# **INTERNAL POLICY EQUITY ASSESSMENT TOOL**

The following questions are used to analyze CCPH policies through an equity lens. It will assess a policy’s existing capacity for equity and help identify ways to increase inclusivity, address disparities, and/or limit unintended barriers. For best results, the assessment should be answered honestly and open-mindedly, and while “N/A” is an acceptable answer, try to avoid it. It is recommended that as many different people with different backgrounds, identities, and perspectives review the policy with this tool as possible.

1. What results are desired from this policy?
2. What groups/demographics are affected by this policy? *Examples: gender, age, income status, race, ethnicity, English as 2nd language, religion, marital/dependent status, disability, sexual orientation, national origin, leadership/management/non-management staff*
3. Which of these affected groups do you belong to, if any? Do you bring other relevant identities and perspectives to this review?
4. How are/will these groups be affected by this policy?
5. How does/will this policy affect the greater Canton community, if at all?
6. Describe or summarize any data about these groups in relation to this policy or its goal.
7. Are there existing disparities between affected groups in relation to this policy?
8. How is/will this policy be perceived by affected groups?
9. Are all affected groups represented in this reviewal process? If not, can we find a way to include them?
10. Are there unintended impacts of this policy that worsen or ignore existing disparities? If so, are there strategies to mitigate these potential burdens?
11. Does this policy consider language or cultural barriers?
12. In what ways does this policy positively impact affected groups?
13. Does this policy educate on equity and/or racial equity issues? If so, how?
14. Does this policy support workforce equity and/or contracting equity? If so, how?
15. How will we be kept accountable for the equitability and inclusivity of this policy? How often will data related to this policy be reviewed?
16. Based on your answers, what recommendations do you have for this policy to maximize equity and/or inclusion?
17. What data (quantitative or qualitative) is informing these recommendations?
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# **D. GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

**Contracting Equity**: Investments in contracting, consulting, and procurement should benefit the communities a jurisdiction serves, proportionate to the jurisdiction’s demographics.

**Disparities**: Differences in outcomes among groups of people (ex: racial disparities in health, income, and housing)

**Equity Lens**: A process to analyze the impact of the design and implementation of policies, practices, and decision-making authority on historically excluded and marginalized individuals and groups; meant to minimize the impact of implicit bias and ensure that a given process deliberately reflects equity values

**Racial Equity**: When race can no longer be used to predict life outcomes, and outcomes for all groups are improved.

**Workforce Equity**: The workforce of a jurisdiction reflects the diversity of its residents, including across the breadth (functions and departments) and depth (hierarchy) of government.
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