

Humberside Police Authority
Equality Impact Assessment Screening – Redundancy Policy

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1 | Name of item being screened for equality impact: | Humberside Police Authority Redundancy Policy |
| 2 | Name of the item author and responsible officers/members for assessing the equality impact: | Author = Neil Kingston; Responsible Officers / Members = Kevin Sharp, Claire Harrison and Ros Taylor |
| 3 | Briefly outline the overall purpose and objectives of the item: | To provide security of employment to employees as far as possible given the current economic circumstances but where this is not possible to ensure staff are treated in a fair, objective and consistent manner. |
| 4 | List the main stakeholders for the item: | HPA employees. |
| 5 | Could the item have a disproportionate impact on any of the strands of diversity: | |
| 6 | Race: | Not currently. |
| 7 | Gender: | No – The Authority employs 7 males and 6 females. Arguably any employee could be subject to this policy. |
| 8 | Disability: | Not currently. |
| 9 | Sexual Orientation: | No – Any employee could be subject to this policy. |
| 10 | Religion/Beliefs: | No – Any employee could be subject to this policy. |
| 11 | Age: | Yes– The use of the statutory Ready Reckoner could illustrate direct discrimination against younger employees as redundancy pay differs dependant on employees' years of service and age. The Police Authority has made contact with the Government Equalities Office, the Cabinet Office Efficiency and Reform Group and the Department for Business, Innovation & Skills to identify if an EIA has been carried out on this tool. At this point, the Authority is concluding that if central government are promoting this toolkit, it can be justified as a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim however the EIA will be updated once an explanation is received. The Police Authority is aware of the new retirement legislation that will take effect on 6 April 2011. HPA will no longer be able to use the default retirement age to compulsorily retire employees; if we want to retire staff then it will have to be objectively justified and if not HPA may face claims of unfair dismissal and discrimination. |
| 12 | Gender Reassignment: | No – Any employee could be subject to this policy. |
| 13 | Pregnancy | No – Any employee could be subject to this policy. |
| 14 | Maternity | No – Any employee could be subject to this policy. |
| 15 | Could any of the | No – The selection criteria section of the policy makes it clear that selection will be as objective as possible and will not |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | disproportionality lead to a positive/negative impact on the overall purpose of the item in question? | directly or indirectly discriminate on grounds of any protected characteristic. |
| 16 | Can any negative impact be justified or avoided? | No |
| 17 | Should the item proceed to a full Equality Impact Assessment? | No |
| 18 | Is there enough evidence to proceed to a full EIA? | No |
| 19 | Are there any changes as a result of the initial screening? | No |
| 20 | Item review date: | September 2011 |

Signed (Completing Officer): Neil Kingston Date: 3 February 2011

Signed (Monitoring Officer): Claire Harrison Date: 11 March 2011

Signed (Monitoring Member): Ros Taylor Date 11 March 2011