

Addressing Inequalities

Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA)

Public Value Review of the Chief Executive's Office (CEO)

Surrey County Council Equality Impact Assessment Template

Stage one – initial screening

(Please refer to pages one to twelve of the guidance before completing this screening)

What is being assessed?	Public Value Review of the Chief Executive's Office
Service	Chief Executive's Office
Name of assessor/s	CEO PVR team
Head of service / Strategic Director	Susie Kemp
Date	12 May 2010
Is this a new or existing function or policy?	Existing function

Write a brief description of your service, policy or function. If this screening is part of a project it is important to focus on the service or policy the project aims to review or improve.

The Public Value Review will be looking at the following functions that are part of the Directorate:

- Corporate Policy
- Performance and Audit
- Legal and Democratic Services
- Communications

Like all Public Value Reviews it seeks to identify ways to reduce costs (in line with the Medium Term Financial Plan) and improve performance and quality assurance.

Indicate for each equality strand whether there may be a positive impact, negative impact, or no impact.

Equality Strand	Positive	Negative	No impact	Reason
Age	X	X		<p>There are potential positive and negative impacts on each of the equality strands.</p> <p>These will be assessed in more detail through the full EIA, but at a broad level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positive impacts could result from improved ways of working and better service delivery. - Negative impacts could result from changes to ways of working, and possible staff reductions. <p>The key areas of potential impact are through the CEO's role with the Voluntary, Community & Faith Sector (VCFS), and on Equalities and Diversity.</p>
Race	X	X		
Disability	X	X		
Gender	X	X		
Belief / Faith	X	X		
Sexual Orientation	X	X		
Other equality issues – please state	X	X		
HR issues	X	X		<p>The review will look at the structure of the CEO Directorate and may result in staff reductions. There may also be changes to ways of working that will need to be assessed for impact (potentially positive or negative) against the equality strands.</p>

If you find a negative impact on any equality group you will need to complete stage one and move on to stage two and carry out a full EIA.

A full EIA will also need to be carried out if this is a high profile or major policy that will either effect many people or have a severe effect on some people.

Is a full EIA required?	Yes (go to stage two) YES	No
If no briefly summarise reasons why you have reached this conclusion, the evidence for this and the nature of any stakeholder verification of your conclusion.		
<p>The conclusion from the EIA screening is that a full EIA should be carried out and maintained as a “live” document throughout the review process. The project team will use the EIA to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inform project planning, in particular when identifying stakeholder groups for consultation/engagement - Assess the impact of initial recommendations (both on external stakeholders and internal staff) - Assess the impact of final recommendations (both on external stakeholders and internal staff) <p>The final EIA will be published with the final PVR report.</p>		
Briefly describe any positive impacts identified that have resulted in improved access or services		

For screenings only:

Review date	17 May 2010
Person responsible for review	CEO PVR team
Strategic Director / Head of Service signed off	Susie Kemp
Date completed	17 May 2010

- Signed off electronic version to be kept in your team for review
- Electronic copy to be forwarded to Equality and Diversity Manager for publishing

Stage 2 – Full Equality Impact Assessment

Page 14 of the guidance

Introduction and background

Using the information from your screening please describe your service or function. This should include:

- The aims and scope
- The main beneficiaries or users
- The main equality, accessibility, social exclusion issues and barriers, and the equality strands they relate to (not all assessments will encounter issues relating to every strand)

If this EIA is part of a project it is important to focus on the service or policy the project aims to review or improve.

Background

The Chief Executive's Office (CEO) Directorate is made up of four key service areas:

- Corporate Policy
- Performance and Audit
- Legal and Democratic Services
- Communications

The role of the Chief Executive's Office (CEO) as set out in its *Strategy 2010-2014* is to “robustly support the Council to achieve its ambition to be world class and to provide a relentless focus on working together as one both internally across the Council and with partners across Surrey”.

