

WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT DESKTOP SCREENING

This exercise is not an EIA. It is a desktop exercise designed to establish if you need to carry out a full assessment. When completing the screening please use plain English avoiding the use of acronyms or jargon. Any documents referred to should be attached to the screening form.

Part One: basic information needed to identify the policy and prepare for screening

1.1	Directorate and Section/Unit	PEP, Worcestershire Partnership
1.2	Title or brief description of the policy being screened.	Report on the proposed changes to the Worcestershire Partnership
1.3	Screening by:	Hazel Robinson Community Engagement Officer, PEP
1.4	Date of screening	11/10/2010
1.5	Related policies/functions:	The Sustainable Community Strategy – this will be reviewed over the next few months by Jennifer Taylor, Partnership Delivery Manager, Worcestershire Partnership.
1.6	To which section of the Directorate or Corporate "business/service plan" does this relate?	It relates to the delivery of the Sustainable Community Strategy (which is overarching the Corporate Plan) and the work of the Community Leadership Unit Plan part of the PEP Directorate Service Plan.
1.7	Is this a new or existing policy?	It is a new report.
1.8	What is the policy trying to achieve?	The report sets out a more effective structure and way of working for the Worcestershire Partnership.

1.9	What are the planned outcomes for this policy?	<p>The outcomes are that decision making will be easier, the skills of the partners will be harnessed to better effect and improved delivery will take place.</p> <p>There will be a better balance of the functions of the Board and the Assembly.</p> <p>Worcestershire Forum - It is proposed that a newly formed Worcestershire Forum could be a fully inclusive network for all parts of the Partnership structures. This will benefit those groups who will have more of a say through this structure.</p> <p>Partnership Board – that the board will be streamlined and therefore more manageable and effective</p> <p>Public services Executive Group – it will be incorporated into the partnership structure</p> <p>Performance group (in place of management group) - will take on much of the work of the disbanded management group and will be strengthened.</p>
1.10	Who will benefit from the policy? How will they benefit?	<p>Changes to the Worcestershire Forum - Although the current Worcestershire Partnership Board is made up of around 40 member organisations, its membership excludes a wide range of organisations and communities that have an interest in the county. In order to communicate with a wider range of partners, the Partnership currently convenes an 'assembly', an annual one-day event that tends to be topic based and attended by a range of stakeholders, many of whom are already engaged at various levels</p>

		<p>across the Partnership. However, attendees are not considered to be 'members' of the assembly and some only come in contact with the Partnership once a year at this event, with attendance varying each year. The newly formed Worcestershire Forum would be a fully inclusive network for all parts of the Partnership structures. This will benefit those groups who will have more of a say through this structure.</p> <p>Changes to the Partnership Board –Membership has been inclusive, resulting in a Board involving over 40 organisations, some sending more than one representative. This has led to it being ineffective - it is proposed that it will be streamlined and therefore more manageable and effective which will benefit all partners. It is recognised that this will exclude many organisations currently having Board membership. However, by establishing the more inclusive and structured Forum (outlined above), together with the continuation of the Shenstone Group, the planned reconfiguration of Theme Groups, and further work on the role and function of District LSPs, the Partnership will be able to provide a greater opportunity for wider representation of groups and more effective engagement within the structures</p> <p>Public services Executive Group</p> <p>This newly set up group will be incorporated within the partnership structure – It is primarily concerned with public sector resources, its very senior management membership will agree and champion joint working across public services therefore benefiting partners and the communities they serve through more efficient joined up working.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Performance group (in place of management group) In light of other changes – it is proposed that the current Management Group could be disbanded. Much of its work, especially around performance and monitoring delivery of strategies could then be overseen by a strengthened Performance Group.</p> <p>Reconfiguration of theme groups Review of theme groups will take place - looking at how the theme groups can be as effective and streamlined as possible. This will benefit all partners as time/resources will be more efficiently spent.</p> <p>further work on the role and function of District LSPs It is proposed that there will be a single community strategy which the districts local strategic partnerships will all have a chapter in and be a major delivery vehicle for. At present all districts have their own. The benefits of this will be a more joined up, cost and time effective strategy which all district will benefit from. However on the other hand there will be actions that there will not be the room to include in this one strategy so districts may feel that they do not have the ownership they may have had previously.</p>
1.11	Who is formally responsible for the delivery of this policy? If different, who is responsible for leading on the delivery?	Jennifer Taylor, Partnership Delivery Manager, Worcestershire Partnership

