

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT WORKBOOK



Department:	HR
Corporate Document(s) this Equality Impact Assessment Relates to:	Recruitment (Police Staff) Joint Policy
Associated Documents:	

Equality Impact Assessment	
Developed By	Rebecca Newman
Part One Initial Assessment Approved By	Rebecca Newman
Part Two Full Assessment Approved By	N/A
Date Published:	16 th July 2013
Review Date:	4 th February 2016
Version Control:	2

Date Reviewed	Name and Job Title of Reviewer

PART ONE

INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE TEST

The Initial Equality Impact Assessment and Significance Test templates should be completed prior to seeking authority to proceed with the development of the following documents:

- Strategies
- Plans, including Contingency Plans
- Project Initiation Documents
- Policies and Procedures

The Initial Equality Impact Assessment and Significance Test grading will always be agreed by three people. This will give integrity and consistency to the process and will draw on the experience, knowledge and common sense judgement of more than a single individual. The following will usually be the posts involved in the process;

Policy and Procedure

- Policy or Procedure Owner or Holder
- Policy Officer
- Diversity Officer

Other Corporate Documents

- Corporate Document Owner
- Corporate Document Developer
- Diversity Officer

Advice on the types of information available to assist in the completion of the templates can be obtained from the Policy or Diversity Units.

It is recognised that there will be occasions when the knowledge and experience of the staff members involved in the Equality Impact Assessment process will be such that there may not be a need to undertake any initial research or consultation in order to complete the Initial Equality Impact Assessment. This is acceptable provided that the reasons are accurately recorded in the workbook.

INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

1.1 Summarise the main aim(s) or purpose of the corporate document.

Main aim(s) or purpose, including any benefits or outcomes	Date
<p>To provide guidance and information on the recruitment, selection and appointment procedures for police staff.</p> <p>Benefits:</p> <p>Managers: guidance on how to define roles, advertise vacancies, and how to manage the recruitment procedure from selection to appointment.</p> <p>Individuals: guidance on processes, support available, and the use of reasonable adjustments.</p> <p>HR Department: guidance on internal processes and clarification of responsibilities throughout the recruitment and selection procedure.</p> <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear guidance for management, individuals and HR to follow • Responsibilities clearly laid out within policy 	

1.2 Identify individuals and organisations internally and externally that are likely to have an interest in, or be affected by, the corporate document. Where a review is being undertaken, if appropriate, highlight any changes to who might have an interest in the document.

Interested individuals and organisations	Date
Internal	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police staff • Managers • HR Department • Chief Officers • Unison • Staff Network Groups (particularly Reach Out) • PCC's 	
External	
<p>Members of the public: an effective recruitment and selection procedure will assist in attracting good quality applicants from the wider labour market. Good internal processes which uphold the principles of a fair recruitment and selection procedure will boost morale and improve retention, impacting positively on service provided to customers (who may also be potential recruits).</p> <p>Other forces: an effective recruitment and selection process sets a standard of best practice against other forces, improving reputation and promoting itself as a desirable potential employer.</p>	

1.3 Who implements the corporate document and who is responsible for the corporate document?

This includes shared documents, documents that affect contractors or other public or private bodies: for example Group 4 Security, Multi Agency Protocol or PFI.

Implements: Managers, HR Department, PSD, Occupational Health
Responsible: HR Department, Chief Officers

1.4 What factors could contribute or detract from the outcomes?

The desired outcomes could be affected negatively by anyone involved in the recruitment and selection process who fails to consistently implement the actions and procedures required by the policy.

1.5 Are there any concerns that the corporate document could have a differential impact on any of the following groups and is there evidence to support this?

Group	Yes	No	Evidence	Date
Age		X		
Disability		X		
Gender reassignment		X		
Marriage and civil partnership		X		
Pregnancy and maternity		X		
Race		X		
Religion or belief		X		
Sex		X		
Sexual orientation		X		

Protective Security Marking:	NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED
------------------------------	-------------------------

Family Status e.g. dependants or caring responsibilities		x		
Economic Status		x		

1.6 Could the differential impact identified in 1.5 above amount to there being potential for adverse impact and, if so, can this be justified on any of the following grounds:

- promoting good relations between diverse communities;
- promoting equality of opportunity;
- eliminating unlawful discrimination;
- eliminating unlawful harassment;
- encouraging participation in public life;
- addressing the specific needs of disabled people.

	Yes	No	Reason	Date
Is there potential for adverse impact?		x		
Can this adverse impact be justified?				

SIGNIFICANCE OF INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Based on the information provided in the Initial Equality Impact Assessment template, assess the significance of the impact as either Low, Medium or High.

Guide to assessing significance:

Low – where the answer in respect of all eleven groups in 1.5 above is ‘no’;

Medium – where the answer in respect of between one and four groups in 1.5 above is ‘yes’. However, if the likely adverse impact on any or all of those groups is considered to be particularly significant, it may be appropriate to classify the significance as High;

High – where the answer in respect of between five and eleven groups in 1.5 above is ‘yes’ or where the likely adverse impact on one or more groups is considered particularly significant.

