality & Diversity Resource

Name: Sean Burke
as per section 1.8 above

Designation: Sergeant H150

Date: 08 April 2013

Police Reform Executive Delivery Officer

The final stage of the EIA is to formally sign off the document as being a complete rigorous and robust assessment.

Decision makers must take account of the results of Equality Impact Assessments when considering whether to approve a new or revised policy.

Name: Barry McEwan

Designation: Chief Superintendent

Date: 19 April 2013