



## Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

### Title of policy/process under consideration

**Complaints Policy**

### Lead department

**Corporate Affairs**

Is this policy/process? (Please tick)

New  Existing  Revised

Is this a full EIA? (Please tick)

Yes  No

### Please state the reasons for the above decision.

We have not identified any negative impacts of the revised policy.

## What are the policy/process objectives and aims?

The policy aims and objectives are to provide users, ILF staff, Independent Assessors and third parties with information and guidance to confirm the process if someone wishes to make a complaint.

The policy explains how a complaint can be made and the timescales that someone can expect to receive a response to a complaint. It also explains that any complaint received against a member of staff will be considered in line with the ILF Disciplinary Policy.

The policy advises the appeals process in respect of 2nd tier complaints and that the ILF falls under the jurisdiction of the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman. It states that if someone is unhappy with the final ILF response they can approach the Independent Case Examiner and confirms the timescales for this. The policy advises that the Ombudsman does not normally investigate complaints if they have not been through the ILF complaints procedure.

The policy confirms that the ILF has the power to make ex-gratia payments to compensate for financial loss, gross inconvenience or gross embarrassment in line with the "Ex-gratia Payments" policy.

## Please state the reasons why the changes are taking place.

The Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman advocate that an appeals process be simple, clear, involving as few steps as possible. Having too many complaint stages may unnecessarily complicate the process and deter user's from pursuing their concerns.

The Department of Work and Pensions have adopted a 2-tier appeals process to improve their complaint and decision review handling and the changes to the policy will align the ILF process with that of the Department of Work and Pensions.

Within the current complaint policy there are 3 appeal stages, Complaints and Decision Review, the Senior Management Panel and then the Trustees of the User Personal Cases Committee. The number of stages in the revised policy has been reduced from 3 to 2, Complaints and Decision Review and the ILF Chief Executive Officer. This revision removes the current duplication where the Senior Management Panel consider a 2<sup>nd</sup> tier complaint and the letter is signed by the Chief Executive Officer.

The change to the process will also improve the service provided to users. A

user may find that it can be a lengthy process to currently exhaust the internal complaint stages before their case can be considered externally by the Independent Case Examiner or the Ombudsman. The reduced number of stages will enable the user to receive a final outcome from the ILF within a shorter timescale.

Key			
-2	Significant negative impact	+1	Mild/moderate positive impact
-1	Mild/moderate negative impact	+2	Significant positive impact
0	Neutral impact		
Protected Characteristic	Impact	Notes	
Age	0	The policy will be universally applied to all ILF users and it is not expected to have an impact relating to age.	
Disability	0	The policy will be universally applied to all ILF users and it is not expected to have an impact relating to disability.	
Gender	0	The policy will be universally applied to all ILF users and it is not expected to have an impact relating to gender.	
Gender reassignment	0	The policy will be universally applied to all ILF users and it is not expected to have an impact relating to gender reassignment.	
Marriage and civil partnership	0	The policy will be universally applied to all ILF users and it is not expected to have an impact relating to marriage and civil partnership.	
Pregnancy and maternity	0	The policy will be universally applied to all ILF users and it is not expected to have an impact relating to pregnancy and maternity.	
Race	0	The policy will be universally applied to all ILF users and it is not expected to have an impact relating to race.	
Religion or belief	0	The policy will be universally applied to all ILF users and it is not expected to have an impact relating to religion or belief.	
Sexual orientation	0	The policy will be universally applied to all ILF users and it is not expected to have an impact relating to sexual orientation.	

What alternative policy/process options have been considered to reduce or alleviate any identified impact?

There has not been any identified negative impact as a result of this assessment. The policy has been revised with a view to making the Complaint process simple, clear and involving as few steps as possible.

What research has been gathered/considered when making decisions regarding the Protected Characteristics?

Department for Work and Pensions internal 'guidance to support the 2 tier complaint resolution process'.

Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman 'Principles of Good Complaint Handling' document.

The Equality Act has been considered to ensure that the policy does not directly or indirectly discriminate against any of the Protected Characteristics.

The members of the EIAB also provide experience relating to the protected characteristics when reviewing the equality impact assessments.

Are any future actions required for example monitoring or review?


The policy is not due to be reviewed again as standard before the ILF closes on 31 March 2015.

EIAB comments/recommendations

The EIAB reviewed the EIA on 25 April 2013 and agreed to the EIA as presented with no suggestions for amendments.

Date form completed 5 April 2013

Signature of EIAB chair



Date 26 April 2013

## Subsequent amendments to policy/process

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required

Date of amendment

Details of amendment

Reason why a new EIA is not required