Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

Deciding what needs to be assessed

In theory all policies, decisions, services, projects and programmes should be impact assessed. The most practical approach is to assess as the proposal is being developed or as processes, services and policies come up for review making the EQIA part of the development process. Do not be put off by the list below, it does not mean that long and detailed assessments are required every time you are engaged in one of the activities. However, it does mean that you should always consider the equalities implications of your proposals.

Policy

- New policy development
- Substantial revision of an existing policy or process
- Any change which may have a disproportionate impact on a particular group

Decision

- Key decision
- Decision for management board/cabinet
- Budget change decision

Service

- New service
- Service review, including the decommissioning of services
- Any service change which may have a disproportionate impact on a particular group

Projects and programmes

• All, at planning stage

Further information: Equality Impact Assessments - a user's guide

Section one

| No. | Question | Response |
|-----|--|---|
| 1.1 | Name of policy/decision/service/ project/programme being assessed | Delivery of a new Entertainment Venue for Swindon |
| 1.2 | Summary of aims and objectives of the policy/decision/service/ project/programme | The Venue would replace the Wyvern theatre as Swindon's major events venue |
| 1.3 | Who is affected by the policy/decision/service/ project/programme? (For example, employees/service users/supplier/contractor) | Users / customers Employees |
| 1.4 | What involvement and consultation has been done in relation to this proposal? (For example, with relevant groups and stakeholders) | Involvement with the cultural sector and community groups in developing the "cultural quarter business case", which identified the need for a new venue |
| 1.5 | What are the arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the actual impact of the policy/funding activity/event? | We will work with the preferred operator to establishment a framework for monitoring and reviewing the equalities impact of the new venue. |

Section two – protected characteristics

| Protected characteristic group | Is there a potential for positive or negative impact? Is the impact neutral? | Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used | Action to address negative impact (for example, adjustment to the proposal) |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Disability | Positive | New venue that can | |
| | | be designed around | |
| | | access for all best | |
| | | practice | |
| Gender reassignment | Positive | New venue that can | |
| | | be designed around | |
| | | access for all best | |
| | | practice | |
| Marriage or civil | Positive | Scheme to be | |
| partnership | | designed alongside | |
| | | design of wider public | |
| | | realm enhancements | |
| | | (including routes to | |
| | | the venue) to make | |
| | | the location safer, | |
| | | more inclusive and | |
| | | feel more welcoming | |
| Pregnancy and | Positive | New venue that can | |
| maternity | | be designed around | |
| | | access for all best | |
| | | practice | |
| Race | Positive | Scheme to be | |
| | | designed alongside | |
| | | design of wider public | |
| | | realm enhancements | |
| | | (including routes to | |
| | | the venue) to make | |
| | | the location safer, | |
| | | more inclusive and | |
| | | feel more welcoming | |
| Religion or belief | Positive | Scheme to be | |
| | | designed alongside | |
| | | design of wider public | |
| | | realm enhancements | |
| | | (including routes to | |
| | | the venue) to make | |
| | | the location safer, | |

| | | more inclusive and | |
|----------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | feel more welcoming | |
| | | | |
| Sexual orientation | Positive | Scheme to be | |
| | | designed alongside | |
| | | design of wider public | |
| | | realm enhancements | |
| | | (including routes to | |
| | | the venue) to make | |
| | | the location safer, | |
| | | more inclusive and | |
| | | feel more welcoming | |
| Sex (gender) | Positive | Scheme to be | |
| | | designed alongside | |
| | | design of wider public | |
| | | realm enhancements | |
| | | (including routes to | |
| | | the venue) to make | |
| | | the location safer, | |
| | | more inclusive and | |
| | | feel more welcoming | |
| Age | Positive | Scheme to be | |
| | | designed alongside | |
| | | design of wider public | |
| | | realm enhancements | |
| | | (including routes to | |
| | | the venue) to make | |
| | | the location safer, | |
| | | more inclusive and | |
| | | feel more welcoming | |
| Children in care and | Positive | Scheme to be | |
| care leavers | | designed alongside | |
| | | design of wider public | |
| | | realm enhancements | |
| | | (including routes to | |
| | | the venue) to make | |
| | | the location safer, | |
| | | more inclusive and | |
| | | feel more welcoming | |
| | I | <u>- </u> | |

Section three – evaluation

| No. | Question | Explanation/justification |
|-----|--|---|
| 3.1 | Is it possible the proposed policy or activity or change in policy or activity could discriminate or unfairly disadvantage people? | No potential adverse impacts identified |

| No. | Final Decision | Tick the relevant | Include any explanation / justification required |
|-----|---|-------------------|--|
| | | box | |
| 1 | No barriers identified, therefore | Yes | Positive impacts for equalities across |
| | activity will proceed | | all groups |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 2 | Stop at some point because the data | | |
| | shows bias towards one or more | | |
| | groups | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 3 | Adapt or change the event in a way | | |
| | which you think will eliminate the bias | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 4 | Barriers and impact have been | | |
| - | identified, however having considered | | |
| | all available options carefully, there | | |
| | appear to be no other proportionate | | |
| | ways to achieve the aim of the policy | | |
| | or practice (for example, in extreme | | |
| | cases or where positive action is | | |
| | taken). Therefore, proceed with | | |
| | caution with this knowing that it may | | |
| | favour some people less than others, | | |
| | providing justification for this decision | | |

Section four – record keeping

| Question | Response |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Will this EqIA be published* (*EqIA's should be published alongside relevant event paperwork including cabinet papers): | Yes |
| Date completed | 10 th October 2024 |
| Review date (if applicable) | N/A |

Change log

| Name | Date | Version | Change made |
|--------------|-------------------------------|---------|-------------|
| David Dewart | 10 th October 2024 | V1 | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Responsibilities

| Question | Response | Date completed |
|----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Name of person leading this EqIA | David Dewart | 10 th October 2024 |

| Question | Response |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Names and roles of people | Julian Russell – Consultant Advisor |
| involved in the consideration | |
| of impact | |

| Question | Response | Date signed |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Name of Director signing EqIA | Richard Bell | 10 th October 2024 |