

Humberside Police Authority Equality Impact Assessment Template

This template is to be completed for submission with all new Humberside Police Authority policies from 31st May 2005. See accompanying guidance notes. It should also be completed for any full assessment of existing functions, policies or practices. All questions should be considered from the perspective of all six strands of diversity, Race, Disability, Gender, Religion and Belief, Sexual Orientation and Age

1. Set up the Equality Impact Assessment team

This should be determined by the Communities and Partnership Committee of Humberside Police Authority. It should be a mix of officers and members with specialists co-opted to the team as appropriate.

Identify all members of the EIA team:

Neil Kingston
Victoria Wise
Ms Alene Branton MBE
Gabriel Doherty
Chief Inspector Paul Cunningham

2. Identify main aims of the function / policy

2.1 Identify the aims and projected outcomes of the policy

Community Engagement Strategy: The aim of the joint (Authority and Force) Community Engagement Strategy is not explicit rather it is an integral part of the wider Citizen Focus Policing / Neighbourhood Policing agenda.

The Police Authority has a statutory function to make arrangements for obtaining the views of local people about the policing of their area and obtain the co-operation of local people in preventing crime. The main reasons for this duty to consult, is to

2.1 Identify the aims and projected outcomes of the policy

determine the local priorities for policing and to monitor service delivery by the Force. Related to this is the duty upon the Police Force and the Police Authority under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to co-operate with the other 'responsible authorities' in formulating and implementing crime and disorder intelligence assessments and partnership plans for each unitary authority area.

The joint Community Engagement Strategy states that '*this strategy aims to recognise the increasing diversity within communities and to provide a framework for ensuring that the benefits of diversity are harnessed and community cohesion is strengthened, whilst ensuring effective engagement occurs at a local level for the benefit of the different communities*'.

In addition there are other topics that the Authority is required to consult on, which best fit under the 'obtaining the co-operation of people in preventing crime' remit. This currently includes the budget, police use of stop and search powers and the preparation of our Equality schemes. The joint Community Engagement Strategy 2008-11 was approved by the Neighbourhood Policing Board on 22 April 2008. This documents the reasons why the Authority and Force consult and what methods we will employ to improve our community engagement.

Success measures identified as part of the joint Community Engagement Strategy include the successful implementation of neighbourhood policing and improvements in public satisfaction, confidence and reassurance. The agreed measure of public confidence is recognised as the British Crime Survey.

2.2 Which individuals and organisations are likely to have an interest in or likely to be affected by the policy

People who live, work, study or have a business in the Humberside area.

Community groups and organisations representing diverse groups across Humberside.

Humberside Police.

Members of the Police Authority.

Local partnerships such as Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) and Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs)

Independent Advisory Groups (IAGs)

Humberside Police Staff Associations

3. Consider the Evidence

3.1 What relevant quantitative data has been considered?

The Communities and Partnerships Committee receives reports following each major piece of consultation. These include feedback from quarterly public meetings, including the Force response to these findings and any public opinion surveys. In terms of the MRUK survey the data is provided with an age, ethnicity and gender split but not, so far, the other strands of diversity.

Public meetings arranged by the Police Authority are not currently monitored in terms of any diversity statistics although attendance is recorded. The joint Strategy advises that statistics in relation to crime and disorder levels, and calls for service will be used as measurements of success or otherwise. On this basis the latest performance indicators reveal that satisfaction with the Force response / action in dealing with racist incidents is below the satisfaction levels of the Force response in connection with other crime types (such as burglary, vehicle crime, violent crime etc. – March 2008).

Census data 2001 has also been considered. This revealed the following expressed as percentages with the actual numbers in brackets:

