

## Worcestershire County Council Equality Impact Assessment Simplified Desktop Screening

This exercise is not an Equality Impact Assessment. It is a simplified desktop exercise designed to establish if there is a need to carry out a full assessment.

<b>Part One:</b> basic information needed to identify the policy/function and to prepare for the screening.		
1.1	Directorate and Section/Unit.	Environmental Services – Countryside Service
1.2	Title or brief description of the policy/function being screened.	Information & Interpretation
1.3	To which section of the Directorate or Corporate “business/service plan” does this relate?	Environmental Services Performance Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting sustainability, inclusive communities and protecting the county’s cherished environment</li> <li>• Improving customer access to our services and facilities</li> </ul>
1.4	Are there any related policies/functions? If so what are they?	
1.5	Screening carried out by	Dave Hollis and Matt Maginnis
1.6	Date of screening	16 January 2007
1.7	What is the policy or function trying to achieve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To produce information which raises awareness of service provision, enables access to services and increases enjoyment of service provision</li> <li>• To produce interpretation which increases understanding and appreciation of the natural environment</li> </ul>
1.8	What are the specific outcome measurers?	Level of awareness, numbers of participants, level of understanding, extent of behaviour change, extent of perception change.
1.9	Who is formally responsible for ensuring the delivery of this policy/function?	Matt Maginnis
1.10	Who is responsible for leading the delivery if different from 1.9?	Dave Hollis
1.11	Are there any priorities within this policy/function? If so what are they?	None
1.12	Has any consultation, explicitly on the policy/function, taken place? If so who was consulted and when?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus groups with under-represented groups: Adults with learning disabilities, people who work with adults with learning disabilities, young people, university students, mothers and toddlers, BME group. April to October 2006</li> <li>• Feedback on publication design (various leaflets, booklets and magazines): Feedback from</li> </ul>

		readers. On-going basis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizens Panel feedback about information provision</li> </ul>
1.13	Is equality monitoring in place for this policy/function?	Yes - but informal and to a limited degree

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

		Yes	No	Details
2.1	Is there any way in which the policy/function is directly discriminatory or in breach of the Council's Equality and Diversity Policy?		✓	
2.2	Are there any barriers to people from minority groups getting the full benefit of this policy/function which have not been resolved as part of the policy/function?		✓	Any potential barriers are mitigated against by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All staff being required to have 'Diversity Awareness' on the Countryside Service Core Competency Matrix</li> <li>• Using images of underrepresented groups in publications</li> <li>• Using the corporate 'difficulties' panel on all publications</li> <li>• I&amp;I being designed with specific target audiences in mind</li> <li>• Following generic good practice inc large print, clear fonts, good colour contrasts, low panels, inerractive displays with sound, themes which people from all backgrounds can identify with</li> <li>• Feedback analysis being undertaken in order to identify issues as they arise via feedback cards in publications</li> <li>• Adherence to all corporate equality procedures / systems eg selection &amp; recruitment</li> <li>• Any potential prejudice being removed from I&amp;I request systems etc by the development of objective systems</li> </ul>
2.3	Are there any other ways the policy/function could unintentionally deliver poorer quality outcomes for individuals because they were members of a minority group?		✓	

2.4	Could people from minority groups reasonably believe that they would be likely to get poorer benefits from the policy/function?		✓	
-----	---	--	---	--

↓  
→ If the answer to any of these questions is yes or “could be yes” then you **must** take action. If the issue is straightforward remedy it **now** so the answer changes to no. If it cannot be remedied now or there are outstanding issues you should go on to a full EIA.