

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE – 5 DECEMBER 2022

PART I – NOT DELEGATED

6. REQUEST TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE PENSIONER FORUM (EHoS)

1 Summary

1.1 To receive a report to consider a change of name of the Pensioner Forum to Senior Forum.

2 Details

2.1 Feedback has been received to the Council from local social media groups and the local newspaper that the current name of the Forum, Pensioner Forum, is a barrier to access and they have declined to promote the forum on their platforms.

2.2 This barrier could be considered as restricting attendance at the meetings although significant promotion has been undertaken by the Pensioner Champion and officers to increase the attendance at the events held and feedback received has been very positive on the forum meetings held this year and attendance has been increasing.

2.3 The Committee are asked to consider changing the name of the Forum to Senior Forum following consultation with the attendees of the Pensioner Forum at their meeting on 11 November 2022. Other options were considered by the Forum but were rejected.

2.4 Members maybe aware that work is currently taking place to review and update our Comprehensive Equalities Policy, which will include a review of our wider community engagement strategy incorporating all our various forum meetings.

2.5 It is worth noting by the Committee that the term generally used is “older person” and this is what Age UK use.

3 Options and Reasons for Recommendations

3.1 That the Committee consider changing the name of the Pensioner Forum to Senior Forum.

4 Policy/Budget Reference and Implications

4.1 There are no policy or budget implications in changing the name of the Forum.

5. Financial, Legal, Community Safety, Public Health Implications

5.1 None specific.

5 Equal Opportunities Implications

5.1 Relevance Test

Has a relevance test been completed for Equality Impact?	Yes
----------------------------------------------------------	-----

Did the relevance test conclude a full impact assessment was required?	No
There is currently insufficient data to undertake a full impact assessment. Work is currently taking place to review and update our Comprehensive Equalities Policy, which will include a review of our wider community engagement strategy incorporating all our various forum meetings.	

5.2 Impact Assessment

None specific.

6 Staffing Implications

6.1 The issuing of the agendas for the Forum meetings and support at the meetings is provided by the Committee Team. In 2022 there will have been 6 meetings/forum events held.

7 Environmental Implications

7.1 None specific. The attendees of the meetings prefer the forum meetings to be held as face to face meetings.

8 Customer Services Centre Implications

8.1 The Customer Service Centre will be advised of any name change to the forum should it be agreed.

9 Communications and Website Implications

9.1 If the name change is agreed external, internal, website and intranet communications and communication with Members and partners will be undertaken.

10 Risk and Health & Safety Implications

10.1 The Council has agreed its risk management strategy which can be found on the website at <http://www.threerivers.gov.uk>. In addition, the risks of the proposals in the report have also been assessed against the Council's duties under Health and Safety legislation relating to employees, visitors and persons affected by our operations. The risk management implications of this report are detailed below.

10.2 The subject of this report is covered by the Committee and Community Partnerships service plans. Any risks resulting from this report will be included in the risk register and, if necessary, managed within these plans.

Nature of Risk	Consequence	Suggested Control Measures	Response <i>(tolerate, treat, terminate, transfer)</i>	Risk Rating <i>(combination of likelihood and impact)</i>
----------------	-------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

Continue with the current name for the Forum	Continues to be a barrier to access	To agree a name change	Treat	1:2
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------	-------	-----

10.3 The above risks are scored using the matrix below. The Council has determined its aversion to risk and is prepared to tolerate risks where the combination of impact and likelihood scores 6 or less.

Very Likely ----- Likelihood ----- ▼ Remote	Low	High	Very High	Very High
	4	8	12	16
	Low	Medium	High	Very High
	3	6	9	12
	Low	Low	Medium	High
2	4	6	8	
Low	Low	Low	Low	
1	2	3	4	
Impact				
Low -----► Unacceptable				

Impact Score

4 (Catastrophic)

3 (Critical)

2 (Significant)

1 (Marginal)

Likelihood Score

4 (Very Likely (≥80%))

3 (Likely (21-79%))

2 (Unlikely (6-20%))

1 (Remote (≤5%))

10.4 In the officers' opinion none of the new risks above, were they to come about, would seriously prejudice the achievement of the Strategic Plan and are therefore operational risks. The effectiveness of the management of operational risks is reviewed by the Audit Committee annually.

11 Recommendation

11.1 That the Committee consider changing the name of the Pensioner Forum to Senior Forum

Report prepared by: Sarah Haythorpe, Principal Committee Manager

Data Checked by:

Kimberley Grout, Executive Head of Service

Emma Sheridan, Interim Head of Community Partnerships

Ciara Feeney, Interim Monitoring Officer

Data Quality

Data sources:

None

1	Poor	
2	Sufficient	x
3	High	

Background Papers

None

APPENDICES / ATTACHMENTS

Equality Impact relevance test