In its *Strategy 2010-2014*, the CEO identified 10 priorities as follows:

Residents

1. Deliver the Council vision through effective medium term planning
2. Enhance and promote the reputation of the organisation
3. Equip elected Members to be effective community leaders
4. Drive and co-ordinate the cross-Council Change Programme
5. Identify and maximise opportunities for joint working to improve services, be more efficient and provide value for money
6. Achieve excellence in the local government equalities framework by 2011

Costs

7. Ensure the CEO is delivering value for money

Performance

8. Embed a strong culture of performance management across the organisation
9. Promote and champion sound governance and ensure it happens

Staff

10. Support the people in the CEO as we deliver our work.

The aims, objectives and scope of the PVR as set out in the review Terms of Reference are as follows:

Aims

To deliver improved outcomes and value for money for the residents of Surrey by reviewing the Chief Executive's Office (CEO).

Specifically to ensure the CEO is:

- efficient, effective and fit for purpose;
- equipped to deliver the commitments and savings set out in the CEO Strategy and Plan and the Medium Term Financial Plan; and
- adding value both internally (in Surrey County Council) and externally (in Surrey and beyond).

Objectives

To undertake a fundamental review of the Chief Executive's Office (CEO):

- Making recommendations for reducing costs and increasing income, thereby delivering the medium term savings target for the CEO of £2.9m by 2013/14 (£0.95m of which has already been delivered and is reflected in 2010/11 budgets).
- Improving performance, making recommendations for moving to top quartile performance by 2014.
- Ensuring robust quality assurance.
- Enhancing the reputation of the CEO as the "corporate glue" that adds value, while identifying new opportunities for innovative working with other Services and partners.

Scope

Everything in the CEO is in scope except:

- Election costs;
- Surrey Strategic Partnership/LPSA reward grant;
- Spelthorne high street regeneration grant;
- the Policy initiatives budget owned by the Leader;
- Member allowances and expenses within the Member Allowances Scheme; and
- Salary costs of the Chief Executive and Strategic Directors.

Main beneficiaries/users

The CEO provides a support service to individuals and groups within Surrey County Council (SCC):

- The Council's [Cabinet](#)
- All Members
- The Council's officer leadership (County Council Management Team)

- Other Directorates

It also works with partner organisations, in particular those that are part of the [Surrey Strategic Partnership](#), including:

- District and Borough Councils
- Police
- NHS
- Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector

The work of the CEO also impacts residents: via the support it provides to the Council and partners, and through more direct contact and engagement in areas such as work with the voluntary, community and faith sector (VCFS) (e.g. through direct funding, and also support to representative groups), equalities and diversity, consultation and communications, emergency management, and legal and democratic services.

The main equality, accessibility, social exclusion issues

As set out in the EIA screening document the PVR could have potential positive and/or negative impacts on each of the equality strands. The same applies to accessibility and social exclusion.

There are three key ways in which these impacts could take effect.

- Impacts on CEO staff
- Impacts on those in SCC – and partner organisations - that the CEO supports and works with
- Impacts on residents

There is further analysis on the potential positive and negative impacts, and the consequent required actions in the Analysis and Assessment section below.

Now describe how this fits into ‘the bigger picture’ including other council or local plans and priorities.

In seeking to achieve the aims and objectives listed in the earlier section of this document, the CEO PVR is contributing to the delivery of the Council’s overall Corporate Strategy to become world-class, and support the five stated strategic objectives:

- Core Responsibility
- Personal Responsibility
- Deciding and Delivering Locally
- Prevention
- Working Together

It also seeks to ensure that the CEO is operating within the current financial means, as set out in the Council’s [Medium Term Financial Plan](#) and in

subsequent papers to the [Cabinet on 13 July](#) on in year budget reductions following the Government's deficit recovery measures and emergency budget announcement

The PVR supports the direction set out in the [Chief Executive's Office Directorate Strategy and Plan 2010-14](#) and in the supporting Service Plans.

The PVR has been carried out on accordance with the standard PVR methodology. As part of this, Terms of Reference and Initial Recommendations reports were taken to the PVR Steering Board. The review was supported by relevant project management documentation.

