

## Initial Equalities Screening Record Form

<b>Date of Screening: February 2014</b>	<b>Directorate: Corporate Services</b>	<b>Section: HR</b>	
<b>1. Activity to be assessed</b>	Revenue Budget 14/15 – Employment Implications		
<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>	Tony Madden		
<b>5. Who are the members of the screening team?</b>	Pat Butler, Tony Madden		
<b>6. What is the purpose of the activity?</b>	Make organisational change necessary to achieve the required budget savings		
<b>7. Who is the activity designed to benefit/target?</b>	Staff		
<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>	Y	N ✓	No disabled staff being made redundant.
<b>9. Racial equality</b>	Y ✓	N	Adverse  Equality monitoring data indicates that 8.3% of the Redundant staff excluding the Dementia team are BME compared to 6.6% in the non schools workforce. (However, this over representation is one individual in a small group.) The percentage of BME staff being made redundant in the Dementia team (6.7%) is broadly comparable with the non-schools workforce.

<b>10. Gender equality</b>	Y ✓	N	Adverse	In the redundancies excluding the dementia team, 71% are women compared with 75% in the non-schools workforce, so the percentages are broadly comparable. 100% of the redundant staff in the Dementia team are women – however this reflects the current profile of that team, no selection has taken place from within the team.
<b>11. Sexual Orientation equality</b>	Y	N ✓		All staff to be made redundant who had declared a sexual orientation were heterosexual.
<b>12. Gender re-assignment</b>	Y	N ✓		No known instances of staff concerned having had gender reassignment.
<b>13. Age equality</b>	Y ✓	N	Adverse on older groups of staff	The redundancies outside the Dementia team included the 50-59 and over 65 groups to a greater extent than in the non-schools workforce (58.3% and 8.3% respectively, compared with workforce levels of 29.5% and 2.3%).  Within the Dementia team the greater impact was on the 40-49 and 50-59 groups (both 40%, compared with 28% and 29.5% respectively in the non-schools workforce) but this reflects the current profile of that team as no selection took place within the team.
<b>14. Religion and belief equality</b>	Y ✓	N	Adverse impact	The cross council redundancies show a lower rate of Christians and other religions than in the workforce, with those classified as “none” being a higher proportion (33.3% compared with 28.1%.)  In the Dementia team the proportion of Christians is lower (46.7%) and the proportion of those classified as none is higher, although no selection took place from within the team so this represents the profile of the team.  The non schools workforce is 58.8% Christian and 13.1% other, with 28.1% classified as none.
<b>15. Pregnancy and maternity equality</b>	Y	N ✓		None known
<b>16. Marriage and civil partnership equality</b>	Y	N ✓		None known

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.	n/a		
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?	n/a		
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?	<p>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 close/reduce service areas.</p> <p>The numbers affected are quite small and this can lead to a disproportionate impact on percentages.</p> <p>There is no significance perceived in the adverse impacts identified.</p>		
20. Could the impact constitute unlawful discrimination in relation to any of the Equality Duties?	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.
21. What further information or data is required to better understand the impact? Where and how can that information be obtained?	None		
22. On the basis of sections 7 – 17 above is a full impact assessment required?	Y	N✓	The explanations offered above are deemed sufficient not to warrant a full EIA.
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.			
Action	Timescale	Person Responsible	Milestone/Success Criteria
24. Which service, business or work plan will these actions be included in?			
25. Please list the current actions undertaken to advance equality or examples of good practice identified as part of the screening?			
26. Chief Officers signature.	Signature: TONY MADDEN		Date: February 2014