

Single Equality Scheme Consultation Feedback – Appendix 2

	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	COMMENTS MADE	ACTION TAKEN
1.	Pat Carrington, Principal, City College (by email)	Confirmed no comments on the draft Single Equality Scheme.	N/A
2.	Officer from PCC Operations Directorate (LL by email)	Commented on the term “discrimination” and recommended the document define the way in which this term is used. Pointed out that the Council has to discriminate i.e. differentiate or make a distinction in order to provide Council services where they are needed.	Definitions of direct and indirect discrimination added in Section 2 of the scheme using definitions from the Equality & Human Rights Commission.
3.	Member of the public (MS by email via a voluntary sector organisation)	Commented on the needs of the Asian Pakistani community based on own experience since 2009. Comments focused on inequalities faced by Sunni women in Peterborough including dietary needs, social welfare, the internet, religion/culture, role in decision-making, role of religious men and use of mosques. Also highlighted the skills of many Sunni women.	Noted - feedback to be used as part of needs assessment and evidence for equality impact assessments and other work across council services.
4.	Kevin Tighe, Chief Executive, Vivacity (by email)	Commented that the document looks extremely comprehensive, focused on the City Council which is understandable and correct. The action plan is reasonably smart given the strategic nature of the document. Suggested additional action around reviewing pricing policies to see if policy and practice match. Suggested identifying a small number of ‘must do’ items.	Additional item added and priority actions indicated with ** in the action plan.
5.	Cross Keys Homes (by	Commented the draft is much improved from the pre-consultation version – comprehensive and reflective of	Section 11 of the Scheme has been expanded to outline the Greater

Single Equality Scheme Consultation Feedback – Appendix 2

	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	COMMENTS MADE	ACTION TAKEN
	email)	current legislative position. Noted that some legislative changes are still part of the scheme where this makes sense e.g. socio-economic inequalities. This version is less centred on employment and staff issues and has a broader context of partnerships, the external environment and the services provided. Suggested setting the SES in the context of the Single Delivery Plan for Peterborough and showing a structure chart around which groups are involved in delivering the scheme.	Peterborough partnership, Sustainable community Strategy, Single Delivery Plan and Diversity Forum.
6.	PCC Children's Services (by internal email)	Commented that paragraph 4.5.6 should read 101 languages not 24 languages. Also added text to the children's services section of the action plan.	Addition to the action plan included in final draft document. Specific section in action plan added for Children's Services.
7.	Member of the public (PS by email)	Commented that SES no longer a requirement and therefore assumes we are publishing the SES to comply with the requirements to prepare and publish equality objectives by 6/4/12 plus also the principles of compliance with the general equality duty. Also commented that the draft SES is just slightly tidies up from the pre-consultation draft and doesn't appear to have been consulted on with people affected by equality issues. Considers there is no assessment of the needs of equality groups, no link to existing equality schemes, no discussion on the consultation that has taken place, no reference to the publication of information in support of compliance with	SES updated in terms of changes to legislation and clear reference made to the requirement to publish equality objectives and the general equality duty. The consultation draft was informed by comments made during the pre-consultation phase and also by other relevant consultations/engagement including with disabled people. This summary of consultation responses is being published alongside the SES. The action plan has been made as

Single Equality Scheme Consultation Feedback – Appendix 2

53

	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	COMMENTS MADE	ACTION TAKEN
		<p>general equality duty, too much internal focus. Considers the action plan is unrelated to the needs of equality groups, lacking in ambition, unrelated to the main body of the SES, has too many one-off times, isn't SMART. Specific suggestions made: Include revision of action plan annually in the action plan. Reflect Foreword sentiments in the Introduction. Considers adults with disabilities are ignored in Section 4. Queries why numbers in Section 4 are estimates rather than actual numbers Considers Section 4 should set out the needs of each group. Suggests section 4.5.5 would sit better in section 4.2 Suggests Section 6 is better reflected within the action plan. Suggests Section 7 commitments are not picked up in the rest of the SES. Suggests lack of emphasis on external engagement in Section 8 and queries confidence in the Council openly discussing and considering difficult issues. Paragraph 8.3 should refer to Annexe 2 rather than Appendix 2. Questions if sections 9, 10, 11, and 13 should be included in the SES and if they are, suggests buildings regulations should be too. Points out that socio-economic duty has been removed from the legislation. Unclear if Annexe 3 is complete.</p>	<p>SMART as possible. An action has been added to reflect annual updates of the action plan. Section 4 uses estimates which are available for each group referred to and describes the overall issues for each group. References are made to more detailed assessments such as the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. Specific sections reviewed and amendments made where appropriate.</p>

Single Equality Scheme Consultation Feedback – Appendix 2

	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	COMMENTS MADE	ACTION TAKEN
8.	PCC Human Resources (by internal email)	Minor wording changes proposed. Additional text added on HR requirements in relation to race equality and information publication requirements. Updated SES to reflect recent changes around monitoring of workforce in relation to new recruitment – gender reassignment and sexual orientation. Updated SES in relation to Investors in People accreditation. Definition of disability updated. Proposals to change elements of action plan related to HR.	Wording changes, updates and action plan changes made where appropriate.
9.	PCC Creating Opportunities, Tackling Inequalities Scrutiny Committee – July 2011	Requested that action plan be made as specific as possible. An equalities representative should be identified from each department in the Council. Suggested increased reference to carers' support. Requested that reference to Dogsthorpe be removed.	Action plan has been made as SMART as possible. Equality representatives are already identified for each department in the Council. Carers' support references enhanced. Dogsthorpe reference is factual.
10.	Diversity Forum – June 2011	Individuals agreed to feed back on the document. Discussed the possibility of developing a Peterborough 'brand' for all organisations' Single Equality Schemes. Highlighted the need to focus on equality objectives. Discussed how the Forum can support the Single Equality Scheme and be more involved going forward.	The development of equality objectives is a key action within the Scheme. The Forum will be fully engaged in this work and in overseeing the action plan. Further debate on greater consistency across Peterborough to be had.
11.	Customer Services Focus Group	Discussion regarding economic wellbeing and surprise expressed that this is not a protected characteristic – view expressed that people should not be discriminated due to	Economic well-being included in the scheme although not a protected characteristic under the legislation.

Single Equality Scheme Consultation Feedback – Appendix 2

	COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	COMMENTS MADE	ACTION TAKEN
	– 24 members of the Citizen’s Panel – July 2011	their income level. View that the Council already treats people (in customer services terms) fairly, with respect and according to needs. On this basis some people did not feel the categorisation by protected characteristics was useful. Questions raised as to whether we do enough to ensure that people newly arrived in this country/the city are aware of their rights and responsibilities.	Action in relation to people newly arrived being looked at further by Neighbourhoods Team.

This page is intentionally left blank