

# University Complaints Handling Procedure

## Equality Impact Assessment

May 2013

**Please complete and return by email to Mohammed Hameed, Diversity Partner**  
[m.hameed@napier.ac.uk](mailto:m.hameed@napier.ac.uk)

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| Faculty/Service Area<br><b>Governance Services</b>   | Date of Assessment<br>10/5/2013  | Name of the proposal to be assessed<br>University Complaints Handling Procedure  | Person responsible for the assessment<br>David Cloy<br>Assistant Secretary |
| Who was present at the EIA?<br><br>David Cloy (Assistant Secretary)<br>Mohammed Hameed (Diversity Partner) | Is this a <b>new</b> or <b>existing</b> proposal?<br><br><b>Existing</b> |  | When will this proposal be reviewed?<br><br><b>3 Years</b>                 |
| 1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the proposal                                       |  | To provide an open and accessible complaint handling procedure available to all who use the University's services and which complies with the statutory requirements of the Scottish Public Service Ombudsman's Model Complaints Handling Procedure. |  |
| 2. Who is intended to benefit from the proposal and in what way?   |  | Any user of our services, including students, applicants and members of the public.  |  |
| 3. What outcomes are wanted from this proposal?  |  | An open and accessible procedure which users can easily follow and which enables lessons to be learned and service improvements to ensue.  |  |

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| 4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?  | Lack of visibility or awareness of the procedure, but this is mitigated by communication plan for its dissemination. |  |  |
| 5. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on minority ethnic groups? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?                         | Y  |  | Yes, positive. The procedure is intended to have a positive impact as it has a clearly defined procedure, with appeal mechanism, which applies equally to all regardless of protected characteristics. There is also monitoring of cases which concern protected characteristics as well as monitoring of the demographic of complainants. |
| 6. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact due to gender (including pregnancy and maternity)? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | Y  |  | Yes, positive. The procedure is intended to have a positive impact as it has a clearly defined procedure, with appeal mechanism, which applies equally to all regardless of protected characteristics. There is also monitoring of cases which concern protected characteristics as well as monitoring of the demographic of complainants. |
| 7. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact due to disability? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?                                 | Y  |  | Yes, positive. The procedure is intended to have a positive impact as it has a clearly defined procedure, with appeal mechanism, which applies equally to all regardless of protected characteristics. There is also monitoring of cases which concern protected characteristics as well as monitoring of the demographic of complainants. |
| 8. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to sexual orientation? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?               | Y  |  | Yes, positive. The procedure is intended to have a positive impact as it has a clearly defined procedure, with appeal mechanism, which applies equally to all regardless of protected characteristics. There is also monitoring of cases which concern protected characteristics as well as monitoring of the demographic of complainants. |
| 9. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to their age? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?                        | Y  |  | Yes, positive. The procedure is intended to have a positive impact as it has a clearly defined procedure, with appeal mechanism, which applies equally to all regardless of protected characteristics. There is also monitoring of cases which concern protected characteristics as well as monitoring of the demographic of complainants. |

|   |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| 10. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to their religious belief (or none)? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?          | Y |  | Yes, positive. The procedure is intended to have a positive impact as it has a clearly defined procedure, with appeal mechanism, which applies equally to all regardless of protected characteristics. There is also monitoring of cases which concern protected characteristics as well as monitoring of the demographic of complainants. |
| 11. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people with dependants/caring responsibilities? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?          | Y |  | Yes, positive. The procedure is intended to have a positive impact as it has a clearly defined procedure, with appeal mechanism, which applies equally to all regardless of protected characteristics. There is also monitoring of cases which concern protected characteristics as well as monitoring of the demographic of complainants. |
| 12. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to them being transgender or transsexual? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?     | Y |  | Yes, positive. The procedure is intended to have a positive impact as it has a clearly defined procedure, with appeal mechanism, which applies equally to all regardless of protected characteristics. There is also monitoring of cases which concern protected characteristics as well as monitoring of the demographic of complainants. |
| 13. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to their marital or civil partnership status? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | Y |  | Yes, positive. The procedure is intended to have a positive impact as it has a clearly defined procedure, with appeal mechanism, which applies equally to all regardless of protected characteristics. There is also monitoring of cases which concern protected characteristics as well as monitoring of the demographic of complainants. |

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>14. Describe how this proposal will help the University to meet its Public Sector Equality Duty obligations.</p> |  |  | <p>The University's Complaints Handling Procedure is designed to be easily accessible to all regardless of protected characteristic. Where support may be necessary, for example due to a disability or because the complainant's language of choice is other than English, it will be provided by the University. The nature of the complaints can be varied and can concern the University itself or can be between individuals. By approaching the issue of complaints in a supportive and inclusive manner, with opportunities for resolution at a local level through, for example, mediation (where appropriate), it is hoped that the three needs of the General Duty (below) are advanced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other prohibited conduct</li> <li>• Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not</li> <li>• Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.</li> </ul> |
|---|--|--|---|