



# Equality Impact Assessment Summary

## Summary

Name of Product Vetting Appeals Policy

Brief Description of Product EIA to support the Vetting Appeals Policy. The Policy has some positive impacts on those with protected characteristics, this EIA addresses how the Policy supports an enhanced layer of objectivity for vetting appeals where a candidate declares a protected characteristic.

Product / Product Summary Attached Yes

Department DSE

Assessment Writer [Redacted], Head of Information Management

Date Started 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2021

Head of Dept Sign Off [Redacted], Head of DSE

EDI Manager Sign Off [Redacted] – 08/02/2022

Review Date January 2023

## Version Control

This is a living document and should be updated as we update our products and receive new insights and data on how our people or communities engage with our product.

Version	Date	Reason for update	Author
1.0	Dec 2021	First iteration of document	[Redacted]

**Please ensure you consult the Equality Impact Assessment Guidance while completing this document**

## Stage One – Early Thinking


## Equality Impact Assessment Summary

Use this space to confirm if you are developing a proposal that will impact upon policies and practices that are likely to impact upon our communities or workforce. Consider If you aren't sure how your product may impact people due to their protected characteristics please use our [Equality Consideration Checklist](#).

Is an EIA required at this time?	Yes
If no, what is your rationale?	N/A

### Stage Two – Identify Scope

Please consult the [Equality Impact Assessment Guidance](#) for suggestions as to consider how you might evidence both positive and negative impact. Where possible please provide references or links.

Sources	 <p>Disproportionality within Vetting 'As Is' F</p> <p>The attached report from the NPCC includes findings from the research and analysis carried out into Police vetting outcomes and disproportionality across the protected characteristics.</p> <p>Cleveland Police have not yet started to collect protected characteristic information alongside the vetting application (pending system upgrade in 2022), so we are relying on findings from the NPCC report and its research and analysis across other forces. In future, once we have collected enough meaningful data, we will be able to incorporate Cleveland Police specific data too.</p>
Consultation	Staff Associations and Networks have agreed to participate in the independent scrutiny panel meetings, akin to the measures described in 'Vetting failures and appeals' on p13 of the NPCC report.

### Stage Three - Impact

What potential positive or negative impacts has your research and consultation revealed? Consult the [Equality Considerations Checklist](#) for previously identified impacts that may be relevant.

#### Age

#### Data & Background Information

The attached report (p18) shows forces are more likely to grant vetting clearance to candidates in younger age groups. Younger age groups are more likely to request an appeal (p19) and older age groups are more likely to have a successful appeal (p19).

Positive Impacts

Negative Impacts

## Equality Impact Assessment Summary

<p>The impact of consulting with an independent scrutiny panel which includes a representative from a relevant employee association or Strategic Independent Advisory Group (SIAG), provides additional objectivity to the review and adds value to the process by sharing any cultural/community nuances that may be relevant to the review, surrounding the declared protected characteristic/s.</p>	<p>None identified at the time of writing.</p>
<b>Disability</b>	
<b>Data &amp; Background Information</b>	
<p>Disability is currently not measured in relation to vetting success and appeal rates. This is largely due to vetting decision makers not having any information available that would identify this characteristic, therefore reducing any unconscious bias during decision making around this characteristic.</p>	
<b>Positive Impacts</b>	<b>Negative Impacts</b>
<p>Even though this characteristic is not identified during the vetting decision making process, those who declare this characteristic upon appeal, will benefit from the input of the independent scrutiny panel.</p>	<p>None identified at the time of writing.</p>
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	
<b>Data &amp; Background Information</b>	
<p>Gender reassignment is currently not measured in relation to vetting success and appeal rates. This is largely due to vetting decision makers not having any information available that would identify this characteristic, therefore reducing any unconscious bias during decision making around this characteristic.</p>	
<b>Positive Impacts</b>	<b>Negative Impacts</b>
<p>Even though this characteristic is not identified during the vetting decision making process, those who declare this characteristic upon appeal, will benefit from the input of the independent scrutiny panel.</p>	<p>None identified at the time of writing.</p>
<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	
<b>Data &amp; Background Information</b>	
<p>Marriage and civil partnership are currently not measured in relation to vetting success and appeal rates. This is largely due to vetting decision makers not having any information available that would identify this characteristic, therefore reducing any unconscious bias during decision making around this characteristic.</p>	
<b>Positive Impacts</b>	<b>Negative Impacts</b>

