



Police Scotland
Screening and Equality Impact Assessment Form

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|
| EIA Author's Name: | Graeme Brockie | Designation: | Police Sergeant | Date: | 11/03/2013 |
| Version Number of Policy: | 1 | | | | |
| Name of Policy | Midlothian Local Policing Plan | | | | |

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'.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Name of Policy | Midlothian Local Policing Plan |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|

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? |
| <p>The Midlothian Local Policing Plan outlines the policing priorities for 2013-14 the community identified during recent consultation in 2012 and how we plan to address them throughout the year ahead.</p> <p>It is produced as part of a planning process which takes account of the Scottish Governments overarching vision for public services, the Strategic Police Priorities set by Scottish Ministers, the Scottish Police Authorities Strategic Police Plan, the Chief Constable of Scotland's Annual Police Plan.</p> |
| 1.2 What outcome(s) are you trying to achieve? |
| <p>This plan is produced as part of a planning process which takes account of the Scottish Governments overarching vision for public services, the Strategic Police Priorities set by Scottish Ministers, the Scottish Police Authorities Strategic Police Plan, the Chief Constable of Scotland's Annual Police Plan and the Local Policing Plan for Midlothian.</p> <p>The Local police plan for Midlothian represent a critical part of the delivery process for the new service, demonstrating our commitment to local policing within the national planning framework and enabling us to respond effectively to the concerns of local communities as well as meet and tackle nationwide demands.</p> <p>This plan is the first under the new policing arrangements for Scotland.</p> <p>When it comes to local police services, one size doesn't fit all. Communities across Scotland have different needs but clearly all want access to the best expertise and services in policing to meet their area's needs and priorities.</p> <p>Ensuring our community can live their lives free from the fear of crime is a high priority in Midlothian and we have an excellent record of working</p> |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

in partnership with other agencies to ensure our service provision is the best it can be.

The Scottish Policing Assessment sets out the priorities for the Police Service of Scotland to the year 2015. It is a key document for the police in the continuous process of meeting future policing challenges and ensuring that the service the police provide to the communities of Scotland is of a high standard.

The Strategic Assessment undertaken by Midlothian's Community Safety Partnership forms the basis of the Community Safety Strategy in Midlothian.

Throughout 2012 we consulted with people from across Midlothian about the issues that were of greatest concern to them. These consultation results made a critical contribution to identifying issues for local communities and these have been translated into the key policing priorities for Midlothian.

All of our work is underpinned by our commitment to equality and diversity in our dealings with the public we serve as well as our own staff.

We recognise that effective and fair policing is about reflecting the needs and expectations of individuals and local communities. Survey results show that different communities have differing expectations and contrasting experiences of the service provided by the police. Our aim is to ensure that our service to all is fair and consistent, keeping those who are most vulnerable safe and enhancing their quality of life.

Our plans have been written having taken all of this into account.

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| 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 |
| Midlothian Shadow Police and Fire & Rescue Board have approved the document. This is a representative group of elected members, business people and members of the community. | | |
| Divisional Lay Advisor was consulted during the creation of this document. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| (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 Midlothian Policing Plan is intended to document policing priorities. These have been identified through sound analytical evidence. It is not foreseen that this will in anyway discriminate or disadvantage any particular groups. | | |
| 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? No. The Midlothian Policing Plan is intended to document policing priorities and it is not perceived that it will lead to any such opportunity. | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|------|--------|-----|--------------|---|
| 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 Midlothian Policing Plan is intended to document policing priorities and it is not perceived that it will have any impact on different 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 | Some aspects of public perception consultation relates to young peoples behaviour. None of the police priorities or policies relate specifically to young people and are based on the whole population. |
| Disability | | | | X | |
| Gender | | | | X | The strategic aim is Reducing Violent Crime. This includes gender-based violence involving both men and women and will not disadvantage any single group. |
| Gender Reassignment | | | | X | |
| Marital / Civil Partnership Status | | | | X | |
| Pregnancy & Maternity Leave | | | | X | |
| Race | | | | X | |
| Religion or Belief | | | | X | |
| Sexual Orientation | | | | X | |

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.

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: | | |
| EIA Author's Name: Graeme Brockie | Designation: Police Sergeant 4862E | Date: 11/03/13 |
| E&D Resource's Name: Mike Parsons | Designation: Equalities and Diversity Officer | Date: 02/04/2013 |
| 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: Chief Inspector James Royan | Designation: Local Area Commander | Date: 9 May 2013 |

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 Owning 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 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 2.2 Evidence/Information from Other Sources (attach relevant research/evidence/monitoring) | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Source/Title of evidence | Further evidence gathered |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |

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) | |
| 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

| |
|---|
| 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" |
|---|

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| 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

| |
|---|
| 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? |
| Please provide details |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| 5.2 Who will be responsible for the above monitoring? | |
| Please provide details | |
| 5.3 When will the policy be reviewed and who will be responsible for this review? | |
| Please provide details | |

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

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| Place(s) published: | | Date(s) published: | |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|--|

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: | Designation: | Date: |

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

| | | |
|-------|--------------|-------|
| Name: | Designation: | Date: |
|-------|--------------|-------|

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: | Designation: | Date: |
|-------|--------------|-------|