

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL EQUALITY ANALYSIS / IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EqIA)

### Screening Grid

Characteristic	Could this policy, procedure, project or service, or any proposed changes to it, affect this group less favourably than others in Kent? YES/NO If yes how?	Assessment of potential impact <b>HIGH/MEDIUM</b> <b>LOW/NONE</b> UNKNOWN		Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes what? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why?	Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group? YES/NO - Explain how good practice can promote equal opportunities
		Positive	Negative	Internal action must be included in Action Plan	If yes you must provide detail
<b>Age</b>	Yes – the profile of ages in the group may have an impact due to the experience of the employees in relation to jobs they may be considered for.	Low	None	Any appointment considerations should take account of the value rather than amount of experience a person may have.	Yes – it can promote and show how the organisation values employees who are from all parts of the age spectrum.
<b>Disability</b>	Yes – if reasonable adjustments aren't made where required it may fetter an employee's ability to secure a post in the new structure	Low	Low	<p>The recruitment process may require reasonable adjustments to be made for staff with disabilities covered by the Equality Act 2010</p> <p>The new posts may require reasonable adjustments to made for staff with disabilities covered by the Equality Act 2010</p> <p>Managers will need to be aware of disabilities in the above and ensure staff are not treated less favourably as a result.</p>	Yes – any appointments could promote and show how the organisation values employees with this protected characteristic
<b>Gender</b>	Yes – female senior officers are under represented compared to KCC workforces as a whole (44% 74.8%)	Low	Low	Any appointment considerations should take account of the value rather than amount of experience a person may have.	Yes – any appointments could promote and show how the organisation values employees with this protected characteristic

	Female staff may have shorter service due to caring responsibilities and may have primary caring responsibilities.			Caring responsibilities will not be a consideration in appointments.	
<b>Gender identity</b>	No	Low	None		Yes – any appointments could promote and show how the organisation values employees with this protected characteristic
<b>Race</b>	No	Low	None		Yes – any appointments could promote and show how the organisation values employees with this protected characteristic
<b>Religion or belief</b>	No	Low	None		Yes – any appointments could promote and show how the organisation values employees with this protected characteristic
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	No	Low	None		Yes – any appointments could promote and show how the organisation values employees with this protected characteristic
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	No	Low	None		Yes – any appointments could promote and show how the organisation values employees with this protected characteristic
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnerships</b>	No	Low	None		Yes – any appointments could promote and show how the organisation values employees with this protected characteristic
<b>Carer's responsibilities</b>	Yes – employees may have caring responsibilities for children, people with a disability, older people etc.	Low	Low	Caring responsibilities will not be a consideration in appointments.	

## Part 1: INITIAL SCREENING

**Proportionality** - Based on the answers in the above screening grid what weighting would you ascribe to this function – see Risk Matrix

Low	Medium	High
Low relevance or Insufficient information/evidence to make a judgement.	Medium relevance or Insufficient information/evidence to make a Judgement.	High relevance to equality, /likely to have adverse impact on protected groups

### Low

Due to the size of the group it is difficult to provide evidence on some of the categories that doesn't directly identify individuals. Therefore where it has been possible to assess the impact of the change on some groups this has been identified. With other protected characteristics the change process will be managed in a way that does not discriminate or disadvantage any of the people involved.

### Context

The context is set out in the Cabinet paper of the 14 October 2013 – Facing the Challenge: Top Tier Realignment

### Aims and Objectives

See above

### Beneficiaries

See above

### Information and Data

This is a small group of employees so it is difficult to provide data that does not identify individuals. Where it has been possible to understand the profile without compromising people's personal data this has been done and compared against KCC averages.

### Involvement and Engagement

N/A

### Potential Impact

There are certainly positives to be had in promoting how the organisation sees people from the different characteristics and that they are not a barrier to working at the most senior level in KCC. However, this would only be achievable if people are prepared to reveal them and champion the fact.

**Adverse Impact:**

Any potential negative impact will be mitigated by following the relevant KCC policies and procedures.

**JUDGEMENT**

<b>Option 1 – Screening Sufficient</b>	<b>YES</b>
--	------------

Whilst internal action is identified this is merely how KCC would mitigate the impact of this change by following its policies and procedures.

**Justification:**

<b>Option 2 – Internal Action Required</b>	<b>NO</b>
--	-----------

<b>Option 3 – Full Impact Assessment</b>	<b>NO</b>
--	-----------