This EIA template is part of the Council's overall [Action for Equality and Diversity policy](#), and supporting [Single Equality Scheme](#). It also complements the [EIAs](#) on CEO services and policies that have already been completed or are planned.

Evidence gathering and fact-finding

(Page 15 of the guidance)

What evidence is available to support your views above? Please include:

- **A summary of the available evidence**
- **Identification of where there are gaps in the evidence (this may identify a need for more evidence in the action plan)**
- **Information on contributing factors to inequality.**
- **What information is currently captured with respect to usage and take up of services.**
- **What the current situation is in relation to equality and diversity monitoring (where relevant)**

Evidence and information

Alongside evidence gleaned from stakeholders (see next section) the following information sources have fed into the PVR conclusions, and the understanding of what impacts these could have.

- Service monitoring reports including equality monitoring data (see below for details)
- User feedback e.g. from customer satisfaction surveys (also see stakeholders in next section)
- Benchmarking against other councils
- Internal audit reports
- External assessments / accreditations e.g. inspections, peer reviews
- Staff survey results
- Outputs from the staff "Listening" workshops
- Team self-assessments
- Equality Impact Assessments already completed on CEO

services/policies

Also note that the CEO Senior Management Team reviewed this EIA.

Current equality and diversity monitoring

The Workforce Information report (July 2010) for the CEO shows sets out the following key facts. On the whole the CEO performs well against the equalities targets.

Top 5% earners

- The percentage of top 5% earners that are women is 70%, well above the SCC target of 48%.
- The percentage of top 5% earners from ethnic minorities is 11%, above the SCC target of 6%.
- The percentage of top 5% earners that have a disability is 25%, above the SCC target of 8%.

All employees

- The percentage of employees that have a disability is 5%, above the SCC target of 4%.
- The percentage of employees from ethnic minorities is 11.6%, above the SCC target of 8%.
- 6% of employees are aged between 15-24, with an average age of 41 years. The SCC position is 5.2% employees aged 15-24 and an average age of 45 years.
- 27% of employees have not declared religion/faith, which is below the SCC average of 42%.
- 19% of employees have not declared sexual orientation, which is below the SCC average of 34%.

Other key workforce profile facts

- 22% of employees don't work full time hours. This percentage is highest in Legal and Democratic Services where there are also a high percentage of females (86%)

Gaps

There are no significant gaps in data, but note that the development of Surrey (a Local Information System) will improve the Council's understanding of Surrey and its communities, supporting evidence-based decision making and targeting of services. A separate EIA will be completed on this.

Sources of evidence may include:

- Service monitoring reports including equality monitoring data
- User feedback
- Population data – census, state of the county, Mosaic
- Complaints data
- Published research, local or national.

- Feedback from consultations and focus groups
- Feedback from individuals or organisations representing the interests of key target groups
- Evidence from partner organisations, other council departments, district or borough councils and other local authorities

How have stakeholders been involved in this assessment? Who are they, and what is their view?

The stakeholders for the PVR were identified at the outset of the project and were thereafter involved in the development and shaping of the PVR recommendations and consideration of impacts. This ensured that there was wide input and opportunity for challenge. This involvement took place over the period of the review from May to September 2010.

- CEO Senior Management Team - fortnightly meetings, one-to-one discussions, and a bespoke workshop to look at options.
- PVR project team (between May and June there was a wider project team with representatives from each Service. This group assessed current performance and budgets and drew up initial options.
- CEO staff - all staff workshops on 14 July, email updates from the Assistant Chief Executive, the PVR mailbox, snet site, and team meeting discussions).
- County Council Management Team - one to ones with the Assistant Chief Executive and meeting on 20/09/10.
- Cabinet Members – Cabinet meeting on 26/10/10, and Assistant Chief Executive one to ones with CEO Portfolio Holders.
- Member Reference Group – two Members from the Change and Efficiency Select Committee who kept the full Committee apprised of the key developments.
- Other SCC Directorates – a “challenge group” which met on 24/06/10 and 15/09/10. This comprised of a senior representative from each Directorate and was chaired by a Strategic Director.
- PVR Steering Board - Terms of Reference on 27/05/10, Initial Recommendations on 01/07/10 and Draft Final Report on 27/09/10.
- External “peer” experts – visits to best practice councils and external challenge from senior officers at two other councils.
- Key partners – one to one discussions and via the Surrey Strategic Partnership Delivery Management Group on 08/09/10
- Trade Unions – meeting in June.