Strand of Diversity	ERYC	Hull City Council	North Lincolnshire	North East Lincolnshire
Gender:				
Male	49% (153,049)	49% (119,131)	49% (74,771)	49% (76,706)
Female	51% (161,064)	51% (124,458)	51% (78,078)	51% (81,273)
Age:				
18-24	8.4% (20,802)	13.4% (24,721)	8.9% (10,431)	9.6% (11,369)
25-35	16.5% (40,675)	21.1% (38,854)	18.3% (21,589)	19.3% (22,942)
36-45	18.5% (45,818)	18.5% (34,182)	19.2% (22,596)	19.1% (22,642)
46-55	19.1% (47,282)	16.0% (29,553)	18.5% (21,784)	17.3% (20,538)
56+	37.5% (92,713)	31.0% (57,232)	35.2% (41,521)	34.7% (41,219)
Ethnicity:				
White British	97.6% (306,517)	96.4% (234,716)	96.0% (146,801)	97.5% (154,066)
Non White British (details available on request)	2.4% (7,596)	3.6% (8,873)	4.0% (6,048)	2.5% (3,913)
Religion / Belief:				
Christian	79.7% (250,260)	71.7% (174,758)	79.5% (121,439)	75.7% (119,603)
Buddhist	0.1% (408)	0.2% (374)	0.1% (180)	0.1% (160)
Hindu	0.2% (569)	0.1% (257)	0.2% (289)	0.2% (298)
Jewish	0.1% (403)	0.1% (265)	0.03% (43)	0.1% (91)
Muslim	0.3% (848)	0.9% (2,116)	1.1% (1,740)	0.5% (755)
Sikh	0.1% (195)	0.1% (227)	0.3% (479)	0.1% (117)

Any other religion	0.2 (493)	0.2% (389)	0.1% (181)	0.1% (227)
No religion	11.9% (37,383)	18.3% (44,627)	11.4% (17,477)	14.6% (23,088)
Religion not stated	7.5% (23,554)	8.5% (20,576)	7.2% (11,021)	8.6% (13,640)

3.2 What relevant qualitative data has been considered?

A review of the Police Authority's consultation mechanisms was carried out in April 2008 by the Consultation and Partnership Manager. With respect to race and diversity the report states *'it is appropriate for the Authority to now consider more effective ways of engagement rather than continuing to try to go it alone. A primary method for achieving this should be through the Force Independent Advisory Group'*. Themed targeted engagement has been tried by the Authority involving a range of minority groups but the feeling was that, although some views expressed by these groups were useful and informative it was clear that because of limited participation they could not be regarded as inclusive or representative. The review states that *'the Police Authority has tried to engage with minority ethnic and diverse communities in the past and has faced problems with trust and scepticism from these communities most notably asylum seekers, refugees and those whose backgrounds are from countries where the police have very different values and working practices from our own'*. It goes on to recommend that the Authority considers a service level agreement with specialists in the area of minority group consultation.

The review of community engagement also proposed that we continue with our public consultation meetings across the Humberside area on a peripatetic basis yet discontinue the annual (MRUK) public opinion survey. In addition it was concluded that 'mystery shopper' type exercises and the short survey included with the precept leaflet should continue. It was recognised that the Authority needs to integrate better with 'partner' consultation arrangements and produce its own cost-effective and inclusive community engagement strategy. When developed this strategy will be shared with Members of the Communities and Partnership Committee and partner organisations. It is important that the resultant strategy contains an action plan detailing the type of community engagement that will be carried out and what outcomes we are seeking to achieve as well as specifying how we ensure under represented groups are adequately consulted.

The Home Office conducted research in 2003, which concluded that public awareness of police authorities was very low. Whilst there has been a step change in consultation / community engagement by Humberside Police Authority since then, it is felt that the situation is unlikely to have improved significantly. There is no doubt that people do not differentiate between the Authority and the Force.

A Key Individuals Network (KIN) Diversity improvement / compliance plan is currently under development within the Force by Chief Inspector Paul Cunningham in conjunction with Force Community Cohesion officers.

3.3 What gaps in data / information were identified?

Monitoring data is poor to non-existent in respect of disability, religion / belief and sexual orientation. Monitoring data is not routinely collected by the Police Authority public forums. The majority of surveys do not generally produce a large enough sample for differences between people from different backgrounds to be analysed with any degree of confidence. The MRUK public opinion survey does include results which are capable of further analysis in respect of ethnicity, gender and age to identify whether any differences in response is revealed.

The Authority does not have any reliable information from young people in terms of their experiences of crime, being victims of crime and their perceptions of crime and the police. The developing community engagement strategy should hopefully outline how the Authority intends to improve consultation with young people as well as those from a minority ethnic background.

There are also gaps in respect of groups and communities that have yet to be contacted e.g. gypsy / traveller groups, specific minority ethnic groups, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender groups and people with disabilities.

