

### Equality Impact Assessment : Screening Pro Forma

<b>Section</b>	Human Resources	<b>Officer responsible for the screening/scoping</b>	Ali Fleming		
<b>Name of Policy to be assessed</b>	Restructure Procedure	<b>Date of Assessment</b>	2/8/10	<b>Is this a proposed new or existing policy/procedure/practice?</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/procedure/practice?</b>	To provide managers and employees with guidance on the operational processes that should be followed when a restructure is planned and to ensure a fair, consistent approach is followed across the Council.				
<b>2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To ensure that the appropriate groups (e.g. Finance, Union etc) are involved with the process in order that all associated processes are taken into account and followed.</li> <li>• To ensure that legislative processes are followed (e.g. consultation etc) in order to minimise the risk of litigation.</li> </ul>				
<b>3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managers will benefit from having a robust, transparent and easy to understand procedure to follow as it will enable them to plan the process from start to finish.</li> <li>• Employees will benefit as they will be treated fairly, consistently and within the requirements of employment legislation.</li> <li>• The wider Council will benefit through having more efficient and effective restructures thereby helping focus resources more efficiently.</li> </ul>				
<b>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That all managers will follow this procedure when handling internal restructures to ensure that they are handled efficiently, fairly and consistently.</li> <li>• That employees involved understand the process.</li> <li>• More efficient and timely restructures.</li> </ul>				

<p><b>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b></p>	<p>Factors that could detract from the outcome could be that managers could fail to follow the procedure thereby putting the Council at risk of employees raising grievances or submitting tribunal claims. This will need to be addressed through training and robust HR advice.</p> <p>Contributory factors could include support from senior management and successful restructures as a result of using the procedure. This will engender confidence in the procedure and its aims and objectives.</p>		
<p><b>6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?</b></p>	<p>Managers, employees, senior management, Union.</p>	<p><b>7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?</b></p>	<p>Managers and HR implement the policy. HR are responsible for its upkeep and monitoring with input from managers.</p>
<p><b>8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups?</b></p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>The principles of the procedure are applied across all employees regardless of their ethnicity however different cultures could have a different expectation of the way a restructure should be handled and therefore may feel disadvantaged or treated unfairly. There is no evidence to support this hypothetical situation however, should it arise, the Restructure Manager would need to bear this in mind when conducting individual meetings with affected employees.</p>		
<p><b>9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?</b></p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>The procedure takes into account any part time workers (section 11.) who may, more typically be women, and shift workers, who may more typically be men. It makes allowances for their working patterns in terms of consultation periods, timing of meetings etc.</p>		
<p><b>10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?</b></p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or</b></p>	<p>The procedure takes into account employees with visual or hearing impairment and ensures</p>		

<p><b>otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>that copies of documentation are offered in different formats if required. It also takes account of any employees on long term sick and the need to make arrangements for them to receive the relevant information.</p> <p>The principles of the procedure are applied across all employees regardless of whether they have a disability or not. It would be expected, normal management practice to take any disabled employees into account when making practical arrangement for meetings.</p>		
<p><b>11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</b></p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>The principles of the procedure are applied across all employees regardless of their sexual orientation.</p>		
<p><b>12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?</b></p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>It is possible that there may be a differential impact due to age of any individual restructure proposal (e.g. if a number of more experienced staff were being made redundant) however this EIA applies to the practical procedure of a restructure and this is therefore not within the scope of this EIA.</p> <p>It is possible that the redeployment stage of the procedure may have a differential impact on more senior employees who may not have been interviewed in some time or more junior employees who may not have much interviewing experience. Training and/or support would be provided for these individuals if they required it so the impact would be minimal.</p> <p>The principals of the procedure are applied across all employees regardless of their age.</p>		
<p><b>13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</b></p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>No</p>

<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The procedure does not specifically take into account the needs of employees who follows any particular religion or belief however it is possible that this would need to be taken into account when arranging meetings (e.g. if the employee needed to pray at a particular time of day).</p> <p>The differential impact is considered minimal as the Restructuring Manager would invariably know that this was the case for this individual and the profile of the Council is such that cases of this would be rare.</p> <p>The principals of the procedure are applied across all employees regardless of their religion or belief.</p>		
<p><b>14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities?</b></p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The principals of the procedure are applied across all employees. It is possible that if the employee is a carer they may work part time. The procedure takes into account any part time workers (section 11.) who may, more typically be women, and shift workers, who may more typically be men. It makes allowances for their working patterns in terms of consultation periods, timing of meetings etc.</p> <p>The Council does not currently monitor its staff who are carers, although, in most cases it is likely to be known by the Restructure Manager which of his staff has caring responsibilities. There is no evidence that identifies that the role of carer is a concern in the restructure procedure.</p>		
<p><b>15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them have an offending past?</b></p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>No</p>

<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>The principals of the procedure are applied across all employees. The Council does not currently monitor whether its staff are ex-offenders and, as such, this may not be known about an individual.</p>		
<p><b>16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them being Transgender or transsexual?</b></p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>The principals of the procedure are applied across all employees.</p>		
<p><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></p>		<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>No. Most of the impacts described above are hypothetical in nature and may only occur in a minimal number of cases. The basic principals of the procedure are applied across all employees and should therefore not negatively impact on any group.</p>
<p><b>18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?</b></p>	<p><b>Y</b></p>	<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><b>Business improvement</b> <b>19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?</b></p>		<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>Possible in the case of religion or belief however any differential impact would be minimal as the number of employees in this category are likely to be small. It would also be expected that this circumstance (the need to pray) should be known to the manager if it is required on a daily basis. This would therefore be taken into consideration in the normal course of events.</p>
<p><b>20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?</b></p>		<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>The likelihood of differential impacts is low for the reasons given above, and therefore, it would be difficult to conclude that they cut across the equality strands.</p>

<b>21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	n/a																
<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>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	No																
<b>23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?</b>	<b>Y</b>		<p>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</p> <p>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</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="891 890 2125 1002"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age</th> <th>Disability</th> <th>Gender</th> <th>Race</th> <th>Sexuality</th> <th>Religion</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age	Disability	Gender	Race	Sexuality	Religion	Total	Impact	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2
Age	Disability	Gender	Race	Sexuality	Religion	Total	Impact												
1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2												
			Yes however this is because this is an HR procedure affecting all staff.																
<b>24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda?</b>																			

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

**Date** 2 February 2010

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

**Date** 2 February 2010

**Countersigned**  
**(member of Equality Action Group)**

**Date** 11 February 2010