In general the stakeholder groups recognised the need for the PVR and for changes to be made given the current financial context. They contributed suggestions and – by ensuring that the potential impacts from their perspective were understood – influenced the proposals included in the PVR report.

Note that there will be further stakeholder involvement through the implementation of the PVR proposals. This will include groups outside the Council (e.g. External Equalities Advisory Group).

Analysis and assessment

Given the available information, what is the actual or likely impact on minority, disadvantaged, vulnerable and socially excluded groups? Is this impact positive or negative or a mixture of both? (Refer to page 17 of the EIA guidance for full list of issues to consider when making your analysis)

The key potential positive and negative impacts are set out for the following three areas.

- Impacts on CEO staff
- Impacts on those in SCC – and partner organisations - that the CEO supports and works with
- Impacts on residents

Actions to maximise positive and reduce negative impacts are listed against these areas, but **in all cases the effectiveness of these actions and the exact impacts that occur will need to be tracked and responded to as appropriate**. This will need to be done both through the implementation of the PVR, and as an ongoing part of the CEO's business as usual.

Cross-cutting positive impacts

Before looking at specific areas, it is important to re-cap on the overall aims and objectives (see in full above) of the PVR, which include improving performance and quality assurance, and adding greater value to the organisation and partners.

If the PVRs main objectives are achieved (i.e. improving performance and quality assurance, and adding greater value to the organisation and partners) they will benefit staff, individuals and groups the CEO works with, and residents (directly, or indirectly). In each case there would be a positive impact across all the equality strands.

Impacts on CEO staff

The proposed re-configuration of the CEO will involve structural changes and an overall reduction in staffing numbers. The main potential negative impact is that the change process is run in a manner that has an unfair impact on staff in minority, disadvantaged, vulnerable or socially excluded groups. For example, if the consultation document is not made accessible to those members of staff on maternity or long term sick. Or if an assessment process does not make allowances for those declaring a disability.

To avoid these negative impacts the **changes will be implemented in an open and fair way, in accordance with the Council's human resources policies and procedures** (including the "Change Management" policy). Implementation planning will need to ensure that:

- All affected staff have equal access and opportunity to contribute.
- Communications about the review are clear, are sufficiently tailored to take account of different requirements, and reach all affected staff.
- All recruiting managers are aware of their responsibilities under equalities legislation and the Council's recruitment policy, and apply these (e.g. disabled staff able to apply under the "2-ticks" scheme).
- Officers involved in the implementation are mindful of the current staff profile* and equalities monitoring (see data section above), and the existing profile is compared to the profile of those affected by proposed changes.

**For example, the staff profile indicates that there are a relatively high proportion of female employees, especially in legal and democratic services. In view of this particular care will be taken to ensure that staff on maternity leave have the process for slotting and applying for roles clearly communicated to them.*

- The process must be in accordance with the Council's flexible working policies.
- There is appropriate support in place for staff, including management support, awareness of the Employee Assistance Programme, and specific provisions such as guidance on CV writing and interview skills.
- All vulnerable employees access the Council's redeployment programme.
- Work streams are managed through the period of change in a fair way that takes account of the changes and the time required for them, whilst maintaining key service levels.

Of the other recommendations, the proposed shift to smarter ways of working through the "Making a Difference" programme (use of technology, travel, and workspace) has both potential positive and negative impacts. For example, new IT may be seen as a way to make work easier for staff, but this could have a negative impact on a disabled member of staff if the kit or software is not suitable. The same potential issues apply to the more specific plans in legal services to make more use of IT and work more flexibly.

