



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 (Y/N): N
Title: Project Herald – Nurses in Custody	
Summary: See COP paper for 7 February 2008	
Branch / OCU: TPHQ Emerald Custody Directorate	
Date created: 28 Jan 2008 Review date: 28 Jan 2009 Version: 1	
Author: Detective Superintendent, Emerald Custody Directorate	

Directorate/Department/Borough/OCU: TP Emerald Custody Directorate
Name, type or title of proposal (If a corporate policy, a policy workbook must also be completed): Project Herald – Nurses in Custody

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

The proposal aims to provide nurses as healthcare professionals within custody rather than rely on the current call-out system for obtaining forensic medical assistance. It is envisaged that this will provide professional assistance to the custody staff in determining the medical needs and meeting the forensic medical requirements of each case. It is also anticipated that detainees, custody staff, investigators and others involved in the custody process such as solicitors and appropriate adults will benefit through reduced delays. Additionally, victims of crime who require forensic medical examination as part of the evidential recovery process will benefit from reduced delays.

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

Information has been gathered by reference to existing MPS records, learning emerging from IPCC and Coroner's enquiries, the experience of other police forces and the experiences of our staff in custody suites. A focus group was formed involving external consultant nurses to determine the MPS custody medical and forensic requirement. FMEs were invited to provide their vision of how an improved service meeting our needs would be constructed. The proposal under consideration has been formulated as a result of this initial consultation and involvement. Further engagement and consultation with stakeholders will be ongoing throughout the planning and implementation process.

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

a.	Who is responsible for managing this consultation/involvement? TP Emerald Custody Directorate Herald Project Team will lead on consultation and involvement.
b.	Why is this consultation/involvement taking place? To further the involvement of current Forensic Medical Examiners in the proposed changes to service delivery and gain the involvement of those not yet engaged. Also seeks engagement from current custody staff including nurses deployed at Charing Cross.
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. FMEs, Custody Officers, DDOs, Custody Nurses, users of custody, unions, federation, OH, Diversity Directorate.
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
e.	What are the results of the consultation/involvement? How are these fed back into the process? Users, unions and federation have all been positive. External consultation with other forces and nurse practitioners has also been positive. Consultation/involvement with existing FMEs is ongoing with mixed views emerging.

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 forensic medical process already takes place. The proposed changes aim to make sure that risks are better managed through early assessment by a professional rather than medically untrained custody staff and that delays are reduced for all persons, including detainees, victims and others, who require the service.
(ii)	Will any part of the proposal be directly or indirectly discriminatory? Explain: No. The proposed changes are to the method of service delivery rather than to the standard of service delivery and are therefore based on needs of individuals and the investigative process.
(iii)	Is the proposal likely to negatively affect equality of opportunity? Explain: No.
(iv)	Is the proposal likely to adversely affect relations between any particular groups or between the MPS and those groups? Explain: No.
(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: 28 January 2008
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.

Deleted: , e.g. people of different ethnic background including minorities

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 <i>(delete as applicable)</i>
	Introduce the proposal	Yes / No <i>(delete as applicable)</i>
	Amend the proposal (an impact assessment should be made of any amendments)	Yes / No <i>(delete as applicable)</i>
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