1.12	What (if any) are the key priorities within this policy?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Streamline arrangements in the Partnership, to be more cost effective and time efficient, 2. Sharpen the focus of the Partnership on delivering improvements, and greater clarity of the functions and membership of the different parts of the Partnership structures 3. Rebalance the function of the Board and the Assembly.
1.13	What (if any) previous consultation has been done on this policy? Who was consulted and when?	<p>Paper circulated to all partners, and assembly attendees (week commencing 5th July 2010) for comment</p> <p>Worcestershire Partnership Board 21st July 2010 for comment</p> <p>Management Steering Group – 8th September – review consultation feedback and proposals for implementation date</p> <p>Worcestershire Partnership Board 27th October 2010 final decision prior to Worcestershire Assembly on 11th November 2010 which could be in new Worcestershire Forum Format</p>
1.14	Is equality monitoring in place for this policy?	no

Part Two: this is the test to see if further action is required. For the purpose of this exercise concentrate on the impact on people of differing age, gender, disability, race/ethnicity, religion or belief and sexual orientation.

		Y	N	Details including what information you have based your decision on.
2.1	Is there any way in which the policy is directly discriminatory or in breach of the County Council's Equality and Diversity Policy? (see Annex E)		X	No, this proposed restructure looks to work with our partners in the statutory, voluntary and private sectors to ensure the best outcomes for people who live, work and visit Worcestershire. All partners have been consulted on these changes.
2.2	Are there any barriers to people from minority groups getting the full benefit of this policy which have not been resolved as part of the policy?		X	No, in fact it will mean that groups would have more of a voice as being part of the Worcestershire forum rather than the former Worcestershire Assembly.
2.3	Are there any other ways the policy could unintentionally deliver poorer quality outcomes for individuals because they belong to a minority group or groups?(they may belong to more than one)		X	No it will enable groups to have more of a voice as mentioned, they could potentially have a wider audience as part of the forum to highlight issues to.
2.4	Could minority groups reasonably believe they would be likely to get poorer benefits from the policy?		X	Changes to the Partnership Board –Membership has been inclusive, resulting in a Board involving over 40 organisations, some sending more than one representative. This has led to it being ineffective - it is proposed that it will be streamlined and therefore more manageable and effective which will benefit all partners. It is recognised that this will exclude many

				organisations currently having Board membership. However, by establishing the more inclusive and structured Forum (outlined above), together with the continuation of the Shenstone Group, the planned reconfiguration of Theme Groups, and further work on the role and function of District LSPs, the Partnership will be able to provide a greater opportunity for wider representation of groups and more effective engagement within the structures – so although groups may initially perceive that they would receive less benefit this would not be the case. This will be highlighted to them in the proposed restructure report that they will have seen and been consulted on.
2.5	In what ways could this policy make a positive contribution to equality or to relations between groups?			Groups would have more of a voice as being part of the Worcestershire forum rather than the former Worcestershire Assembly so this would enhance relationships as groups would feel more listened to by other partners.

If the answer to questions 2.1 to 2.4 is yes or "could be yes" then you **must** take action. If the issue is straightforward then remedy this **now** so the answer changes to no. If it cannot be remedied now or there are outstanding issues you must continue on to a full EIA. Where you have decided a full EIA is not required but have identified actions which must be taken then please record these below:

Specific Action	How will you know when this is completed?	Resources/cost	Person Responsible	Completion date