3.4 What consideration has been given to commissioning research?

The Authority already utilises a market research company to conduct the central plank of its community engagement work. In addition the Authority is also considering entering into an arrangement with an umbrella body that have closer links with community and voluntary groups including ethnic minorities. The missing information in respect of community engagement can be collected through more consistent monitoring covering the six strands of diversity, including the occasional monitoring of public forum attendees.

The topics being discussed when engaging with minority ethnic groups and other diverse groups is aiming to find out if there are any differences in policing priorities or levels of service delivery experienced by these communities. This should attempt to compensate to some degree for these groups being under represented in the quantitative results obtained through our normal consultation methods.

4. Assess likely Impact

4.1 From the analysis of data and information has any potential for differential / adverse impact been identified?

Race: From the analysis of the limited monitoring data available and our intuitive feeling people from a minority ethnic background are under-represented in the Authority's consultation methodology. The joint Community Engagement Strategy doesn't really represent the wider community and would not enable the public to readily identify with it. Young people from a minority ethnic

background (when compared to young white people) are more likely to be approached by the police; have a more negative view of the police; are more likely to be stopped and searched and are less likely to describe the police as fair, trustworthy and helpful.

There may be an adverse or differential impact due to communication from the Authority and Force generally being in written English. This could adversely impact those who cannot read English, those with poor or limited literacy skills and anyone who is short-sighted.

Disability: The lack of any sort of data in respect of disability makes it impossible to assess differential impact. There may be an adverse or differential impact due to communication from the Authority and Force generally being in written English. This could adversely impact those who cannot read English, those with poor or limited literacy skills and anyone who is short-sighted. The joint Community Engagement Strategy lacks detail about how we are practically going to engage with the disabled community. For example how will we take account of website publications and will we be doing anything differently for the partially sighted (e.g. Braille copies / website 'readers').

Gender: Males (when compared to females) have a more negative view of the police and are more likely to be stopped / searched

Religion and Belief: The lack of any sort of data in respect of religion / belief makes it impossible to assess differential or adverse impact.

Sexual Orientation: The lack of any sort of data in respect of sexual orientation makes it impossible to assess differential or adverse impact. These groups may however be reluctant to self identify for fear of repercussions.

Age: It is accepted that there is no specific engagement with older or young people although PCSOs have started to informally engage through networks established with local schools.

4.2 Explain intentional impact

Race: N/A

Disability: N/A

Gender: N/A

Religion and Belief: N/A

Sexual Orientation: N/A

Age: N/A

In relation to the above there is a possibility (going forward) that certain diverse groups (e.g. ethnic minority groups, youth, gay and lesbian communities etc.) could receive more focus than other groups. This however could be justified on the grounds of promoting equality.

5. Consider Alternatives

<p>5.1 Summarise what changes have been made to the policy to remove or reduce the potential for differential / adverse impact?</p> <p>The joint Community Engagement Strategy recognises that <i>'it is important to focus particular attention on community cohesion and inclusivity in respect of 'socially excluded, disadvantaged and minority and ethnic groups and individuals'</i>. However it stops short of outlining what specifically will be done to address this issue other than recognising that <i>'bespoke community engagement methods should be utilised to provide for community needs'</i>.</p> <p>Generally speaking the majority of people engaged with the Authority / Force self select to attend consultation events / meetings are in the older age group (over 55). In part this is to be expected because they make up about 35% of the total population of the Humberside area. Being older they are more likely to be retired and therefore have a little more time on their hands. The Authority continues to use public meetings and opinion questionnaires as its main consultation methods. The Authority and Force should consider how its resources will be deployed to engage with those groups whose voices are not properly heard. More targeted engagement with under represented groups will help to address the gaps identified earlier about not having sufficient data to assess differential or adverse impact.</p> <p>The forthcoming Police Authority Community Engagement Strategy (following the review carried out by the Consultation and Partnership Manager) will identify the methodology by which the Authority will engage with under represented groups. As more monitoring data becomes available to measure participation by disability, religion/belief, sexual orientation etc a similar approach will be undertaken to ensure that people from diverse backgrounds can participate equally. At this stage the joint Community Engagement Strategy will be reviewed by the C&P Committee on an annual basis to ensure it is 'fit for purpose' and to help identify new and innovative ways to engage all sections of the Community. Allied to this is the developing Police Authority Community Engagement Strategy which offers a unique chance to improve participation overall and with diverse groups in particular.</p>
<p>5.2 Summarise changes to the policy to remove or reduce the potential for differential / adverse impact that were considered but not implemented, and explain why this is the case</p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p>5.3 If potential for differential / adverse impact remains explain why implementation is justifiable in order to meet the wider policy aims</p>