On ways of working, the following actions need to be taken:

- When developing the detailed business case in legal services for the development of IT and a shift to more mobile working, attention needs to be paid to the potential equalities impacts – an EIA should be completed as part of the process.
- When developing the detailed CEO proposals for the Making a Difference programme attention needs to be paid to the potential equalities impacts

– an EIA should be completed as part of the process.

Impacts on those in SCC – and partner organisations - that the CEO supports and works with

The PVR report includes the “quality assurance” recommendation that customer feedback on the CEO’s performance is better co-ordinated. This will help to flag any negative (or positive) impacts and inform consequent action.

Impacts on residents

The key potential impacts on residents are set out below. Some of these are more direct; others are about support services that have a knock on impact on the services residents receive. Also, some of the impacts relate more broadly to what might occur during a period of change and when services are prioritising key activity; others are more directly linked to specific proposals in the PVR report.

The key impacts are listed under the current main service/functional areas of the CEO. Cross-references are made to other relevant existing or planned EIAs.

Communications

The key potential negative impact is that reduced budgets for publicity and engagement activities result in vulnerable, disadvantaged or minority groups not getting access to information (and therefore potentially services) that they need.

The communications team will continue to make more use of web e-media. This can have positive impacts in terms of being more transparent and connecting with groups who utilise these channels more than traditional media (e.g. younger people).

But, there are also potential negative impacts for those who don’t access and use computers and the internet. Whilst some people simply choose not to use this technology, research shows a strong correlation with those experiencing social disadvantage¹. 15 per cent of UK the population – more than six million adults – are both socially and digitally excluded.

Actions to try and reduce any negative – and maximise any positive – impacts include:

- Tailoring engagement and information more effectively to key groups, using intelligence from Surrey-I and Mosaic to inform this and evaluate effectiveness.
- Joining up communications and engagement activity with other public

¹ Digital Inclusion Team (2007) *The Digital Inclusion Landscape in England: Delivering Social Impact through Information and Communications Technology*. London: Digital Inclusion Team

sector partners so it is both more effective and provides better value.

- Equipping and supporting Members to represent their communities
- Ensure that the Council's policy on 'accessible and inclusive communications' (communicating with everyone) is applied so that material is produced in the appropriate format for the target audience concerned
- Surrey County Council's Race Online 2012 pledge to get as many people as possible online by the time the Olympic Games begin.

Note that detailed EIAs have previously been completed on the Council's approaches to communications, and an EIA on the Communications and Engagement Strategy will be completed by December 2010.

Legal and Democratic Services

An EIA on "overview and scrutiny" was completed in 2008, which identified current and potential negative impacts, and actions to address these. The key potential negative impact for democratic services is that the reconfiguration of the CEO and/or the planned review of Select Committees adversely impacts progression of these actions. This would result in the democratic process becoming less inclusive and accessible, and failing to take account of - and represent - all sections of the community.

In legal services it will be important to consider the potential impact on staff of any changes that occur as a result of partnership working or IT and other flexible working arrangements. The work of Legal Services has a less direct interface with the public than other parts of the Council, but consideration will need to be given of the effect of any such changes particularly in relation to the department's involvement with, for example, adults or children with disabilities, vulnerable children, travellers, and those that don't have English as a first language.

Actions to try and reduce any negative – and maximise any positive – impacts include:

- The reconfiguration of legal services has a potentially beneficial effect for vulnerable children and adults because it will enable lawyers to respond to safeguarding issues more effectively
- Ensuring that work to increase the inclusiveness and accessibility of the democratic process remains a priority, including further provision of equalities and diversity training for all Members, and acting as a gateway to ensure that Cabinet and Select Committee reports include equalities considerations. (Note that EIAs are scheduled for March 2010 to look at accessibility of venues, quality of public reports, advertisement of meetings, and accessibility of documents)
- When reviewing the Council's Select Committees attention needs to be

paid to the potential equalities impacts – an EIA should be completed as part of the process.

- When exploring options for i) the use of IT and ii) delivering legal services in partnership, attention needs to be paid to the potential equalities impacts – an EIA should be completed in each case as part of the process.

