

### Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

<b>Section</b>	<b>Human Resources</b>	<b>Officer responsible for the screening/scoping</b>	Judith Coslett, Head of HR		
<b>Name of Policy to be assessed</b>	Potential decision to remove market supplements that can no longer be justified by the market	<b>Date of Assessment</b>	4/6/09	<b>Is this a proposed new or existing policy/procedure/practice?</b>	Potential decision – to be considered
<b>1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/procedure/practice?</b>	<p>A potential decision to remove market supplements that can no longer be justified by the market aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure fair pay and equality for all staff by not paying a supplement to anyone unless there is clear justification</li> <li>• Ensure appropriate use of the Council's resources by only paying a supplement where necessary for recruitment and retention purposes</li> </ul>				
<b>2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain.</b>	N/A				
<b>3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?</b>	<p>Employees – they should have fair and equal pay and be confident that no-one is receiving a supplement unless it can be justified</p> <p>The Council – resources should be used appropriately and supplements should only be paid where necessary</p>				
<b>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?</b>	A removal of any market supplements which can no longer be justified to maintain fairness in pay and appropriate use of resources.				
<b>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b>	Incorrect assessment of whether there is justification for a supplement, for example using out-of-date comparator information or benchmarking using salaries from a different salary level area such as London.				

<b>6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?</b>	Staff (fair and equal pay) and Management Team (appropriate use of resources)		<b>7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?</b>	The decision will be taken by Management Team and implemented by HR
<b>8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups?</b>	¥	N	The decision to remove market supplements which could no longer be justified would be applied to any employee regardless of race. Around 2% of the Council's employees have declared themselves to be of an ethnic background and 5 employees would be affected by this decision. Statistically, with such a low percentage and such a small number of employees affected, you would not expect to be able to identify a differential impact.	
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	None of the affected employees (when completing the monitoring form at the point of recruitment) has declared themselves to have an ethnic minority background.			
<b>9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?</b>	¥	N	The decision to remove market supplements which could no longer be justified would be applied to any employee regardless of gender. The Council has a fairly even mix of male and female employees and in the Planning department it is 44 female (56%) and 34 male (44%)	
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	Three female and two male employees would be affected by the decision, 60% female and 40% male of those affected. This is not far off the gender mix for the department.			
<b>10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?</b>	¥	N	The decision to remove market supplements which could no longer be justified would be applied to any employee regardless of disability. Around 2% of the Council's employees have declared themselves to have a disability and 5 employees would be affected by this decision. Statistically you would not expect to see an impact.	
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	None of the affected employees (when completing the monitoring form at the point of recruitment) has declared themselves to have a disability.			

<b>11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</b>	¥	N	The decision to remove market supplements which could no longer be justified would be applied to any employee regardless of sexual orientation.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	The Council does not currently monitor sexual orientation.		
<b>12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?</b>	¥	N	The decision to remove market supplements which could no longer be justified would be applied to any employee regardless of age. The affected employees are of the average age for the catchment group of employees in the role to which the supplement has been applied.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	The average age of a Planning Officer at the Council is 28. The two affected Planning Officers are 26 and 27. The average age of a Senior Planning Officer at the Council is 34. The affected Senior Planning Officers are 30, 35 and 36.		
<b>13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</b>	¥	N	The decision to remove market supplements which could no longer be justified would be applied to any employee regardless of their religious belief.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	The Council does not currently monitor religious belief so is not aware of the religious beliefs of the affected employees. Their religious beliefs are not a factor in the decision to remove a market supplement.		
<b>14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities?</b>	¥	N	The decision to remove market supplements which could no longer be justified would be applied to any employee regardless of whether or not they have dependant/caring responsibilities.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	The Council does not currently monitor whether employees have dependant/caring responsibilities. This has not been a factor in deciding whether a market supplement should be removed.		

<b>15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them have an offending past?</b>	¥	N	The decision to remove market supplements which could no longer be justified would be applied to any employee regardless of whether or not they have an offending past.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	The Council asks applicants at recruitment stage whether they have an offending past and although this is not captured on Selima it can be checked by reference to the application forms. None of the 5 affected employees has declared an offending past on their application form.		
<b>16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them being Transgender or transsexual?</b>	¥	N	The decision to remove market supplements which could no longer be justified would be applied to any employee regardless of whether or not they are transgender or transsexual.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	The Council does not currently monitor whether employees are transgender or transsexual. This has not been a factor in deciding whether a market supplement should be removed.		
<b>17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure/practice?</b>	¥	N	No
<b>18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?</b>	¥	N	No adverse impact identified.

<b>Business improvement</b>			
<b>19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?</b>	☒	<b>N</b>	
<b>20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?</b>	☒	<b>N</b>	No differential impact identified
<b>21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?</b>	☒	<b>N</b>	Not relevant
<b>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?</b>	☒	<b>N</b>	The Council could, and plans to, improve its equality monitoring of employees. This would help identify any impact on areas which are not currently monitored.
<b>23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?</b>	☒	<b>N</b>	<b>Yes</b>
			<b>No</b>
<b>24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it</b>			No

around the equality agenda?				
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--

**Signed**  
**(completing officer)**

**Date 4 June 09**

**Signed**  
**(Head of Section)**

**Date 4 June 2009**

**Countersigned**  
**(HR representative)**

**Date July 2009**