Protective Security Marking:	NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED
------------------------------	-------------------------

Low: No further assessment required and review every three years.	X
Medium: Requires Full Equality Impact Assessment and relevant consultation in year one and bi-annual review.	
High: Requires Full Equality Impact Assessment and relevant consultation in year one and annual review.	

Equality Impact Assessment - Low Significance

Those corporate documents identified as having a low significance will be developed without the need to complete a Full Equality Impact Assessment. However, if during the course of the corporate document process equality issues are identified then the Initial Impact Assessment and Significance Test should be repeated.

Equality Impact Assessment – Medium and High Significance

The Full Equality Impact Assessment process will commence when approval has been given to develop the corporate document.

The Initial Equality Impact Assessment Template and Significance of Initial Equality Impact Assessment were completed by:

Name: Rebecca Newman
Position: HR Manager (Policy & Reward)
Date: 10.12.12

Name: Abraham Eshetu
Position: Diversity Manager
Date: 22.01.13

Name: Charlie Hall
Position: T/DCC
Date: 05/07/13

PART TWO**FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

All questions should be considered from the perspective of all diversity strands, i.e. age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation and from the perspective of family status e.g. dependants or caring responsibilities and economic status.

2.1 Research

1. What monitoring arrangements are in place? (With new corporate documents there may be no arrangements in place, in which case go to question 2)	
2. What quantitative data has been considered?	
3. What qualitative information has been considered?	
4. Is there a public concern regarding the subject of the corporate document? If so, describe how these concerns have been identified	
5. Provide details of any changes in legislation or national guidance affecting the corporate document	
6. Summarise the findings	
7. Have gaps in the research or data been identified?	
8. Has the corporate	

Protective Security Marking:	NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED
------------------------------	-------------------------

document been amended in light of the research findings?	
9. Outline any plans for further research or data collection	

2.2 Consultation

10. Which individuals and organisations internally and externally were consulted or involved and how were they consulted or involved?	
11. Have consultees been informed of the results of consultation or involvement and by what means?	
12. Summarise the key findings or outcomes of the consultation or involvement	
13. Has the corporate document been amended in light of the consultation or involvement?	
14. Is there a need for further consultation?	
The results of consultation should be recorded in Appendix A	

2.3 Equality Analysis and Review

15. Is there any evidence that the corporate document could be perceived as discriminatory or could damage good relations between people of different groups?	
---	--

Protective Security Marking:	NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED
------------------------------	-------------------------

16. What might the negative implications of the corporate document be for the public or Constabulary staff?	
17. What might the positive implications of the corporate document be for the public or Constabulary staff?	
18. Is there any evidence that the corporate document has an adverse impact, directly or indirectly, on any members of the public or Constabulary staff?	
19. What changes, if any, have been made to the corporate document as a result of the Equality Impact Assessment to reduce adverse impact?	
20. What changes, if any, were considered but not implemented?	
21. If the potential remains for the corporate document to have a negative impact on members of one or more groups, explain why implementation is to continue and can this be justified?	
22. If your assessment is that the corporate document is likely to have an adverse impact is there an alternative means of achieving the document's aim, objective or outcome?	

23. What changes, if any, need to be made in order to minimise unjustifiable adverse impact?	
--	--

2.4 Monitoring

24. What arrangements have been made to monitor the corporate document? Please identify monitoring review dates	
--	--

2.5 Summary

25. Please provide a summary of the findings of the Equality Impact Assessment against the corporate document under each of the eleven diversity strands. This summary will be used by the Constabulary to inform the public and will become a public document.	
---	--

PART THREE

FINAL APPROVAL AND SIGN OFF

Assessment completed by:

Name:

Position:

Date

Signed by Corporate Document Holder:

I am satisfied that [Name of Corporate Document) has been fully Equality Impact Assessed.

Name:

Position:

Date:

Appendix A: Equality Impact Assessment Consultation Record

Consultee	Comment	Action
Suffolk Diversity Unit	3.3 'Drafting the advert' 2 nd paragraph: The phrase "and to enable candidates to deselect" is not clear. There should be no stereotyping of any protected characteristic unless the post has a genuine and justifiable occupational need.	Policy amended
	Paragraph 4.1: It needs to be mentioned that the application form includes the equal opportunity monitoring form (4.5 correctly mentions that this is separated before the application goes to the selection panel).	Policy amended
	General: Satisfied that the procedure includes provision for applicants with any form of disability to have an equal opportunity to apply and attend any interview.	No action required.
	Security Vetting, 10.3: This could particularly preclude some BME people from applying if they had only been resident in the UK for a relatively short time. This issue is however covered by the Vetting Procedure and its Equality Impact Assessment.	No action required.
	Job Descriptions and Adverts: It is accepted that there are many 'small teams' in which staff work, however there needs to be an awareness that emphasis on phrases such as 'working in a small team' could put off those potential applicants who may be concerned that they may stand out because of their particular protected characteristic, eg. race, sexual orientation, gender.	If a post will require an individual to work as part of a small team, then I see no issue with this information being reflected in the JD and the advert. No amendment necessary to policy.
Suffolk Reach Out	Satisfied that the procedure has provision for applicants with any form of disability to have an equal opportunity to apply and attend any interview.	No action required.
SAWP	No issues but to re-emphasise the point about no gender stereotyping	No action required.
Joint Estates and Facilities Dept	Paragraph 2.3: No advice listed on what to do if grading needs checking.	Policy amended