Corporate Policy

A key potential negative impact stems from the reduced central consultation budget for the Council. Consultations are used to understand the views and needs of vulnerable groups and ensure everyone has an opportunity to shape policies. A risk is that a reduced budget for consultations has an adverse impact on the level of contact and understanding between the Council and vulnerable groups, resulting in less effective services. There is also a risk around legislative requirements to consult with disabled people.

There is a potential positive impact from the planned roll out of Surrey-I software. This will enable a better understanding of Surrey and its residents, including vulnerable groups. In turn this will support more targeted engagement and services. It will also open up data and intelligence to other organisations and the public so they can use it to inform their own decisions and/or provide services.

There are proposals to further explore the way that the Council works with the voluntary, community and faith sector (VCFS), including support and funding the CEO provides to VCFS infrastructure groups. Given the role that the VCFS plays with vulnerable, disadvantaged and minority groups, any proposals emerging from this work will have potential positive and negative impacts.

The re-configuration of the CEO could potentially have a negative impact on the capacity building and co-ordination work that CEO officers carry out with the VCFS. In particular representative groups e.g. EEAG, SUDEN, Surrey Minority Ethnic Forum and the disability networks.

Similarly there could be an impact on the delivery of work to co-ordinate the Council's overall approach to equalities and diversity.

Changes to the emergency management team could potentially reduce the ability to support vulnerable groups during in an emergency event (e.g. helping vulnerable individuals during a flood or heavy snow event).

Note that a separate EIA is being completed on the Community Buildings Grant Scheme.

Actions to try and reduce any negative – and maximise any positive – impacts include:

- Tailoring consultation and engagement activity more effectively to key

groups, with a clear steer from CLT (Council Leadership Team) and use of intelligence from Surrey-i.

- Joining up consultation and engagement activity with other public sector partners so it is linked to corporate and partnership priorities, is targeted, meets statutory requirements, is more coherent, and produces better value for money.
- Ensuring that the consultation and engagement framework and toolkit are applied across the Council and that the actions from the EIA (July 2009) on this framework and toolkit continue to be progressed. This should include applying effective consultation through PVRs, and making sure that EIA action plans look at consultation.
- When exploring options for future work with the voluntary, community and faith sector attention needs to be paid to the potential equalities impacts – an EIA should be completed as part of the process.
- Target reduced resources at highest need areas such as the priority places.
- Ensuring that the Council continues to make progress on emergency planning and that as part of this an EIA is completed on Business Continuity Plans (scheduled for December 2010)
- Updating the Council's Corporate Strategy in light of national and local policy developments.

Performance and Audit

A potential negative impact is that the reconfiguration of the CEO adversely impacts the embedding of equalities and diversity into the Fit for the Future cross-Council change programme (which includes the Public Value Review programme).

For internal audit the main potential negative impact is that proposals to increase income have a negative impact on the team's capacity to fulfil its core duties which include:

- Evaluating controls relating to the Council's objectives – where these have a positive impact (e.g. tackling discrimination, promoting equality) internal audit may assist by highlighting weaknesses and recommending actions for improvement. They also look at Services' EIAs and action plans as part of their audits.
- Ensuring that the Council complies with current legislation, including that which protects the rights of minority and excluded groups e.g. Equality Act 2010, Human Rights Act 1998.
- Investigating irregularities that may be brought to light through the Council's Speaking Out policy.

Actions to try and reduce any negative – and maximise any positive – impacts include:

- Ensuring that the equalities and diversity considerations built into the Fit for the Future change programme and Public Value Review guidance continue to be applied, are updated in light of any changes to the Corporate Strategy, and that there is further learning on how to do this effectively.
- Ensuring that the internal audit team continues to deliver its core duties – this will be tested through the annual refresh of an EIA on the internal audit service, which is completed as part of the Council’s corporate governance review arrangements.

