

Appendix 1: Equality Impact Assessment Screening:

Redundancy Policy

1. Context

This EIA screening is undertaken because the paper requires a decision in relation to a:

- Policy review

2. Relevance to the Public Sector Equality Duty:

The draft document sets out the policy that the organisation will adopt for employees at risk of redundancy (including redeploying staff to suitable alternative employment) and the arrangements for redundancy pay. It does not relate to the decision to change/restructure an organisation and the impact this might have on the equality profile of the workforce and on patients/service users with different protected characteristics.

The policy has the potential to impact positively or negatively on different groups of employees or it could have a neutral impact, depending on how it is implemented.

A proposed equality statement is not yet completed (section 12). However, it will need to make address both non-discriminatory practice and the 3 aims of the public sector Equality duty (see below). It should also refer to all of the 9 protected characteristics.

The policy is relevant to the following aspects of the Public Sector Equality Duty:

1) Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010

A reference to non-discriminatory practice does appear in section 7.2 (selecting employees for redundancy) but this omits reference to pregnancy/maternity and to marriage/civil partnership.

S7.2 also highlights the need for any training provided to comply with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 (this would cover accessibility issues and the need for reasonable adjustments for disabled employees).

2) Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not

In s7.3 (individual meetings with “at-risk” employees), the potential of the policy to avoid a negative impact on the equality of opportunity to secure satisfactory options going forward could be reduced by making explicit provision for equality issues to be discussed in these meetings. This is likely to empower employees to raise individual issues such as the need for, or effectiveness of, current reasonable adjustments to their working environment and working practices and the equality implications of each option explored. Individual employees might wish to discuss concerns around a fear of discrimination or harassment in new locations or teams.

Following redeployment or relocation, any effective reduction in the level of employee remuneration (through rebanding to a lower grade or more expensive travel to work requirements) is likely to impact most adversely on lower paid employees. Looking at the CCG’s workforce profile, such employees are more likely to be female than male, so such an outcome could be indirectly discriminatory in limiting the range of suitable redeployment options to this protected group. S8, in referring to pay protection and excess travel payments, addresses this potentially negative outcome and improves the feasibility/suitability of a wider range of redeployment options.

3) Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not

Having a clear and transparent policy, which is effectively implemented and which addresses potentially discriminatory outcomes, has the potential to foster good relations between staff from different protected groups

2. Impact on Protected Groups:

Depending on how it is implemented, the policy could impact positively or negatively in relation to the following protected characteristics:

Age.	Yes	Disability.	Yes	Sexual Orientation.	Yes
Race.	Yes	Sex.	Yes	Religion or Belief.	Yes
Gender Reassignment.	Yes	Pregnancy & Maternity.	Yes	Marriage or Civil Partnership Status	Yes

3. Health Inequalities:

Does it relate to an area with known Health Inequalities? No

4. Where it is considered that the policy has no relevance to the General Duty or Protected Groups, this should be recorded here with reasons, along with any advice received:

--

5. Conclusion:

Proceed to full EIA: No
Quality Assured by: David Harris, Senior Equality Advisor, South west CSU
Date: 7 April 2014