N/A

6. Consult Formally

6.1 Has the function / policy been subject to consultation? If no, why not. If yes, state which individuals and organisations were consulted and what form the consultation took

The Joint Force Authority Community Engagement Strategy was considered by the Force Independent Advisory Group (FIAG) and was considered by Members of the Force Neighbourhood Policing Board. It has not been considered by the Communities and Partnership Committee. I am not personally aware of any external consultation carried out. This may be due to the fact that primarily this is an internal document.

6.2 What was the outcome of the consultation?

The Joint Community Engagement Strategy was considered by the Force Independent Advisory Group (FIAG) and was not referred back for any subsequent work.

6.3 Has the function / policy been reviewed and / or amended in the light of outcomes of consultation?

The Joint Force Authority Community Engagement Strategy was reviewed by the Force lead after initial feedback as part of the Equality Impact Assessment process and also after consultation with the Force Independent Advisory Group (FIAG). The Police Authority has also however recently reviewed its own consultation arrangements and the recommendations from this review are currently being considered. The idea is that the results of this review will help to formulate a new Community Engagement Strategy for the Police Authority.

6.4 Have the results of the consultation been fed back to the consultees?

A report on the 'Improving Consultation' document and an outline of the emerging Strategy has been brought to the Communities and Partnership Committee. Feedback was given to those inputting to the strategy. I am unaware whether any other feedback (other than to the Force Neighbourhood Policing Board) was relayed to those who commented on the original Joint Force Authority Community Engagement Strategy.

7. Decide whether to adopt the Policy

7.1 Provide a statement outlining the findings of the impact assessment process. If the policy has been identified as having a possibility to adversely impact upon diverse communities, the statement should include justification for the implementation.

The joint Force Authority Community Engagement Strategy has been adopted within the Force as part of the wider Citizen Focus /

Neighbourhood policing agenda. This impact assessment has identified that there is potential adverse impact in relation to those adults under the age of 55 and those from an ethnic minority background. The same is probably therefore the case in relation to religion and belief. There is a shortage of data in relation to participation rates of people with a disability, gay, lesbian and bisexual Humberside residents.

8. Make Monitoring Arrangements

8.1 What consideration has been given to piloting the policy?

The Joint Force Authority Community Engagement Strategy was not considered appropriate for piloting.

8.2 What monitoring will be implemented at a national level by the policy owning agency and / or other agency?

Implementation of duties under the various pieces of legislation will be monitored by bodies such as the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC).

At a local level the Police Authority (Communities and Partnership Committee) should monitor the joint Force Authority Community Engagement Strategy to ensure that the success criteria are delivered and any possibility of differential (and adverse) impact is minimised. Ultimately the joint Force Authority Community Engagement Strategy should lead to a reduction or elimination of potential differential impact. The Strategy should aim to ensure equality of engagement and hence therefore to ensure no adverse impact.

The emerging Police Authority Community Engagement Strategy should also aim to reduce any potential differential (and adverse) impact on diverse groups. One of the strategic objectives in this strategy is *'all approaches to engage and consult with communities will take account of the differing needs of diverse communities, demonstrating a commitment to equality and ensuring respect for diversity, essential in policing'*.

8.3 Is this policy intended to be implemented by local agencies that have a statutory duty to impact assess policies? If so what monitoring requirements are you placing on that agency?

N/A

9. Publish Assessment Results

9.1 What form will the publication of the impact assessment take?

The impact assessment will be circulated as part of the Committee papers to various organisations and will be published on the Authority's website. An annual summary of impact assessments is also published in the Authority's Local Policing Summary / Annual Report.

Date Completed: 17 July 2008

Signed / date (Completing Officer) Neil Kingston

Signed / date (Chief Executive) John Bates