Jenny Thompson, Protective Services (Crime)	Paragraph 2.1: There needs to be a hyperlink to procedures for set up and grading of new posts, so staff are aware of the actual process.	Joint Grading policy is not yet in place. Policy amended to contact HR Service Desk who can advise on latest guidance.
	Paragraph 2.2: There needs to be hyperlink to procedures for getting the vacancy authorised – does it go via RAG etc? Where is this process documented so that staff can follow it?	Norfolk authorise vacancies via Enact, and this is being introduced shortly into Suffolk. Policy does advise to contact HR Service Desk. No policy amendment required at this time, although policy can be updated once Enact is in place.
	Section 3: What is the process that determines whether its an internal or an external advert or both? Where is it documented? This is open to discriminatory practice and challenge	CHASE UP EMMA BLACK'S COMMENTS ON THIS.
	Paragraph 3.3: This appears unfair practice – how does the line manager know that someone in the organisation doesn't have the specialist skills for the role? It's his opinion not fact. This will be open to challenge, as the organisation does not keep adequate enough records of all staff skills to turn his opinion to fact.	CHASE UP EMMA BLACK'S COMMENTS ON THIS.
	Paragraph 4.3: Internal applications should be in 2 parts: Part 1 - the essential criteria /refs bit for the line manger to sign Part 2 - the equal ops and personal info bit should be sent direct to HR. Staff may not want monitoring information about race/sexual orientation or personal information passed wider than HR. <u>It encourages discrimination</u> and many staff will not fill in the monitoring form if it is seen by wider circles. It's 'needs to know' information and equal ops monitoring and personal information is not needed to be known by line managers and anyone else who has	The equal opps form is separate to the application form. The line manager therefore does not need to see this document. No policy amendment required.

<p>Jenny Thompson, Protective Services (Crime) cont.</p>	<p>access to their emails. This too could be open to challenge.</p>	
	<p>Paragraph 5.4: Where is this scoring criteria? It needs to be included – otherwise what does 3 mean?</p>	<p>The scoring criteria is shown on the shortlisting forms.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 8.1: This suggests that when a vacancy arises for a specialist role it is not advertised but candidates who are on a ‘special’ list are selected. Whilst this might save time it precludes anyone who missed the opportunity first time round to apply for a specialist post. It would be fairer if the post was re-advertised and worded to say previous applicants will also be considered. Whilst previous applicants may have been the best at the time – a re-advertisement may bring in someone better that raises the bar. It also removes the potential for discriminatory practice.</p>	<p>These points are accepted, however the policy clearly outlines the type of circumstances in which a select list would be used, i.e. those which occur frequently and are complex to recruit to, such as those requiring an assessment centre. There is no mention of specialist roles, which tend to be unique and rarely occurring. No amendment to policy required.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 8.4: This is contradictory – as ‘select’ lists are supposed to be for staff with specialist skills to save time for recruitment. So how can the vacancy be offered to any staff at risk – they wont have the ‘select’ skills and therefore negates the need to have a ‘select’ list.</p>	<p>As above, select lists are not usually linked to ‘specialist’ roles or skills. Staff at risk of redundancy will always be given priority for a vacancy, however they must meet all the essential criteria of the post in order to be successfully appointed to the role. No policy amendment required.</p>
<p>Paragraph 9.2: This makes the assumption that the successful applicant has to accept the offer straight away – is this fair? Is this legal? Salesman pressure? Cooling off period etc? There could, be a clause to say acceptance required within 7 days?</p>	<p>If the candidate wishes to turn down the offer of appointment they can do so at any time, regardless of whether they have verbally accepted the post. No policy amendment</p>	

		required.
	Paragraph 10.11: There needs to be a clause to say that occ health will inform line managers of any previous or existing mental issues that the candidate discloses as this will effect the workload and stress tolerance levels of the work that can be allocated. Failure to make a line manager aware is brewing trouble for later on when the candidate suddenly has stress attacks or a nervous breakdown. Mental issues can just reappear. It is unfair on the line manager if he is not aware of any predispositions, and unwittingly puts the candidate in a situation where stress and anxiety re-appears.	Occupational Health cannot disclose medical information about individuals to their line manager without their consent. It is for individuals to discuss any relevant medical condition, physical or mental, with their manager if they so wish. Further information is available in the Disability Management policy. No amendment to policy required.
	Paragraph 11.1: Written feedback should be provided if requested.	Due to the resources available it is not possible to provide written feedback to all candidates on request. No amendment to policy required.
Norfolk IAG	All responded with no issues/comments.	No action required.
Ch Supt Protective Services (Sp Ops)		
Suffolk Police Authority		