There is a specific proposal on the implementation of a tailored quality management framework for the Council. This has potential positive impacts, as it will help ensure that agreed standards are understood, met, and tested across the Council. Many of these will quality standards relate to services provided to vulnerable and disadvantaged groups (e.g. Local Government Equality Framework), and the promotion of equality. Note that a full EIA will be completed for this new framework.

What can be done to reduce the effects of any negative impacts? Where negative impact cannot be completely diminished, can this be justified, and is it lawful?

Actions to reduce any negative impacts are described in the above section and are summarised in the action plan at the end of this document. There is no guarantee that these can be completely diminished, which is why this EIA recommends that the impacts of PVR implementation be tracked.

The PVR proposals can be justified given the context (see above sections on background, aims, objectives, and the wider council context) and the use of data/information and stakeholder involvement (see above sections) in the consideration of options and proposals.

Where there are positive impacts, what changes have been or will be made, who are the beneficiaries and how have they benefited?

The potential positive impacts and beneficiaries are set out in the section above. The changes that will be made to try and maximise these positives are set out in the PVR action plan. As part of the PVR implementation these actions will be tracked and their actual impacts assessed.

Recommendations

Please summarise the main recommendations arising from the assessment. If it is impossible to diminish negative impacts to an acceptable or even lawful level the recommendation should be that the proposal or the relevant part of it should not proceed.

At this stage in the process the main recommendations are as follows:

Implementation of the re-configured CEO

1. Implementation is designed and delivered in line with the Council's human resources policies and procedures so that it is fair, transparent, complies with statutory requirements, and takes account of the workforce profile. In doing this it will take into account the potential impacts, and actions, identified in this EIA.

Tracking and responding to impacts

2. Actions identified in this EIA for specific functional areas of the CEO are built into the relevant 2011/12 service plans so the actual impacts can be tracked and responded to as required
3. The CEO EIA programme is updated to reflect the need for separate EIAs to be completed on detailed functional areas (as part of the consultation process), and the future reviews that are proposed as part of the PVR

Action Plan – actions needed to implement the EIA recommendations

Issue	Action	Expected outcome	Who	Deadline for action
1. Implementation of the re-configured CEO	Design and deliver in line with HR policies, and take account of impacts on staff & other services/partners identified in this EIA	Fair process Full compliance with HR policies	CEO SMT with HR	Design by October 2010 Implement Nov-May 2010
	Once completed, evaluate and look at any lessons learnt	Learning		Evaluate May 2010

Issue	Action	Expected outcome	Who	Deadline for action
2. Service plans	Ensure that 2011/12 service plans can help track actual equalities impacts and inform appropriate action (DEG reps to verify the potential impacts ensure this happens in their service area)	Minimise <i>potential</i> negative impacts. Understanding of <i>actual</i> impacts, and action taken in response	CEO SMT	Service Plans ready for April 2011 – then tracked through 11/12
	Quality assure Service Plans to check that <i>all</i> actions in the EIA for each functional area are covered: - Comms - Legal and Dems - Policy - Perf and Audit	Service Plans include all actions from the EIA	CEO SMT	Feb ready for April 2011
3. CEO EIA programme	Update the CEO EIA programme to take account of: (i) any detailed functional EIAs that need to be completed as part of the consultation process (ii) key planned reviews that need to complete EIAs	Equalities impacts of detailed proposals in the consultation are understood and taken into account Impacts of future proposed changes are understood	CEO SMT & CEO DEG	Update programme Nov 2010 Track thereafter

- Actions should have SMART Targets
- Actions should be reported to the Directorate Equality Group (DEG) and incorporated into the Equality and Diversity Action Plan, Service Plans and/or personal objectives of key staff.

Review date	20/08/10
Person responsible for review	CEO PVR team
Strategic Director / Head of Service signed off	Susie Kemp
Date completed (Revisions)	20/09/10 (Updated 15/10/10 following feedback from Corporate Policy) (Updated 09/11/10 following further feedback from CEO DEG members)
Date forwarded to EIA coordinator for publishing	09/11/10

- **Signed off electronic version to be kept in your team for review**
- **Electronic copy to be forwarded to your service EIA coordinator**