

APPENDIX 2

Diversity Impact Assessment: Screening Form

Directorate RCC	Name of Policy/Strategy Medway's Community Partnership Plan 2009-2012	
Officer responsible for assessment Corinna Woollett	Date of assessment 12 February 2009	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 six priorities: Tackling Substance Misuse, Tackling ASB, including Criminal Damage, Tackling Repeat Business of Violent Crime, Improving the local street scene, Reducing the Fear of Crime and Disorder and Improving Public Confidence.	
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?	The Partnership is ultimately responsible and works through the Performance Delivery Group to implement improvements delivered by the relevant agencies or contractors.	

APPENDIX 2

Assessing impact		
7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial groups</i>?	NO	
What evidence exists for this?		<p>The underpinning Strategic Assessment (SA), which was compiled by the Police Analyst, only provided a breakdown of crime for specific offences. These were youth crime and robberies, whereby ethnicity was considered in the analysis. There was no concern regarding hate crime and therefore this was not recommended to be a priority. Kent Crime Victimization Survey (KCVS) data was also used. The KCVS surveys residents on a random basis and therefore may not necessarily capture data that is 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. The top three priorities for PACTs are Anti Social Behaviour, Environmental and Parking. These fall into the priorities within the plan. Medway CSP carried out a strategically positioned consultation exercise across Medway between the 21st November and 4th December 2008. Over 1,300 residents, visitors and workers took part in the consultation whereby priorities were identified.</p> <p>Of the 400 people that took part in the written survey, 88% defined themselves as white British, with 43 people defining themselves within an ethnic minority group. Out of the 400, 237 stated what their priority was on the written survey, therefore enabling priorities to be cross referenced to identify any if any particular group suffered from a disproportionate amount of a particular crime. There were 217 white British and 20 ethnic minorities. Due to the low uptake of ethnic minorities, definite conclusions are unable to be made.</p>
8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?	NO	
What evidence exists for this?		<p>The underpinning SA did consider Hate Crime using comparable data of 9 types of prejudice, one of which is disability prejudice. The KCVS 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. 17% of participants in the consultation exercise stated that they were disabled. There were no specific issues of note therefore disabled people will benefit from the plan as much as non disabled people.</p>
9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?	NO	

APPENDIX 2

impact due to <i>gender</i> ?		
What evidence exists for this?	Gender was considered in the underpinning SA. A breakdown of crime was provided for Domestic Violence and Robberies. The KCVS was considered, however, it cannot be analysed in terms of hitting gender specifics, as this is not recorded. This is also the same for the PACT priorities. The CSP public consultation captured gender data for 400 out of the 1,300 participants. Overall, 51% of participants were male, 48% were female and 1% not recorded. Females were more fearful of being physically or attacked. The action planning stages of the plan will take this into consideration.	
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 impact due to <i>religion or belief</i>?	YES	The underpinning SA does not breakdown crime in relation to religion and/or belief. However, it does 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. There was no significant concern and therefore religion and belief will not affect the personal benefits from the plan.
What evidence exists for this?		
12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's <i>age</i>?	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	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. The public consultation captured the priorities of the following age bands: 0-15 2% 16-24 11% 25-44 30% 45-64 31% 65+ 26% Those aged between 25-64 biggest concern was being physically assaulted or attacked and people using or dealing drugs and those aged over 65 were more fearful of teenagers hanging around. This will be considered in the development of the action plans.	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential	YES	The underpinning SA does not consider trans gendered or transsexual people. Again, the KCVS

APPENDIX 2

impact due to <i>being trans-gendered or transsexual</i> ?		is conducted on a random basis whereby transgender and transsexual is not captured. The public consultation did not question participants on whether they were trans-gendered or transsexual.
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)?	It was identified in the previously submitted DIA that the 2008-2011 plan could not evidence substantial information on how every pocket of the community had been considered. This was subsequently taken on board and a public consultation was carried out whereby 1,300 residents expressed their crime and disorder priority. The diversity questionnaire was not mandatory for participants; however, there was a good uptake of 400. Although there was a good uptake across Medway, it is clear from the survey results that the locations did not always capture the full cross section of a community.

APPENDIX 2

YES	Give details of key person responsible and target date for carrying out full impact assessment (see DIA Guidance Notes)	

APPENDIX 2

Action plan to make Minor modifications		
Outcome	Actions (with date of completion)	Officer responsible
Set up forums to reach all	Social Identity PACTS are being established. These will be 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
Attend existing forums	To attend existing forums for hard to reach groups, such as, the disabled workers forum.	Corinna Woollett
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 2009-10 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)	

APPENDIX 2

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