

Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

Section	Economic Development	Officer responsible for the screening/scoping	Mike Harris
Name of Policy to be assessed	Restructure of the Economic Development Service	Date of Assessment	05/05/2009
		Is this a proposed new or existing policy/procedure/practice?	New
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/procedure/practice?	To review the operation and structure of the service to identify efficiency savings to assist the Borough achieve a balanced budget in 2009/10 and to provide as a minimum services at the same level as currently provided		
2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain.	To have a heritage service that encourages visits from both residents and tourists and to have a Business and Tourism service that minimises the economic downturn and ensures Guildford is best placed to prosper when the upturn comes.		
3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?	The residents, businesses and visitors to Guildford will benefit through a focussed economic downturn and by contributing to savings to achieve a balance budget with no reduction in this service unit.		
4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?	To deliver a saving of £100k in the 2009/10 financial year from the stage 1 budget to the final budget with no reduction in service		
5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Non-cooperation on the part of staff employed in the area(s) affected by the review. Disagreement from Management Team on the structure review outcomes.		
6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?	Employees in the service area and users of the service although the service aspects of this restructure would, if necessary, be considered against the screening Equality Impact Assessment for the relevant service. Consultations have taken place with the staff who occupy posts covered by this structure review	7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?	The restructure is implemented by Mike Harris after due consultation who is also responsible for the review under direction from the relevant Strategic Director.

<p>8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups?</p>	<p>¥</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Please explain There is a low representation of minority ethnic employees amongst the staff in posts being reviewed under the restructure. If any post(s) is considered to be redundant as a consequence of the review, it is, statistically, most likely that they will not be occupied by a minority ethnic employee.</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The ethnic profile of the staff in posts being reviewed under the restructure is:</p> <p>White British <i>Detail removed for data protection reasons</i></p> <p>White Other</p> <p>Indian</p> <p>Undeclared</p>		
<p>9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?</p>	<p>¥</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>If any post(s) is considered to be redundant as a consequence of the review, the gender make up of the staff makes it, statistically, most likely that a female member(s) of staff would occupy such a post(s) and, as a consequence, be affected in a direct way by the outcome of the review. Although the Council is mindful of the gender breakdown of employees (70% female) in undertaking this restructure, in view of the low number of posts covered by the review and the even lower number of changes proposed, it would not consider it statistically exceptional should the direct impact be on any male members of staff.</p>

<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The gender of the staff in posts being reviewed under the restructure is:</p> <p>Female <i>Detail removed for data protection reasons</i></p> <p>Male</p> <p>These statistics have not been weighted to reflect whether the employee occupies a post on a full or job share or part time basis.</p>		
<p>10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	<p>¥</p>	<p>N</p>	
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>None of the staff in posts being reviewed under the restructure has declared that they have a disability as defined under the Disability Discrimination Act 2005</p>		
<p>11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Council has not hitherto monitored the sexuality of its employees and, without that knowledge, it could not conclude that there has or has not been a differential impact, arising from this restructure, on grounds of sexuality.</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The Council has amended, with effect from January 2009, the equality monitoring form that it uses for recruitment purposes to include sexual orientation. This data is used to form the employment record of the successful candidate. The Council is preparing to request all existing staff to complete this revised monitoring form to help the Council understand better the profile of its workforce.</p>		
<p>12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	<p>¥</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>There is a reasonable spread of ages of staff in posts that are affected by this review with the majority being in the age range from 45 to 54 which is not inconsistent with the Council's overall age profile.</p>

<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The age profile of the staff in posts being reviewed under the restructure is:</p> <p>16-24 <i>Detail removed for data protection reasons</i> 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 over65</p>		
<p>13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Council has not, hitherto, monitored the religion or belief of its employees and, without that knowledge, it could not conclude that there has or has not been a differential impact arising from this restructure on grounds of religion or belief</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The Council has amended, with effect from January 2009, the equality monitoring form that it uses for recruitment purposes to include religion or belief. This data is used to form the employment record of the successful candidate. The Council is preparing to request all existing staff to complete this revised monitoring form to help the Council understand better the profile of its workforce.</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>N</p>	<p>The Council does not monitor its staff under the category 'carer' although it is, incidentally, aware of employees who have young children and would be sensitive to that in any decisions that it may make about the future employment of staff in posts covered by the review.</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>			
<p>15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them have an offending past?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>	

<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>None of the staff in posts being reviewed under the restructure is known to be an ex-offender.</p>	
<p>16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them being Transgender or transsexual?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N The Council has not, hitherto, monitored its employees as transgender and, without that knowledge, it could not conclude that there has or has not been a differential impact arising from this restructure on those grounds.</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The Council has amended, with effect from January 2009, the equality monitoring form that it uses for recruitment purposes to include transgender. This data is used to form the employment record of the successful candidate. The Council is preparing to request all existing staff to complete this revised monitoring form to help the Council understand better the profile of its workforce.</p>	
<p>17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure/practice?</p>	<p>⚡</p>	<p>Please explain No clear differential impacts have been highlighted in this review.</p>
<p>18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Please explain for each heading (questions 8-16) on a separate piece of paper. The actual impact on staff affected in a direct way by this review will be assessed against any relevant equality targets set by the Council which may or may not have a bearing on final decisions.</p>
<p>Business improvement 19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?</p>	<p>⚡</p>	<p>Please explain This Impact Assessment concerns a staffing structure review that is focused solely on posts and not the occupants of the posts. It does not have relevance after the completion of the review.</p>

<p>20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?</p>	<p>¥</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Please explain</p> <p>Only in a limited way insofar as the assessment under 18. above may create a need for a greater depth of review where more than one of equality strands may appear to result in an individual(s) being subject to a differential and negative impact on more than one ground. However, with the relatively small number of posts covered by the review and with a number of posts that had no current occupant having already been declared redundant, statistical imbalances would not be unexpected in this structure review.</p>
<p>21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?</p>	<p>¥</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Please explain</p> <p>No other service, either internal or external, has a direct impact on this review.</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>Indirectly in that, any employee occupying a post that was declared redundant under this review would then become subject to the Council's redundancy policy and redundancy procedures both of which have been the subject of an equality impact assessment. The broad thrust of the policy/procedure is that other employment opportunities, locally and/or elsewhere within the Council, should be explored and exhausted before any formal and final notice of termination on redundancy grounds is implemented, i.e. before the end of the last day of service.</p> <p>An outcome of the above impact assessments has been an action that the equality profile of staff selected for redundancy should be monitored to ensure that the actual impact of the application of both the policy and procedure does not result in a differential and consistent impact upon any one of the identified equality groups.</p>

23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?	Y	N		Yes	No
24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda?	Y	N	This is an impact assessment on a single restructuring exercise that ceases to have a life beyond the completion of the exercise.		

Signed
(completing officer)

Date 05 May 2009

Signed
(Head of Section) Date

Countersigned
(Corporate Diversity/Diversity/Policy Team) Date May 2009