

Diversity Impact Assessment: Screening Form

Directorate RCC	Name of Policy/Strategy Medway's Community Partnership Plan 2008-2011	
Officer responsible for assessment Corinna Woollett	Date of assessment 18 Aug 08	New or existing? Existing
Defining what is being assessed		
1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives	To reduce crime and disorder in Medway by working in partnership with key agencies in Medway to achieve the 12 priorities: Tackling violence, reducing serious acquisitive crime, tackling anti-social behaviour, improving the local street scene, delivering safer roads, reducing youth offending, improving community cohesion, encouraging and improving citizen participation, reducing domestic abuse, reducing offending by prolific offenders, combating terrorist threats and tackling all aspects of substance abuse.	
2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?	All residents, visitors and businesses of Medway through focused initiatives.	
3. What outcomes are wanted?	Medway is a safe, clean place to live, work, visit and socialise.	
4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Contribute Good partnership working Funding	Detract Large geographic area Historically high level of crime (Medway & Thanet are top 2 places in Kent)
5. Who are the main stakeholders?	All residents, visitors and businesses of Medway, Police, Kent Fire Rescue, PCT and hospital A&E, voluntary sectors, GOSE and Home Office and all parts of Medway Council	
6. Who implements this and who is responsible?	Partnership is ultimately responsible and works through 12 subgroups to implement improvements delivered by the relevant agencies or contractors.	

Assessing impact		
7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial groups</i>?	YES	The underpinning Strategic Assessment (SA), which was compiled by the Police Analyst, only provided a breakdown of crime for certain offences. These were youth crime and robberies, whereby ethnicity was considered in the analysis. Kent Crime Victimization Survey (KCVS) data was used, along with the Council's opinion poll. The KCVS surveys residents on a random basis and therefore may not necessarily capture data that is a representative of all racial groups. However, the survey does capture perceptions of worry, feelings of safety and ASB in regards to race. Furthermore, the SA analysed hate crime to be decreasing, although it does still remain high within Kent. Partners and Communities Together (PACTs) priorities were also considered; again these may not be a representation of the whole community dependant on attendance, which is not recorded.
What evidence exists for this?	KCVS, SA, Residents Opinion Poll.	
8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?	YES	The underpinning SA did consider Hate Crime using comparable data of 9 types of prejudice, one of which is disability prejudice. The KCVS and Opinion Poll was considered in the priority setting stages, however, it cannot be analysed in terms of hitting disabled persons, as this is not recorded. This is also the same for the PACT priorities.
What evidence exists for this?	KCVS, SA, Residents Opinion Poll.	
9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?	YES	Gender was considered in the underpinning SA. A breakdown of crime was provided for Domestic Violence and Robberies. The KCVS and Resident's Opinion Poll was considered, however, it can not be analysed in terms of hitting gender specifics as this is not recorded. This is also the same for the PACT priorities.
What evidence exists for this?	KCVS, SA, Residents Opinion Poll.	
10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i>?	YES	
What evidence exists for this?	We refer this to the Core Value Group for guidance	
11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential	YES	The underpinning SA does not breakdown crime in relation to religion and/or belief. However, it does

impact due to <i>religion or belief</i>?		consider religion and belief when analysing Hate Crime. The KCVS surveys residents on a random basis and therefore may not necessarily capture data that is a representative of peoples religion or belief in Medway. However, the survey does capture perceptions of worry and feelings of safety in regards to religion.
What evidence exists for this?	SA, KCVS.	
12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's age?	YES	The underpinning SA looked at youth crime in its own entity. This was defined as offences committed either by or against a person aged 17 or younger. The SA used comparable data that includes age prejudice to measure levels of hate crime and in the analysis of robbery crime.
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	SA.	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being transgender or transsexual</i>?	YES	The underpinning SA does not consider transgendered or transsexual people. Again, the KCVS is conducted on a random basis whereby transgender and transsexual is not captured.
What evidence exists for this?	SA, KCVS.	
14. Are there any <i>other</i> groups that would find it difficult to access/make use of the function (e.g. people with caring responsibilities or dependants, those with an offending past, or people living in rural areas)?	YES	No surveys or analytical tools exclude minority groups, such as ex offenders. As with the above, the surveys used and consultation exercises carried out cannot be evidenced to be all-inclusive. It is uncertain what groups the KCVS hit and the PACT process only include those residents that attend the meetings, therefore excluding hard to reach and less represented groups.
What evidence exists for this?		
15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (e.g. disability <u>and</u> age)?	YES	The underpinning SA does consider multiple discrimination when breaking down youth related violence and robbery. Perception data from the KCVS also measures multiple discriminations but does not provide further breakdowns.
What evidence exists for this?	SA, KCVS	

Conclusions & recommendation		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?	YES	This is due to setting priorities from a detailed analytical tool and public opinions that are not necessarily a representation of all.
	NO	
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?	YES	

Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?		
NO	This function/ policy/ service change complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case.	
NO, BUT ...	What is required to ensure this complies with the requirements of the legislation? (see DIA Guidance Notes)?	The 2008-2011 plan was the first plan in a new format, following change in legislation. Legislation changes were that the plan is to be underpinned by an SA. The time between guidance being released and the deadline for the plan to be published was extremely tight. Therefore, consultation aspects were taken from those tools already in place, for example, the PACT process and various opinion surveys. The SA is produced on an annual basis whereby the SA for 2008/09 is due to be released in November 2008. Consultation options are being sought at the present time. These include surveys in key areas and using data from the Social Identity PACTs (please see below action plan).
YES	Give details of key person responsible and target date for carrying out full impact assessment (see DIA Guidance Notes)	

Action plan to make Minor modifications		
Outcome	Actions (with date of completion)	Officer responsible
To ensure that all groups are consulted with in setting what should be the crime and disorder priorities for the area.	Social Identity PACTS are being established. These will created forums that are not representative of the umbrella groups, such as groups that don't fulfil the existing forum criteria, such as Slovakian community, Muslim ladies, etc. These will feed into the next SA to ensure that every voice is heard.	DCI Jon Sutton/Corinna Woollett
Set up forums to reach all. To evidence equalities.	The PACTs already in existence are 'Shout out' (adults with learning disabilities), 'MACA' (black youths), 'Links Youth Group' (a mixture of ethnic minority youths and white British youths), Youth Parliament, Medway Ethnic Minority Forum, Muslim Forum, Medway Older Peoples Partnership. Attendance will need to be recorded and meetings minuted for evidence to incorporate into the 2008/09 SA and support the following DIA.	DCI Jon Sutton/Nicola Endacott (Police Analyst)
To consult with all using various consultation methods.	To conduct consultation exercises to capture local concerns from all, including hard to reach or less represented groups.	Nicola Endacott/Corinna Woollett

Planning ahead: Reminders for the next review	
Date of next review	
Areas to check at next review (e.g. new census information, new legislation due)	

<p>Is there <i>another</i> group (e.g. new communities) that is relevant and ought to be considered next time?</p>		
<p>Signed (completing officer/service manager)</p>	<p>Date</p>	
<p>Signed (service manager/Assistant Director)</p>	<p>Date</p>	