

Equality Impact Assessment : Screening Pro Forma

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------------------------|--|-----|
| Section | Human Resources | Officer responsible for the screening/scoping | Judith Coslett, Head of HR | | |
| Name of Policy to be assessed | Surrey First proposals re staff reductions | Date of Assessment | August 2010 | 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 reduce the size of the workforce of the partner organisations in ways which minimise cost <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forced retirement at 65 whilst still legal • Redeployment across partner organisations with 'dowry' payment • Phased retirements (reduced hours, switching to less demanding roles) • Outplacement support in advance of any immediate redundancy threat | | | | |
| 2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain. | To avoid compulsory redundancies where possible To take a best practice HR approach | | | | |
| 3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way? | The partner organisations in Surrey First – achievement of cost savings Employees – avoidance of compulsory redundancy | | | | |
| 4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice? | Ability of partner organisations to reduce the size of the workforce without incurring high costs Consistent approach by partner organisations Best practice policies which support employees | | | | |
| 5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes? | Partner organisations unable to agree consistent approach Inconsistent application of agreed policy Unwillingness of staff to participate – suspicion of outplacement support, reluctance to reduce hours for fear of redundancy, rejection of redeployment opportunities | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|----------|--|---|
| 6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy? | Chief Executives of partner organisations Unions Heads of HR Employees | | 7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy? | Chief Executives are responsible for the policy decision The policy will be implemented by Heads of HR |
| 8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups? | | N | No – the policy would apply to all staff regardless of their racial background. There are benefits to the staff through the policy rather than disadvantage – eg opportunities to avoid redundancy and to benefit from more flexible working. | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | The percentage of staff from ethnic backgrounds in the Surrey partner organisations is relatively small, with the highest levels being in Woking where 7.5% of the council's workforce are from an ethnic minority. | | | |
| 9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender? | | N | No – the policy would apply to all staff regardless of their gender. More workers over 65 are male and so the forced retirement would statistically affect more men than women. However, the number to be potentially affected is statistically small. | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | The number of staff over 65 is x, x% of these are male. | | | |
| 10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability? | | N | No – the policy would apply to all staff regardless of any disability. Through the application of the protections available in the DDA 1995 a subsequent secondary legislation that are now incorporated into the Equality Act 2010, there are benefits to the staff through the policy rather than disadvantage – eg opportunities to avoid redundancy and to benefit from more flexible working. | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | | | |
| 11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation? | | N | No – the policy would apply to all staff regardless of their sexual orientation. There are benefits to the staff through the policy rather than disadvantage – eg opportunities to avoid redundancy and to benefit from more flexible working. | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | | | |
| 12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have | | | Forced retirement would disadvantage staff over 65 who wish to continue working. | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| a differential impact due to their age? | Y | A redundancy programme targeted at the least costly to dismiss on grounds of redundancy could result in age discrimination. |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | There are x staff who have chosen to continue to work after the age of 65. If the individual employer didn't want to retain them for particular reasons they would be forcibly retired against their will. | |
| 13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief? | N | No – the policy would apply to all staff regardless of their religious belief. There are benefits to the staff through the policy rather than disadvantage – eg opportunities to avoid redundancy and to benefit from more flexible working. |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | |
| 14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities? | N | No – the policy would apply to all staff regardless of any caring responsibilities. There are benefits to the staff through the policy rather than disadvantage – eg opportunities to avoid redundancy and to benefit from more flexible working. |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | |
| 15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them have an offending past? | N | No – the policy would apply to all staff regardless of any offending past. There are benefits to the staff through the policy rather than disadvantage – eg opportunities to avoid redundancy and to benefit from more flexible working. |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | |
| 16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them being Transgender or transsexual? | N | No – the policy would apply to all staff regardless of whether they were transgender or transsexual or not. There are benefits to the staff through the policy rather than disadvantage – eg opportunities to avoid redundancy and to benefit from more flexible working. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | | | No staff in the partner organisations have declared themselves to be transgender or transsexual. |
| 17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure/practice? | Y | | There is an adverse impact on staff over 65. |
| 18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason? | Y | | Yes – the adverse impact is legal and will enable the partner organisations to avoid compulsory redundancies for other staff and to increase opportunities for younger workers who are struggling to find work during the recession. |
| Business improvement | | | |
| 19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups? | Y | N | |
| 20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)? | Y | N | |
| 21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency? | Y | N | Not applicable |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------|--|---|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| 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? | Y | N | See 24 below | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment? | Y | N | <table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="8"> 0 – no possible relevance or adverse impact 1 – extremely low relevance and adverse impact 2 – relatively low relevance and adverse impact 3 – medium relevance and adverse impact 4 - relatively high relevance and adverse impact </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"></td> <td colspan="2">0-8 points</td> <td colspan="4">low adverse impact, no need for full EIA</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"></td> <td colspan="2">9-17 points</td> <td colspan="4">medium adverse impact, full EIA required</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"></td> <td colspan="2">18-24 points</td> <td colspan="4">high adverse impact, full EIA required</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Age</td> <td>Disability</td> <td>Gender</td> <td>Race</td> <td>Sexuality</td> <td>Religion</td> <td>Total</td> <td>Impact</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>6</td> <td>Low</td> </tr> </table> | 0 – no possible relevance or adverse impact 1 – extremely low relevance and adverse impact 2 – relatively low relevance and adverse impact 3 – medium relevance and adverse impact 4 - relatively high relevance and adverse impact | | | | | | | | | | 0-8 points | | low adverse impact, no need for full EIA | | | | | | 9-17 points | | medium adverse impact, full EIA required | | | | | | 18-24 points | | high adverse impact, full EIA required | | | | Age | Disability | Gender | Race | Sexuality | Religion | Total | Impact | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | Low |
| 0 – no possible relevance or adverse impact 1 – extremely low relevance and adverse impact 2 – relatively low relevance and adverse impact 3 – medium relevance and adverse impact 4 - relatively high relevance and adverse impact | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 0-8 points | | low adverse impact, no need for full EIA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 9-17 points | | medium adverse impact, full EIA required | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 18-24 points | | high adverse impact, full EIA required | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | Disability | Gender | Race | Sexuality | Religion | Total | Impact | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | Low | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda? | | | The Council will monitor the application of the proposals to ensure that the outcomes do not have an unintended differential impact of one or more of the protected groups amongst staff. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Signed
(completing officer)

Date August 2010

Signed
(Head of Section)

Date

Countersigned
(member of Equality Action Group)

Date August 2010