

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

EIA Ref	PR/16/42	
Lead Officer	Name	Richard Rout
	Position	DM – Policy, People, Performance and Efficiency Division
	Contact details	0151 511 7427

SECTION 1 –Context & Background

1.1 What is the title of the policy/practice?

Grievance Procedure

1.2 What is the current status of the policy/practice?

Existing

Changed ✓

New

1.3 What are the principal aims and intended outcomes of the policy/practice?

The purpose is to set out a clear and systematic process to help resolve grievances.

1.4 Who has primary responsibility for delivering the policy/practice?

HBC Members
HBC Managers
Human Resources (Policy, People, Performance and Efficiency Division)
HBC employees

1.5 Who are the main stakeholders?

HBC Members	People, Policy, Performance and
HBC Management	Efficiency Team
HBC employees	Trade Unions

1.6 Who is the policy/practice intended to affect?

Residents

Staff ✓

Specific Group(s)

(add details below)

Applies to all Halton Borough Council employees working under a contract of employment, but not school based staff where school governors have adopted different procedures.

1.7 Are there any other related policies/practices?

Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace Appeals Procedure
Disciplinary Procedure

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

SECTION 2 – Consideration of Impact

2.1 Relevance: – the Public Sector Equality Duty

Does this policy / practice / service have due regard to the need to: -

- (a) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conflict that is prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
- (b) Advance equality of opportunity between two persons who share a relevant protected characteristic
- (c) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

Yes (✓) No ()

State reasons below

(Relevance to service users/staff)

The policy is accessible to all employees regardless of protected characteristic.

2.2 Has data and information been used in determining the impact of the policy/procedure under review?

(for example research, surveys, complaints, consultation, , monitoring data)

Equality Group(s)	Workforce Profile data detailing all employees' protected annually is produced, analysed and published annually. Staff satisfaction/opinion survey undertaken triennially.
--------------------------	--

Baseline data and information

Grievances and related information by protected characteristic: it would be possible to obtain this information from records held centrally by Policy, People, Performance and Efficiency Division, however the low numbers make it statistically insignificant

2.3 On the basis of evidence, has the actual/potential impact of the policy/practice been judged to be positive (+), neutral (=) or negative (-) for each of the equality groups and in what way? Is the level of impact judged to be high (H), medium ((M), or low (L)?

Protected Characteristic	Impact type +, =, -	Level H, M, L, -	Nature of impact
Age	=	/	There is no impact on any groups as a result of their protected characteristic, furthermore there is no difference in the way that the procedure may be applied due to the nature of an employee's protected characteristic, nor would it be a reason for the procedure not being applied.
Disability	=	/	
Gender	=	/	
Race/ethnicity	=	/	
Religion / belief	=	/	
Sexual Orientation	=	/	
Gender Reassignment	=	/	
Marital status/ Civil Partnerships	=	/	
Pregnancy/Maternity	=	/	

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

In Halton two further vulnerable groups have been identified: -			
Carers	=	/	As above
Socio-economic	=	/	

2.4 Does the policy/practice have any potential impact on safeguarding vulnerable people?

No – procedure is applicable to HBC employees only
--

2.5 How will the impact of the policy/practice be monitored?

Database of casework

2.6 Who will be responsible for monitoring?

Policy, People, Performance and Efficiency Division; Employee Relations Team
--

2.7 If any negative impacts, or potential negative impacts, have been identified what mitigating actions will be put in place, thereby eliminating the need for a further Stage 2 assessment Where none have been identified insert 'no further action required' in the first column

Action & purpose / outcome	Priority	Timeframe	Lead Officer
No further action required	(H, M, L)		

2.8 Summary of stakeholders involved in this review

Name / Job Title	Organisation/representative of
Kim Mylchreest, HR & Development Lead Officer	Policy, People, Performance and Efficiency Division, Halton BC
Les Unsworth, Policy Officer	Policy, People, Performance and Efficiency Division, Halton BC

2.9 Completion Statement

As the identified Lead Officer of this review I confirm that:- There may be a positive impact for one or more of the protected groups, and that this is justifiable and lawful, or a potential negative impact has been identified, but steps can be taken to mitigate the impact. ✓

Signed: Richard Rout	Date: 22/01/2016
-----------------------------	-------------------------

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

Completed EIAs should be sent to Les Unsworth, Policy, People, Performance and Efficiency Division, to be given a unique reference number and for inclusion on the central register.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

Appendix 1

Public Sector Equality Duty – EIA Checklist

The Equality Act s149 (the Public Sector Equality Duty) requires is that HBC has due regard to the need to:-

- (a) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

These are matters that we must show we have taken into the reckoning in making decisions about the Council's functions. We therefore need evidence of the following:

1. We know about the duty
2. We have reflected on the duty
3. We have consulted those affected or likely to be affected
4. We have used relevant information already in the council's possession (surveys etc.)
5. We have allowed adequate time for consultation with those affected and/or those who speak for those affected
6. We have allowed adequate time for earnest and genuine consideration of the information and views received
7. We have identified any adverse effects
8. We have sought to mitigate any adverse effects of decisions
9. We have identified principal options
10. Decision makers have not made up their mind in advance
11. We have considered all material considerations including our own financial situation, policy and strategy documents alongside along views received from consultees but have not applied those policies etc. In a rigid or unthinking way.