

Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

Section	Museum inc Castle Keep, Wanborough Barn, Salters and Undercroft.	Officer responsible for the screening/scoping	Jill Draper & Mike Beckwith		
Name of Policy to be assessed	Physical and intellectual access	Date of Assessment	24/07/08	Is this a proposed new or existing policy/procedure/practice?	existing
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/procedure/practice?	Enable access to Museum services and facilities by the widest range of people				
2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain.	Access to collections and information/learning as well as physical access.				
3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?	Public; community; visitors; researchers; staff; customers; Council				
4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?	Achieve maximum possible access to collections and services.				
5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Listed building status; funding; resources; space; parking. Central location is good				
6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?	See Q3	7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?	Museum Manager		
8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups?		N	Please explain Policy applicable to all		
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Interests of all groups catered for over a period of time. Should different racial groups have additional/special requirements, these have been catered for.				
9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?		N	Both genders catered for.		

<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>		
<p>10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Listed building status restricts the extent of works that can be undertaken to improve access, however certain protocols are/will soon be in place to help alleviate this situation. The following are other steps taken:</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>Main gallery with temporary exhibitions moved to next to main entrance; additional information on the website; funding available to improve remote/virtual access; general colour contrasting and large print captions for exhibitions for visually impaired; ramps and loop system available; new accessible gallery space proposed; grant applied for to work with people with disabilities on special exhibitions.</p>	
<p>11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>All groups catered for.</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>		
<p>12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Some exhibitions are more applicable to certain age groups but accessible to all ages</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>Museum exhibitions programme.</p>	
<p>13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>All groups catered for over a period of time. Museum and associated buildings are open Monday to Saturday to cater for all religious beliefs. Flexibility with staff could be given if required</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>		
<p>14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>No baby change facilities. Limited space causes some difficulty with buggies.</p>

What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			
15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them have an offending past?		N	Visitors backgrounds are not known or determined
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	Access available to 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 All appropriate steps are taken or protocols introduced
18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?	Y		Please explain for each heading (questions 8-16) on a separate piece of paper. Main adverse impact caused by listed building status, protocols put in place wherever possible.
Business improvement			
19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?		N	Please explain mitigation work undertaken where practical

<p>20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?</p>		<p>N</p>	<p>Please explain</p>
<p>21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?</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>Mitigation work being undertaken or is proposed to eliminate areas of need when possible</p> <p>Should the proposed development plan for the Museum proceed access would be increased.</p>

23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?	N		Yes	No
		24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda? No policy changes just operational ones as described above.		

Signed
(completing officer) Date July 2008

Signed
(Head of Section) Date

Countersigned
(Corporate Diversity/Diversity/Policy Team) Date October 2008