

### Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

<b>Section</b>	Human Resources		<b>Officer responsible for the screening/scoping</b>			
<b>Name of Policy to be assessed</b>	Potential decision to screen World Cup matches in the staff restaurant and allow staff to flex out to watch, making up the time later		<b>Date of Assessment</b>	20 May 2010	<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>The potential decision to screen World Cup matches and allow staff to flex out to watch aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable staff who cannot take annual leave to enjoy the World Cup.</li> <li>• Boost morale by making the most of a national event.</li> <li>• Avoid “sickness” and unauthorised absence on match days.</li> <li>• Protect customer service by maximising the number of staff who are in work on match days.</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 – able to enjoy the World Cup even when they can’t take leave; able to watch matches with their colleagues.          Customers – higher levels of staff in on match days than might otherwise be the case.          The Council – more accurate sickness records.</p>			
<b>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?</b>			<p>Flexibility for staff to flex out for the duration of the match and watch it on-site.          Increased staff morale.          Accurate and true sickness reporting.</p>			

<b>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b>	Lack of support from managers who will need to approve flexi leave. Too many staff all wanting to watch a match – insufficient cover to allow them all to attend. Objections from staff who are not interested in football. Staff preference to call in sick or take unauthorised leave to watch the match in the pub or at home.		
<b>6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?</b>	Staff (flexibility to watch the matches and increased morale), customers (more staff in on match days to provide service) and Management Team (accurate sickness reporting).	<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>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	All matches will be screened so employees from any country could watch their home team play. Employees have to make up the time so there is no benefit for those who watch the matches over those who do not because their team is not in the tournament. Employees can wear team colours, e.g. scarves, hats, whilst watching the match but should be dressed appropriately for work when they return to their desks.		
<b>9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	<p>The offer is available to all staff – male or female, but is likely to appeal to more men than women so more men will benefit. Female staff may complain that they are not given the same option to watch sports which are enjoyed by more women, e.g Wimbledon. Female staff may object to covering male colleague’s phones/work whilst they watch the football.</p> <p>There is, however, unlikely to be a differential impact on part-time staff (these are predominately female) who may not be due to work on a ‘match screening’ day as they will be able to make their own arrangements to watch a match.</p>		

10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	<del>N</del>	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The room where the matches will be screened is fully accessible. There is no evidence that able-bodied people are more interested in football than disabled people. However, disabled employees may complain that special arrangements are made to watch the World Cup but the same is not provided for the para-olympics or other disabled sports.		
11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	<del>N</del>	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Staff of any sexual-orientation are equally able to watch the football. The option may benefit, disproportionately, more heterosexual staff if more of them are interested in football than their homosexual colleagues.		
12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?	N	N	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Staff of any age are equally able to watch the matches. An interest in football is not age related.		
13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	N	N	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Staff of any religion are equally able to watch the matches. An interest in football is not religion related.		
14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities?	N	N	

<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>		Staff with or without caring responsibilities are equally able to watch the matches. An interest in football is not related to whether or not a person has caring responsibilities.	
<b>15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them have an offending past?</b>		Y	N
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>		Staff are equally able to watch the matches whether or not they have an offending past. An interest in football is not related to having an offending past or not.	
<b>16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them being Transgender or transsexual?</b>		Y	N
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>		Staff are equally able to watch the matches whether or not they are transsexual or transgender.	
<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>	Y	<del>N</del>	Yes – potentially an adverse impact on female and gay and lesbian staff.
<b>18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?</b>	Y	<del>N</del>	Yes – the business justification is to reduce “sickness” and unauthorised absence which might otherwise occur because staff want to watch the matches and can’t take leave.

<b>Business improvement</b>  <b>19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?</b>	¥	N			
<b>20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?</b>	Y	<del>N</del>	Yes – female and lesbian.		
<b>21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?</b>	¥	N	No – very minor potential for adverse impact.		
<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>	¥	N	The Council will monitor any feedback from staff should the decision be to provide the flexibility to watch matches at work by swiping out. Any objections on equality grounds will be recorded to support future decision-making.		
<b>23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?</b>	¥	N		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it</b>			In order to minimise any potential concerns about the approach under consideration, matches could be screened for a minimum period – from 5		

around the equality agenda?		minutes before the kick-off until 5 minutes after the end of the game (or immediately on the conclusion of the game).	
-----------------------------	--	---	--

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

**Date** 20 May 2010

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

**Date** 20 May 2010

**Countersigned**  
**(Corporate Diversity/Diversity/Policy Team)**

**Date** 24 May 2010