

## Initial Equalities Screening Record Form (Appendix C)

<b>Date of Screening: April 2016</b>	<b>Directorate: Corporate Services</b>	<b>Section: HR</b>					
<b>1. Activity to be assessed</b>	Revenue Budget 16/17 – Employment Implications of service changes subject to Public Consultation						
<b>2. What is the activity?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy/strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Function/procedure <input type="checkbox"/> Project <input type="checkbox"/> Review <input type="checkbox"/> Service <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organisational change						
<b>3. Is it a new or existing activity?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Existing						
<b>4. Officer responsible for the screening</b>	Nikki Gibbons						
<b>5. Who are the members of the screening team?</b>	Pat Butler						
<b>6. What is the purpose of the activity?</b>	<p>Make additional organisational change necessary to achieve the required budget savings. To assess if any part of the workforce will be disproportionately impacted.</p> <p>Redundancies are handled in line with the Council's organisational change policy/procedure.</p>						
<b>7. Who is the activity designed to benefit/target?</b>	<p>Staff – 9 will be made redundant if no further suitable redeployment can be found. It is part of our organisational change procedure to seek alternative employment for all those at risk of redundancy.</p>						
<b>Protected Characteristics</b>	<b>Please tick yes or no</b>	<b>Is there an impact?</b> What kind of equality impact may there be? Is the impact positive or adverse or is there a potential for both? If the impact is neutral please give a reason.	<b>What evidence do you have to support this?</b> E.g equality monitoring data, consultation results, customer satisfaction information etc Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform members decision making, include consultation results/satisfaction information/equality monitoring data				
<b>8. Disability equality</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">Y</td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">N</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> </tr> </table>	Y	N		✓	None.	None of these employees have declared any disability. The non school workforce has 3% with a declared disability.
Y	N						
	✓						
<b>9. Racial equality</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">Y</td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">N</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Y	N	✓		Adverse, but this is only one individual in a small group	One individual is BME, the others (where known) are all White British. The non school workforce is 11.5% BME
Y	N						
✓							
<b>10. Gender equality</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">Y</td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">N</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> </tr> </table>	Y	N		✓	Broadly neutral	Two males and seven females affected (78% female). The non school workforce generally is 71% female and the department in which the majority of the redundancies occur is 84% female.
Y	N						
	✓						

<b>11. Sexual Orientation equality</b>	Y	N ✓	None	4 individuals identified as heterosexual and the remainder did not specify orientation. The non schools workforce is 86.4% heterosexual.
<b>12. Gender re-assignment</b>	Y	N ✓	None	No known instances of staff concerned having had gender reassignment.
<b>13. Age equality</b>	Y	N ✓	None	The age distribution amongst the redundant employees is mainly in the 30-49 age band (67%). One is under 30 and two are over 50. The non schools workforce is also predominantly in the 30-49 age band (48%), with a further 38% being 50+. The younger profile of this group is likely to reflect a younger group working in the Youth Service.
<b>14. Religion and belief equality</b>	Y ✓	N	Impact on the non-Christian workforce within a small group. The religion/belief of the individuals would not have been evident to those making the selection as it is held for monitoring purposes only.	1 identified as Christian, 3 as "other" and one as "none", the others did not declare their religion/belief. In the non schools workforce 57% are Christian and 3.8% other, with 23.1% identifying as having no religion. The non Christian workforce is therefore disproportionately affected in this group.
<b>15. Pregnancy and maternity equality</b>	Y	N ✓		None known
<b>16. Marriage and civil partnership equality</b>	Y	N ✓		None known
<b>17. Please give details of any other potential impacts on any other group (e.g. those on lower incomes/carers/ex-offenders) and on promoting good community relations.</b>	Many of the youth workers are in part time posts (evenings, weekends) often in addition to a separate day job, so the impact of losing their positions is perhaps less significant as it represents a smaller percentage of household income.			
<b>18. If an adverse/negative impact has been identified can it be justified on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group or for any other reason?</b>	The small numbers involved make comparisons on the basis of percentages misleading.			
<b>19. If there is any difference in the impact of the activity when considered for each of the equality groups listed in 8 – 14 above; how significant is the difference in terms of its nature and the number of people likely to be affected?</b>	The personal characteristics of the individuals to be made redundant are not known to decision makers at the initial stages ie when the decisions are taken to reduce services. The numbers affected are quite small and this can lead to a disproportionate impact on percentages. There is no significance perceived in the adverse impacts identified.			

<b>20. Could the impact constitute unlawful discrimination in relation to any of the Equality Duties?</b>	Y	N✓	No. There is no evidence that discrimination is a factor in the selection of services to be reduced or employees to be made redundant.
<b>21. What further information or data is required to better understand the impact? Where and how can that information be obtained?</b>	None		
<b>22. On the basis of sections 7 – 17 above is a full impact assessment required?</b>	Y	N✓	The explanations offered above are deemed sufficient not to warrant a full EIA. The impact on the individuals At Risk of redundancy is mitigated by seeking redeployment for them; by holding individual meetings with them to discuss their skills and experience, and to explain their severance package. Posts in the teams affected are “ringfenced” for At Risk employees. Other posts which become vacant during this period are looked at on a case by case basis, and those which could potentially provide a redeployment opportunity are advertised internally only to allow those At Risk to apply before any external competition is considered.
<b>23. If a full impact assessment is not required; what actions will you take to reduce or remove any potential differential/adverse impact, to further promote equality of opportunity through this activity or to obtain further information or data? Please complete the action plan in full, adding more rows as needed.</b>			
<b>Action</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Milestone/Success Criteria</b>
Ensure equality of opportunity throughout the redeployment period		HR Heads of Service	
<b>24. Which service, business or work plan will these actions be included in?</b>			
<b>25. Please list the current actions undertaken to advance equality or examples of good practice identified as part of the screening?</b>		Individuals will be individually contacted by an HR adviser to discuss possible redeployment, and to help them where necessary with CVs and other aspects of job search.	
<b>26. Chief Officers signature.</b>		Signature: Nikki Gibbons	Date: June 2016