

Diversity Impact Assessment: Screening Form

Directorate	Name of Function or Policy or Major Service Change		
Business Support Dept	Pay Policy Statement 2015/16		
Officer responsible for assessment		Date of assessment	New or existing?
Tricia Palmer, Assistant Director, Organisational Services.		10 December 2014	New
Defining what is being assessed			
1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives	To comply with Section 38 (1) of the Localism Act 2011 whereby all English and Welsh local authorities are to produce a pay policy statement for 2012/13 and for each financial year after that. The pay policy statement is required to set out the council's policies relating to the remuneration of its chief officers, the remuneration of its lowest-paid employees, and the relationship between the remuneration of its chief officers and the remuneration of its lowest paid employees.		
2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?	The aim of Section 38 of the Localism Act is to ensure there is openness and transparency with regard to the commitment of public money through employee remuneration.		
3. What outcomes are wanted?	To produce a pay policy statement that meets the requirements of the Act. To re-enforce through transparency that there is minimal difference at Medway Council between the pay policies for senior officers and that of the lowest pay. To re-enforce through transparency that the pay relationship between the highest salary and the lowest salary at Medway Council is within the accepted pay multiplier as suggested by Will Hutton's 2011 Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector.		
4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Contribute	Detract	
	Agreement to the Policy at Full Council.	Failure to publish on the website as required under the Act. Failure to adhere to the Pay Policy.	
5. Who are the main stakeholders?	The council (reputation as a fair and transparent employer) senior officers, the lowest-paid employees, the local community (council tax payers)		
6. Who implements this and who is responsible?	Tricia Palmer, Assistant Director, Organisational Services.		

Assessing impact		
7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial/ethnic groups</i>?		Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	<p>Workforce data shows a breakdown as follows: Chief Officers 100% white Lowest paid 93% white Total organisation 91% white (9% other)</p> <p>Whilst there is a small disparity between the chief officer group and the lowest paid, when compared with the ethnicity break down of the organisation (91% white) the disparity would not be seen significant enough to warrant further investigation. This will be monitored on a regular basis.</p>	
8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?		
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	<p>Workforce data shows a breakdown as follows: Chief Officers nil declaring a disability Lowest paid 7% declaring a disability (38% not stated) Total organisation 4 % declaring a disability (69% not stated).</p> <p>Whilst there is a disparity between the chief officer group and the lowest paid, when compared with the disability break down of the organisation (4% declaring a disability) the disparity would not be seen significant enough to warrant further investigation. This will be monitored on a regular basis.</p>	
9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?		There is potential for an adverse impact for females within the senior officer group.
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	<p>Workforce data shows that within the group of chief officers there is a 60% male : 40% female ratio. This would indicate that in terms of gender equality (within that group) there is not a significant differential.</p> <p>However, when compared to the make-up of the total workforce (29% male : 71% female) there is a significant difference in terms of a balanced gender representation within the senior officer group.</p> <p>Those in the lowest paid group is more comparable with the total workforce with 24% of employees are male and 76% female.</p>	

<p>10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i>?</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>Brief statement of main issue</p>										
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p>Sufficient workforce data is not available to enable any meaningful analysis to be undertaken. The Pay Policy Statement 2015/16 indicates that there is no significant difference between the application of the pay policy for either chief officer or the lowest paid as the majority of policies are applicable to all employees. It could therefore be concluded unlikely that there potential for differential impact due to sexual orientation.</p>											
<p>11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>religion or belief</i>?</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>Brief statement of main issue</p>										
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p>Sufficient workforce data is not available to enable any meaningful analysis to be undertaken. The Pay Policy Statement 2015/16 indicates that there is no significant difference between the application of the pay policy for either chief officer or the lowest paid as the majority of policies are applicable to all employees. It could therefore be concluded unlikely that there potential for differential impact due to religion and/or belief.</p>											
<p>12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's age?</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Workforce data shows those under the age of 40 are significantly under-represented in both the senior pay and lowest pay groups.</p>										
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p>Workforce data shows a breakdown as follows:</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="651 1279 1173 1451"> <tr> <td>Chief Officers</td> <td>0% aged under 40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lowest paid</td> <td>20% aged under 40</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>8% aged under 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total organisation</td> <td>36% aged under 40</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>7% aged under 24.</td> </tr> </table> <p>The overall organisational demographic shows an ageing workforce. The council has made a commitment to take positive action measures to assist with its workforce planning to attract into its service younger people. It has regard to the age profile of its current staff and the under-representation of those within the 16-24 age range.</p>		Chief Officers	0% aged under 40	Lowest paid	20% aged under 40		8% aged under 24	Total organisation	36% aged under 40		7% aged under 24.
Chief Officers	0% aged under 40											
Lowest paid	20% aged under 40											
	8% aged under 24											
Total organisation	36% aged under 40											
	7% aged under 24.											
<p>13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being transgendered or transsexual</i>?</p>	<p>NO</p>											

<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p>Sufficient workforce data is not available to enable any meaningful analysis to be undertaken. The Pay Policy Statement 2015/16 indicates that there is no significant difference between the application of the pay policy for either chief officer or the lowest paid as the majority of policies are applicable to all employees. It could therefore be concluded unlikely that there is potential for a differential impact against any employees who are being transgendered or who are transsexual.</p>	
<p>14. Are there any <i>other</i> groups that would find it difficult to access/make use of the function (e.g. speakers of other languages; people with caring responsibilities or dependants; those with an offending past; or people living in rural areas)?</p>		<p>If yes, which group(s)?</p>
	<p>NO</p>	
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p>Sufficient workforce data is not available to enable any meaningful analysis to be undertaken. The Pay Policy Statement 2015/16 indicates that there is no significant difference between the application of the pay policy for either chief officer or the lowest paid as the majority of policies are applicable to all employees.</p>	
<p>15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (e.g. disability <u>and</u> age)?</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>In relation to part-time and full-time employees.</p>
<p>What evidence exists for this?</p>	<p>Workforce data indicates that there are no part-time employees in the chief officer group compared to the lowest paid group where 100% of employees work part-time; of which 76% are female.</p> <p>This shows that the majority of employees on the lowest grade are female and part-time.</p> <p>This would also indicate that females in the most senior roles are less likely to work part-time.</p>	

Conclusions & recommendation		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?		<p>The most significant potential for adverse impact is in relation to age as the council is under-represented in the younger age groups.</p> <p>Potential adverse impact has been highlighted primarily for those in the senior officer group in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the potential of being employed within the senior officer group as a female; and - the potential for a part-time female employee being employed within the senior officer group. <p>Generally data relating to employees within the lowest grade are comparable with that of the make-up of the total workforce.</p> <p>However, it also indicates that the majority of employees in the lowest grade are female part-timers.</p>
	NO	
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?		
	NO	
Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?		
NO	This policy complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case.	

Action plan to make Minor modifications		
Outcome	Actions (with date of completion)	Officer responsible
N/A		

Planning ahead: Reminders for the next review		
Date of next review	2016, the Pay Policy Statement is reviewed on an annual basis.	
Areas to check at next review (e.g. new census information, new legislation due)		
Is there <i>another</i> group (e.g. new communities) that is relevant and ought to be considered next time?		
Signed (completing officer/service manager)	Date	
Signed (service manager/Assistant Director)	Date	