

creening/Scoping Pro Forma

Section	Revenue and Payments Services: Residual Cash Office, Payments and Purchasing sections	Officer responsible for the screening/scoping	Steve White		
Name of Policy to be assessed	Restructure of Residual Cash Office, Payments and Purchasing sections	Date of Assessment	17 December 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?	The restructure is both reactive and pro active. The Residual Cash Office closure is as a result of Concessionary Fares administration transferring to Surrey County Council from 1 April 2011. There will be a loss of work for Payments (Creditors) and Purchasing when the Council ceases responsibility for some leisure services (Spectrum etc) in 2011. The Payments and Cash Office Manager relinquishes half of their span of control and another 2.5fte staff after the loss of one post in 2009.				
2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain.	The restructure focuses on the closure of the Residual Cash Office and the merging of two middle manager posts into one (phase 1). Phase 2 will see the service transform towards performing 'eProcurement' and 'Purchase to Pay' systems.				
3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?	The business community will benefit from the Council's progression to both electronic procurement methods and electronic invoice processing. The new middle manager post created by the merger of sections will give a greater span of control. The Council will benefit from a reduction in costs and more modern and efficient ways of working.				
4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?	A streamlined operation of some support services, providing modern and efficient methods of working. This will create financial savings for the Council and enable employees to work with up to date systems allowing them to provide better service to customers.				
5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	The unsuccessful procurement of a partner to process cheque processing (cash office); unsuitable or inappropriate software solutions; delays in changes to the various leisure services and other losses of Council services.				

6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?	Employees in the service area and users of the services although the service aspects of this restructure would, if necessary, be considered against the screening Equality Impact Assessment for the relevant service. Consultations will take 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 Steve White after due consultation. Steve is also responsible for the review under direction from the relevant Strategic Director.
8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups?		N	There is a low representation of minority ethnic employees amongst the staff in posts being reviewed under the restructure. Within those posts considered to be changed as a consequence of the review it is, statistically, most likely that they will not be occupied by a minority ethnic employee.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The ethnic profile of the staff in posts being reviewed under the restructure is: White British <i>Data deleted for Data Protection reasons</i>		
9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?		N	Within those posts affected by the review the gender make up of the staff is mainly female (11/12) making it likely that the restructure will have a differential impact due to gender. However, 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 female members of staff.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The gender of the staff in posts being reviewed under the restructure is: Female <i>Data deleted for Data Protection reasons</i> Male 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>10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>One member of staff in the posts being reviewed under the restructure have declared that they have a disability as defined under the Disability Discrimination Act 2005. In view of the low number of posts affected by the review and the even lower number of changes proposed, it would not consider it statistically exceptional should the direct impact be on a disabled member of staff.</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>Within those posts affected by the review only one employee has declared that she has 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>N</p>	<p>Within those posts affected by the review, all staff who have declared a sexual orientation are recorded as heterosexual therefore there are no concerns that the restructure will have a differential impact due to sexual orientation.</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>Within those posts affected by the review, 'x' staff have declared their sexual orientation as heterosexual and 'y' staff have chosen not to declare.</p>	
<p>12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?</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>25-34 <i>Data deleted for Data Protection reasons</i> 35-44 45-54 55-64</p>	

<p>13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>In view of the low number of posts affected by the review and the even lower number of changes proposed, it is unlikely that the restructure would have a differential impact as a result of religious belief.</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>		<p>Within those posts affected by the review, 'x' staff have declared their religious belief as Christian, 'y' have declared no religion or not declared a religious belief.</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>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>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 are 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>N</p>	<p>In view of the low number of posts affected by the review and the even lower number of changes proposed, it is unlikely that the restructure would have a differential impact as a result of whether staff are transgender or transsexual.</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>		<p>No staff have declared themselves as transgender or transsexual.</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>N</p>	<p>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>N</p>	<p>Please explain for each heading (questions 8-16) on a separate piece of paper.</p>
<p>19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?</p>		<p>N</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>N</p>	<p>Please explain</p>
<p>21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?</p>		<p>N</p>	<p>Please explain</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?		N	
---	--	---	--

23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?	¥	N	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														
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="815 715 1003 762">Age</th> <th data-bbox="1003 715 1205 762">Disability</th> <th data-bbox="1205 715 1357 762">Gender</th> <th data-bbox="1357 715 1500 762">Race</th> <th data-bbox="1500 715 1653 762">Sexuality</th> <th data-bbox="1653 715 1805 762">Religion</th> <th data-bbox="1805 715 1957 762">Total</th> <th data-bbox="1957 715 2042 762">Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="815 762 1003 813">1</td> <td data-bbox="1003 762 1205 813">2</td> <td data-bbox="1205 762 1357 813">2</td> <td data-bbox="1357 762 1500 813">0</td> <td data-bbox="1500 762 1653 813">0</td> <td data-bbox="1653 762 1805 813">0</td> <td data-bbox="1805 762 1957 813">0</td> <td data-bbox="1957 762 2042 813">5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age	Disability	Gender	Race	Sexuality	Religion	Total	Impact	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5		
Age	Disability	Gender	Race	Sexuality	Religion	Total	Impact											
1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5											
24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda?	¥	N																

Signed
(completing officer)

Date 20 December 2010

Signed
(Head of Section)

Date 17 December 2010

Countersigned
(Corporate Diversity/Diversity/Policy Team)

Date 06 January 2011