

Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|--|--|----------|
| Section | Guildford House Gallery | | Officer responsible for the screening/scoping | Mike Beckwith / Christian Dettlaff | |
| Name of Policy to be assessed | Access (physical & intellectual) | Date of Assessment | 25/06/08 | Is this a proposed new or existing policy/procedure/practice? | existing |
| 1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/procedure/practice? | To make the Gallery, Brew House, shop and art collection as accessible as possible to all. | | | | |
| 2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain. | To remove barriers to access | | | | |
| 3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way? | Visitors, staff, general public, shoppers, exhibitors and the Council | | | | |
| 4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice? | To provide free and easy access to the shop, gallery, offices, Brew House and art collections | | | | |
| 5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes? | Resources, Grade 1 Listed Building status, siting (pedestrianised High Street and hill). | | | | |
| 6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy? | As Q3 | | 7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy? | Gallery Manager | |
| 8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups? | | N | Please explain Same policy for all. <i>Could that create inequality?</i> | | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | | | | |
| 9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender? | | N | Same policy for all | | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or | | | | | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| otherwise) do you have for this? | | |
| 10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability? | Y | Listed building status, no lift to upper floors, sloping floors |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | Protocols in place; Stairwalker available; ramps, full art collection available on line as is other Gallery information; height of exhibits considered; large print descriptions of exhibits; currently tendering for provision of virtual tour. |
| 11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation? | N | Same policy for all |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | |
| 12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age? | N | Same policy for all |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | |
| 13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief? | N | Same policy for all |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | |
| 14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities? | N | Same policy for all. Access for wheelchairs and buggies etc. may be restricted – see 10 above. |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | |
| 15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a | N | No details of individuals would be known, so access is available to all. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| differential impact due to them have an offending past? | | | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | | |
| 16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them being Transgender or transsexual? | | N | Same policy for all |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | | |
| 17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure/practice? | | N | Please explain Protocols and mitigation measures in place as far as possible to overcome access problems within the listed building environment. |
| 18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason? | Y | N | Please explain for each heading (questions 8-16) on a separate piece of paper. NA |
| Business improvement 19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups? | Y | | Please explain Introduction of a virtual tour would help to overcome outstanding issues |
| 20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)? | | N | Please explain |

| | | | |
|---|----------|----------|--|
| <p>21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?</p> | <p>Y</p> | <p>N</p> | <p>Please explain</p> |
| <p>22. Is there a missed opportunity to improve your business in relation to any of the policies, procedures or practices to promote racial, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief equality?</p> | | | <p>If unlimited funds were available and permission given, it may be possible to design in an external lift to the rear of the building and a stairlift to the Brew House. Permanent ramps at the front and rear of the building, but this could have adverse impact on the street scene and other users. If a much larger gallery area were available the full collection could be on view all of the time.</p> |

| | | | Yes | No |
|--|--|---|-----|----|
| | | <p>24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda? None that have not already been considered or we are looking to introduce.</p> | | |

Signed
(completing officer) **Date** June 2008

Signed
(Head of Section) **Date**

Countersigned **Date** October 2008