

### **Screening/Scoping Pro Forma**

<b>Section</b>	Human Resources	<b>Officer responsible for the screening/scoping</b>	Judith Coslett, Head of HR		
<b>Name of Policy to be assessed</b>	Potential decision to freeze non consolidated increments for staff who are at the top of their grade for 2010 and use the money to fund a modest pay increase for the lowest paid staff	<b>Date of Assessment</b>	17/12/09	<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>A potential decision to freeze NCIs and instead offer a modest increase to the lowest paid staff aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure best use of the Council’s resources by prioritising a pay increase for lowest paid staff over bonus payments to those at top of grade</li> <li>• Protect the financial position of the lowest paid staff during a recession when there is likely to be no pay award</li> <li>• Make a saving to contribute to balancing the budget for 2010-11</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 earning £18,024 or less – they will have a small financial payment to help them during the recession  The Council – the saving will help to balance the budget</p>				
<b>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?</b>	<p>£300 one-off payment to 258 staff earning £18,024 or less  £91,750 saving to help balance the budget</p>				

<b>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b>	It would be difficult to implement this proposal if it were opposed by the union		
<b>6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?</b>	Lowest paid staff (will gain a small payment) and the Council (balanced budget and appropriate use of resources)	<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>	¥	N	The decision to freeze NCIs would be applied to any employee regardless of race.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	All staff will be affected by the removal of the opportunity to earn an NCI when at the top of grade, but the 582 staff who are already at the top of grade will be most directly affected. 1% of these staff (when completing the monitoring form at the point of recruitment) has declared as having an ethnic minority background as opposed to 2% across the Council's staff.		
<b>9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?</b>	Y	N	The decision to freeze NCIs would be applied to any employee regardless of gender, but slightly more men will be affected. However, more men will benefit from the consequent pay award for the lowest paid.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	All staff will be affected by the removal of the opportunity to earn an NCI when at the top of grade, but the 582 staff who are already at the top of grade will be most directly affected. Of these 62% are male and 38% female, as opposed to the whole Council staff who are 56% male and 44% female. Slightly more men will lose the opportunity to earn an NCI for 2010. However, the plan to use some of the saving to give a small pay award to staff earning £18,024 or less, means that more men will benefit. 73% of the group who would be eligible for the pay increase are male.		

<b>10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The decision to freeze NCIs would be applied to any employee regardless of disability.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	All staff will be affected by the removal of the opportunity to earn an NCI when at the top of grade, but the 582 staff who are already at the top of grade will be most directly affected. 2% of these staff (when completing the monitoring form at the point of recruitment) has declared as having a disability which is the same as 2% across the Council's staff.		
<b>11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The decision to remove NCIs would be applied to any employee regardless of sexual orientation.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	1% of all staff have declared themselves to be homosexual and 0% to be bisexual. Of the staff at the top of their grade, none declared themselves to be homosexual and less than ½% declared themselves to be bisexual. The percentages are so close that statistically there is no differential impact.		
<b>12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The decision to remove NCIs would be applied to any employee regardless of age, but slightly more older staff will be affected. However, more older staff will be eligible for the consequent pay award for the lowest paid.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	All staff will be affected by the removal of the opportunity to earn an NCI when at the top of grade, but the 582 staff who are already at the top of grade will be most directly affected. The age split of these staff is 16% aged 35 or under, 37% aged 36-49 and 47% aged 50 or over. This compares to all Council staff of 26.75% aged 35 or under, 40.29% aged 36-49 and 32.96% aged 50 or over. Slightly more older staff will lose the opportunity to earn an NCI in 2010. However, of the group of lowest paid workers who are eligible for the small pay award, 39% are over 50 and 26% are in their 40s so more older staff will benefit from the pay award.		
<b>13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The decision to remove NCIs would be applied to any employee regardless of their religious belief.

<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>Of all staff the following declared their religious beliefs: 32% Christian, and less than ½ % for any other religion. Of the staff who are at top of grade 34% declared themselves to be Christian and less than ½ % for any other religion. The percentages are so close that statistically there is no differential impact.</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>¥</p>	<p><b>N</b> The decision to remove NCIs would be applied to any employee regardless of whether or not they have dependant/caring responsibilities.</p>
<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>The Council does not currently monitor whether employees have dependant/caring responsibilities. This has not been a factor in deciding whether an NCI should be frozen.</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>¥</p>	<p><b>N</b> The decision to remove NCIs would be applied to any employee regardless of whether or not they have an offending past.</p>
<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>The Council asks applicants at recruitment stage whether they have an offending past and although this is not captured on Selima it can be checked by reference to the application forms. It is not practical to manually check the application forms of the 582 staff who are currently top of grade to see whether a larger percentage of those most directly affected have an offending staff than the general staff.</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>¥</p>	<p><b>N</b> The decision to remove NCIs would be applied to any employee regardless of whether or not they are transgender or transsexual.</p>
<p><b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b></p>	<p>No staff have declared themselves to be transgender or transsexual.</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>Y</p>	<p><del>N</del></p>	<p>Yes – slightly more men and older people will lose the opportunity to earn a NCI for one year. However, the adverse impact is very small. However, more men and older people will benefit from the modest pay award that the NCI freeze will fund, so overall there is no adverse impact.</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>Y</p>	<p><del>N</del></p>	<p>Yes – the proposal seeks to fund a small financial payment for the lowest paid staff during a time of recession when they are unlikely to receive any pay award.</p>
<p><b>Business improvement</b></p> <p><b>19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?</b></p>	<p>≠</p>	<p>N</p>	
<p><b>20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?</b></p>	<p>Y</p>	<p><del>N</del></p>	<p>Yes, older men are likely to be affected slightly more than other groups, but it is a very small percentage increase and the adverse impact is also very small. They are also more likely to benefit from the consequent pay award for the lowest paid workers which the NCI freeze will fund.</p>
<p><b>21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?</b></p>	<p>≠</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Not appropriate</p>

<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													
<b>23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?</b>	¥	N	0 – no possible relevance or adverse impact 1 – extremely low relevance and adverse impact      0-8 points      low adverse impact, no need for full EIA 2 – relatively low relevance and adverse impact      9-17 points      medium adverse impact, full EIA required 3 – medium relevance and adverse impact      18-24 points      high adverse impact, full EIA required 4 - relatively high relevance and adverse impact					<b>Age</b>	<b>Disability</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Race</b>	<b>Sexuality</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Impact</b>
			2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4					
<b>24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda?</b>	¥	N													

Signed  
(completing officer)

Date 17 December 09

Signed  
(Head of Section)  
Countersigned  
(Corporate Diversity/Diversity/Policy Team)

Date

Date 5 January 2010