## Equality Impact Assessment Summary

<p>Even though this characteristic is not identified during the vetting decision making process, those who declare this characteristic upon appeal, will benefit from the input of the independent scrutiny panel.</p>	<p>None identified at the time of writing.</p>
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	
Data & Background Information	
<p>Pregnancy and maternity are currently not measured in relation to vetting success and appeal rates. This is largely due to vetting decision makers not having any information available that would identify this characteristic, therefore reducing any unconscious bias during decision making around this characteristic.</p>	
Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts
<p>Even though this characteristic is not identified during the vetting decision making process, those who declare this characteristic upon appeal, will benefit from the input of the independent scrutiny panel.</p>	<p>None identified at the time of writing.</p>
<b>Race</b>	
Data & Background Information	
<p>White candidates are more likely to be granted vetting clearance (p18) whereas black, mixed and Asian candidates are least likely to be granted clearance. Candidates born within the UK are more likely to be granted clearance than those born outside of the UK (p18). Asian Chinese and Black Caribbeans are more likely to request an appeal, with other Asian, Black and Mixed ethnicity candidates are less likely to request an appeal (p19). Chinese and black mixed ethnicities are more likely to have a successful appeal, where as other Asian, Black and White ethnicities are least likely to have a successful appeal (p19).</p>	
Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts
<p>The impact of consulting with an independent scrutiny panel which includes a representative from a relevant employee association or Strategic Independent Advisory Group (SIAG), provides additional objectivity to the review and adds value to the process by sharing any cultural/community nuances that may be relevant to the review, surrounding the declared protected characteristic/s.</p>	<p>None identified at the time of writing.</p>
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	
Data & Background Information	



## Equality Impact Assessment Summary

<p>Religion and beliefs are currently not measured in relation to vetting success and appeal rates. This is largely due to vetting decision makers not having any information available that would identify this characteristic, therefore reducing any unconscious bias during decision making around this characteristic.</p>	
Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts
<p>Even though this characteristic is not identified during the vetting decision making process, those who declare this characteristic upon appeal, will benefit from the input of the independent scrutiny panel.</p>	<p>None identified at the time of writing.</p>
Sex	
Data & Background Information	
<p>Forces are more likely to grant vetting clearance to females (p18), males are marginally more likely to request an appeal (p19) and females are more likely to be successful in their appeal (p19).</p>	
Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts
<p>The impact of consulting with an independent scrutiny panel which includes a representative from a relevant employee association or Strategic Independent Advisory Group (SIAG), provides additional objectivity to the review and adds value to the process by sharing any cultural/community nuances that may be relevant to the review, surrounding the declared protected characteristic/s.</p>	<p>None identified at the time of writing.</p>
Sexual Orientation	
Data & Background Information	
<p>Sexual orientation is currently not measured in relation to vetting success and appeal rates. This is largely due to vetting decision makers not having any information available that would identify this characteristic, therefore reducing any unconscious bias during decision making around this characteristic.</p>	
Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts
<p>Even though this characteristic is not identified during the vetting decision making process, those who declare this characteristic upon appeal, will benefit from the input of the independent scrutiny panel.</p>	<p>None identified at the time of writing.</p>
Other – Please clarify	
Data & Background Information	



## Equality Impact Assessment Summary

None identified at the time of writing.	
Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts
N/A	N/A

Stage Four – Mitigation – Actions		
What can be done to mitigate/minimise negative impacts?		
Action	Action Owner	Action Status
N/A		

To be filled in by Head of Department			
Stage Four – Mitigation – Risk Tolerance			
Have we exhausted options to mitigate/minimise any negative impacts? List negative impacts we have not been able to mitigate here – these should be added to the relevant departmental risk register.			
Impacts we cannot mitigate	N/A		
Which Risk Register have these impacts been added to?	N/A		
Departmental Risk Assessment	Impact	Likelihood	Total
EDJ Team Risk Assessment	Impact		
	N/A		

### Stage 5 – Sign Off

Once complete, you must send your completed EIA and the product or product summary to the EDI team at [edi@cleveland.pnn.police.uk](mailto:edi@cleveland.pnn.police.uk)

The team will review your EIA and will either: provide final sign off, OR, return your document with further considerations and recommendations for you to implement.