



Equality Impact Assessment

The Equality Impact Assessment Guidance **must** be used when completing this form:

http://intranet.aware.mps/Corporate/Policy/Operational_Services/SOP/Equality_Impact_Assessment_SOPs.htm

Freedom of Information Act Document				
Protective Marking:	Not Protected		Publication N	
Title:	Project Herald – Enhanced Designated Detention Officers in Custody			
Summary:	See CoP Paper for 05 June 2008			
Branch / OCU:	TPHQ, Emerald, Custody Directorate			
Date created:	14	May	Review	14
			Version	1
Author:	Detective Superintendent David Imroth, TPHQ, Emerald, Custody Directorate			

Directorate/Department/Borough/OCU:
Name, type or title of proposal (If a corporate policy, a policy workbook must also be completed): Project Herald - Enhanced Designated Detention Officers in Custody

1. Aims and Purpose of Proposal - see Step 1 of the Guidance

The proposal aims to provide Enhanced Designated Detention Officers (DDOs) within Custody rather than continue with current processes. At present, a substantial amount of the custody sergeant's time is committed to the completion of administrative tasks involved with the initial booking in process. This is an element of the custody sergeants' function, which could be performed by adequately and suitably trained Enhanced DDOs. The introduction of the new DDO role would then better enable the custody sergeant to supervise the management of detainees but also effectively and efficiently manage the overall custody environment.

This would also increase efficiency within the custody environment throughout by reducing waiting times for detainee processing which will simultaneously increase public confidence in the Criminal Justice System.

The recruitment of Police Staff for these posts from within the local community is an added benefit, as they would tend to reflect the social and cultural make up of the community. This may in some cases ease language barriers or contribute to a better understanding of a detainees cultural beliefs or requirements.

The key stakeholders involved in the project are the Custody Directorate,

Waltham Forest Borough, Newham Borough, Police Federation, PCS Union, MPA and the Home Office.

2. Examination of Available Information – see Step 2 of the Guidance.

The Custody Directorate has available data / throughput figures / average detention times of detainees for the pilot site. This data has been used as a benchmark to evaluate the impact of Enhanced DDOs.

The Herald Project Board members have also agreed that there will be local focus groups at each of the boroughs to ensure wide consultation.

3. Consultation/Involvement - see Step 3 of the Guidance

a. Who is responsible for managing this consultation/involvement?
TP Emerald, Custody Directorate, Project Team will lead on consultation and involvement.

b. Why is this consultation/involvement taking place?
To further the involvement with staff directly or indirectly involved with the change.

c. Who is included within the consultation/involvement, including which group(s)? Consider beneficiaries, stakeholders, service users or providers and those who may be affected.
Custody Officers / Managers, DDOs, Custody Nurse Practitioners, Users of custody, Unions, Police Federation, Employee Relations Unit.

d. What methods of consultation/involvement are employed to ensure full information sharing and participation, e.g. surveys, interviews, community meetings?
Project Board, Meetings with stakeholders, Newsletters, intranet publications, Open / Information Days.

e. What are the results of the consultation/involvement? How are these fed back into the process?
Current pilot DDO staff and Custody Officers have been positive and now recognise the improvement within the custody environment. Employee Relations and the Union have been extremely supportive. Comments, feedback, suggestions are fed back through the Project Team to the Chair of Project Board.

4. Screening Process for relevance to Diversity or Equality issues - see Step 4 of the Guidance

(i) Will the proposal have significantly higher impact on a particular group, community or person the MPS serves or employs?
Explain: No. The booking in procedure already takes place. The proposed changes aim to release the custody sergeant from their current administrative duties so they are more able to provide an

	improved supervisory role of detainees and overall custody suite.
(ii)	Will any part of the proposal be directly or indirectly discriminatory? Explain: No. The proposed changes are to improve the current service delivery.
(iii)	Is the proposal likely to negatively affect equality of opportunity? Explain: No. Recruitment and selection for these posts will be offered solely on merit and successful completion of an Assessment Centre.
(iv)	Is the proposal likely to adversely affect relations between any particular groups or between the MPS and those groups? Explain: No. Key stakeholders are supportive of this new staffing model concept.
(v)	Are there any other community concerns, opportunities or risks to communities arising from the proposal? Explain: No.
(vi)	Is the proposal likely to harm positive attitudes towards others and discourage their participation in public life? Explain: No.
(vii)	Is the proposal a major one in terms of scale or significance? Explain: No.

From the answers supplied, you must decide if the proposal impacts upon diversity or equality issues. If yes, a full impact assessment is required. If no, complete the following box and enter a review date at the end of the form.

Full Impact Assessment Required	No <i>(delete as applicable)</i>
Signed:	Date:
Supervised:	Date:

5. Full Impact Assessment – see Step 5 of the Guidance

a)	Explain the likely differential impact (whether intended or unintended, positive or negative) of the proposal on individual service users or citizens on account of:
	Age: older people, children and young people.
	Details:
	Disability in line with the Social Model.
	Details:

Faith, religion or belief: those with a recognised belief system or no belief.
Details:
Gender or marital status: women and men.
Details:
Race, ethnicity, colour, nationality or national origins.
Details:
Sexual orientation, transgender or transsexual issues.
Details:
Other issues, e.g. public transportation users, homeless people, asylum seekers, the economically disadvantaged or other community groups not covered above.
Details:
b) Is the proposal directly or indirectly discriminatory? Is there a genuine occupational requirement?
Details:
c) Explain how the proposal is intended to increase equality of opportunity by permitting positive action.
Details:
d) Explain how the proposal is likely to promote good relations between different groups.
Details:
e) Explain how the proposal is likely to promote positive attitudes towards others and encourage their participation in public life.
Details:
f) Explain how the proposal enables decisions and practices to adequately reflect the service users perspective.

Details:

6. Modifications – see Step 6 of the Guidance

Could the proposal be modified to reduce or eliminate any identified negative impacts, or create or increase positive impacts? What improvements have been made?

7. Further Research - see Step 7 of the Guidance

Given the analysis so far, what additional research or consultation is required to investigate the impacts of the proposal on the diversity strands?

8. Decision-making - see Step 8 of the Guidance

a. Name, rank or grade of decision maker

b. What is the Decision?

Reject the proposal

Yes / No *(delete as applicable)*

Introduce the proposal

Yes / No *(delete as applicable)*

Amend the proposal (an impact assessment should be made of any amendments)

Yes / No *(delete as applicable)*

c. Name, rank or grade of SMT/(B)OCU/Management Board endorsing decision

9. Monitoring - see Step 9 of the Guidance

a. How will the implementation of the proposal be monitored and by whom?

b. How will the results of monitoring be used to develop this proposal and its practices?

c. What is the timetable for monitoring, with dates?

10. Public Availability of Report/Results - see Step 10 of the Guidance

What are the arrangements for publishing, where and by whom?

Person completing EIA: Signed:	Date:
Person supervising EIA: Signed:	Date:
Quality Assurance Approval: Name and Unit:	Date:
Date Review Due:	

Retention period: 7 years
MP 746/07