

### Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

|  |   |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Subject of assessment:</b>          | Merger of the Teesside and Hartlepool coroner services – addendum to the business case  |  |  |   |
| <b>Coverage:</b>                       | Cross-cutting   |  |  |   |
| <b>This is a decision relating to:</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Policy</b>               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Function</b>          |
|  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Process/procedure</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Programme</b>            | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project</b>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Review</b> |
|  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Organisational change</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state)</b> |  |   |
| <b>It is a:</b>                        | <b>New approach:</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/>                             | <b>Revision of an existing approach:</b>           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>               |
| <b>It is driven by:</b>                | <b>Legislation:</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/>                             | <b>Local or corporate requirements:</b>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>               |
| <b>Description:</b>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Key aims, objectives and activities</b><br/>                     To assess the impact of proposals for a way forward developed as a result of consultation received on the original business case and wider changes in the area which have led to a change in direction which is reflected in the addendum to the original business case.                 </li> <li> <b>Statutory drivers</b><br/>                     There are a number of statutory drivers that are relevant to this review, including, but not exclusive to, Coroners and Justice Act 2009, the Coroners Regulations (investigations) (2013), the Coroners Regulations (inquests) (2013 and the Coroners Act 1988).                 </li> <li> <b>Differences from any previous approach</b><br/>                     It is proposed that the recommendations are revised to reflect feedback from key parties and changes in the wider context which have occurred in the 12+ months that have elapsed since the original business case was drafted. The proposal would provide for an assurance regarding potential risk from the MoJ in respect of an external appointment or if assurances could not be achieved then proposal of the plan to merge until such time as legislative certainty regarding any costs associated with a Senior Coroner losing office are resolved.                 </li> <li> <b>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)</b><br/>                     All local residents, staff affected by the proposal, trades unions, the Chief Coroner, the Ministry of Justice, police and health partners.                 </li> <li> <b>Intended outcomes.</b><br/>                     That a structure (or structures) is put in place that continues to deliver efficient and effective coroner services across the Teesside and Hartlepool Coroner Areas.                 </li> </ul> |  |  |   |
| <b>Live date:</b>                      | November 2015 onwards   |  |  |   |
| <b>Lifespan:</b>                       | n/a.  |  |  |   |
| <b>Date of next review:</b>            | In line with effective project management, the business case is continually under review. If there are any further fundamental issues which impact on the business case, these will be formally reported.   |  |  |   |

| Screening questions  | Response                            |                          |                          | Evidence  |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
|  | No                                  | Yes                      | Uncertain                |   |
| <p><b>Human Rights</b><br/>           Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation? *</p>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The proposed structure(s) will not impact on service delivery and will therefore have no impact on human rights. As set out in the preamble, the pathway will ensure that coroner services for Teesside and Hartlepool continue to deliver efficient and effective services.</p>   |
| <p><b>Equality</b><br/>           Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law?<br/>           Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups? *</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</li> <li>(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;</li> <li>(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> <p>Regardless of the outcome of the project re structure or structures for Tees Valley coroner services, appointment process will be supported by a range of Middlesbrough Council HR policies and will take into consideration Chief Coroner's Guidance Note 6 (which relates to the appointment of coroners). This will ensure that fair and transparent procedures are adhered to and that there is no disproportionate adverse impact on staff as a result of their holding a protected characteristic which could be a breach of the Equality Duty.</p> <p>Based on the evidence available, there are no concerns that the project could disproportionately affect any person because they hold a protected characteristic. Evidence used to assess this evaluation includes equality analysis of staffing included within the review. HR policies have been separately impact assessed. Consultation will be undertaken on proposals with staff and relevant partners as part of the review where appropriate, in line with policies.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Analysis of equality information held on staff</li> <li>o Consultation feedback from staff affected by the project</li> <li>o Wider feedback from consultation with partners and stakeholders.</li> </ul> |

\* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

|   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Community cohesion</b><br/>         Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town? *</p>  | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>Not relevant to the proposal. The project has been designed to ensure that the Coroner service(s) is able to continue to deliver an efficient and effective service that supports all the communities within the Teesside and Hartlepool Coroner Areas effectively.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Analysis of equality information held on staff</li> <li>o Consultation feedback from staff affected by the project</li> <li>o Wider feedback from consultation with partners and stakeholders.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>2020 – the Mayor’s vision</b><br/>         Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough?<br/>         Does the decision impact on statutory duties associated with these key objectives? *</p>   | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>No. The structure(s) would enable the service(s) continue to align with the vision.</p>   |
| <p><b>Organisational management / Change Programme</b><br/>         Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council’s services as set out in its Change Programme?*</p>  | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | <p>This project supports the Change Programme – it has been put in place to deliver improved services to residents, at a lower costs. Proposals will ensure that this continues to be achieved.</p>  |
| <p><b>Next steps:</b></p> <p>➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.</p> <p>➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.</p> <p>This assessment has indicated that there is sufficient information to assess the impact and that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on a group or individual because they hold a protected characteristic. In line with guidance, review proposals will now be subject to consultation. If these consultations identify any unforeseen concerns about the possibility of a disproportionate impact, the impact assessment process will be revisited.</p> |   |   |   |  |

|                                 |                |                         |     |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----|
| <b>Assessment completed by:</b> | Karen Whitmore | <b>Head of Service:</b> | n/a |
| <b>Date:</b>                    | 2.10.2015      | <b>Date:</b>            | n/a |