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# Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment – Initial Screening

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of Policy, Procedure or Function: CCTV Policy** | |
| **School/Department: Estates** | |
| **Author/Position: Stanley Jack, Sacrist** | **Date created: Mar ‘16** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Aims and purpose of Policy, Procedure or Function:**  Ensure that the University’s operation of their CCTV systems complies with the law and that responsibilities for the system are clearly defined.  The use of CCTV is largely regulated by legislation and the principal equalities impact of this policy is likely to be to positive, supporting the University (or authorities) in the investigation of incidents on campus (which could include any allegations by staff, students or visitors of incidents related to their protected characteristic e.g. racial or homophobic abuse, sexual assault etc. The CCTV policy helps to outline how incidents will be investigated, how the systems will be used, and who has access to the systems.  To this end the CCTV policy will contribute to creating a safe work and study environment. With evidence that particular groups feel less safe at night, and some groups less likely to report harassment, this policy can contribute to all categories of staff, student and visitors being more confident to report incidents particularly those with protected characteristics. | | |
| **2. Stakeholders:**  Lead directorate: Estates  Lead sub-section: Security  Affected groups: all staff, students and visitors to the University campus. | | |
| **3. Consultation/Involvement**  Draft Policy scrutinised by the Data Protection Officer and any amendments included. | | |
| Organisation/person consulted or involved | Date, method and by whom | Location of consultation records |
| David Blair, Data Protection Officer | March 2016 - discussion | HR |
| Staff Disability Network | 9 May 2016, by e-mail | HR |
| Staff LGBT Network | 9 May 2016, by e-mail | HR |

|  |
| --- |
| a) Brief summary of results of consultation indicating how this has affected the Policy, Procedure or Function |
| The policy has been created to address a perceived gap in governance oversight of the University’s established usage of CCTV systems on campus.  The policy reflects examples of similar policies at other institutions, outlines the statutory framework within which such activity takes place, and defines the roles and responsibilities of those with access to the systems and provides detail of the protocols for the retention and destruction of images captured. |

| **Policy, Procedure or Function (delete as appropriate)** | **Relevance to promotion of equality of opportunity, elimination of discrimination and promotion of good relations between people of with different protected characteristics** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Equality | **Race** | **Disability** | **Gender** | **Age** | **Sexual Orientation** | **Religion or Belief** | **Gender Reassignment** | **Pregnancy or Maternity** | **Marriage or Civil Partnership** |
| 1. Does the policy, procedure or function impact directly on the public or (for internal issues) students/staff regarding: | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2. Is there any evidence or reason to believe that someone could be affected differently (either individually or as a group) on his or her race, ethnic origin, religion, age, gender, disability, sexual orientation or gender reassignment regarding: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Is there evidence that the above mentioned groups are being affected differently regarding: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Is there public/political concern that the policy, procedure or function is operated in a discriminatory manner regarding: | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Does this policy, procedure or function involve the use or discretionary use of statutory powers or authority regarding: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Does this policy, procedure or function present opportunity to improve community relations regarding: | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Does this policy, procedure or function concern equality of opportunity for students/staff regarding: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Impact on individual equality strands i.e. Race, Religion etc.: Score - High (7-5), Medium (4-3), Low (2-1), N/A (0)** | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

Note – Completion of the template requires each strand to be examined individually. The final relevance score is obtained by totalling vertically the number of equality questions that are answered yes in each strand. The highest relevance score will determine the impact of the policy, procedure or function irrespective of diversity strand.

.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Impact of policy, procedure or function on equality** | | | |
| High | Medium | Low  x | N/A |

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Publication** |
| a) Provide details of arrangements to publish initial screening:  The authors are happy for the assessment to be published on the E&D (EIA) website. The policy itself will be published on the University’s Policy Zone. |

|  |
| --- |
| **6. Review Date:** 2019 (i.e. three years after approval) |

|  |
| --- |
| Author (Name and Position): Stanley Jack, Sacrist |
| Authors signature: |

|  |
| --- |
| Equality and Diversity Adviser (Name):Janine Chalmers |
| Equality and Diversity Adviser signature: |

|  |
| --- |
| **7. Date of submission to Advisory Group on Equality and Diversity:** |
| **6/6/2016**  **Approval Yes**  No |