

Recruitment and Selection

Evidence based equality analysis

Main aims, purpose and outcomes and how does it fit in with the wider aims of the organisation:

To ensure that the Council select the most suitable person for the job on the basis of their relevant merits and abilities and that no employee/job applicant is unfairly treated on any grounds including: race, colour, nationality, ethnic or national origins, religion or belief, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, age, social or economic status, trade union activity, political beliefs, disability or gender reassignment.

To ensure the most cost effective use is made of resources in the recruitment and selection process.

To provide opportunities for internal staff to progress within the Council.

The Council will use positive action where appropriate to encourage recruitment from applicants in under-represented categories.

All applicants will receive fair treatment and a high quality service that reflects well on the reputation and employer branding of the Council.

Lead officer: Nicola Pierce

Stakeholders: Employees, Elected Members, potential and actual job applicants, anyone who may be affected by the Councils' services (residents, businesses and visitors)

Equality analysis is a valuable tool to help embed equality into everything we do

While process is important, equality analysis is essentially about outcomes.

Lack of evidence of discrimination is not evidence of a lack of discrimination.

It is not acceptable to say that a policy is applied uniformly to all groups and is therefore fair and equal. Applying a policy or procedure consistently may result in differential outcomes for different groups.

For each of the areas below, an assessment needs to be made on whether the policy has a **positive, negative or neutral impact**, and brief details of why this decision was made and notes of any mitigation should be included. Where the impact is negative, this needs to be given a **high, medium or low assessment**. It is important to rate the impact of the policy based on the current situation (i.e. disregarding any actions planned to be carried out in future).

High impact – a significant potential impact, risk of exposure, history of complaints, no mitigating measures in place etc.

Medium impact – some potential impact exists, some mitigating measures are in place, poor evidence

Low impact – almost no relevancy to the process, e.g. an area that is very much legislation led and where the Council has very little discretion

| | Neutral | Positive | Negative |
|---|----------------|--|---|
| Target group / area | | | |
| Race and ethnicity (including Gypsies and Travellers; migrant workers, asylum seekers etc.) | | Promotes the use of mixed panels. Consideration given to type of media in order to reach under-represented groups. | When recruiting internally, appointments can only reflect current workforce and will therefore not increase diversity. (medium impact) |
| Disability (as defined by the Equality Act - a person has a disability if they have a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities) | | Council uses the 'positive about disabled people' (two ticks) scheme. Selection tests take account of disability. Reasonable adjustments throughout the recruitment process. | When recruiting internally, appointments can only reflect current workforce and will therefore not increase diversity. (medium impact) |
| Gender | | Promotes the use of gender balanced panels. Wherever possible try to accommodate interview | When recruiting internally, appointments can only reflect current workforce and will therefore not increase diversity. |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | date/time requests although this cannot be guaranteed (e.g. for carers) | (medium impact) |
| Gender reassignment | | | When recruiting internally, appointments can only reflect current workforce and will therefore not increase diversity. (medium impact) |
| Religion and belief | | Wherever possible try to accommodate interview date/time requests although this cannot be guaranteed (e.g. to avoid clashes with religious observance) | When recruiting internally, appointments can only reflect current workforce and will therefore not increase diversity. (medium impact) |
| Sexual orientation (including heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual) | | | When recruiting internally, appointments can only reflect current workforce and will therefore not increase diversity. (medium impact) |
| Age (children and young people aged 0 – 24, adults aged 25 – 50, younger older people aged 51 – 75/80; older older people 81+. The age categories are for illustration only as overriding consideration should be given to needs). | | Wherever possible try to accommodate interview date/time requests although this cannot be guaranteed (e.g. for carers) | When recruiting internally, appointments can only reflect current workforce and will therefore not increase diversity. (medium impact) |
| Rural communities | | | Lack of clear policy on reimbursing interview expenses may adversely impact. (medium impact) |
| Areas of deprivation | | | Lack of clear policy on reimbursing interview expenses |

| | | | |
|--|-----------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | may adversely impact. (medium impact) |
| Human rights | | Handling of personal data in line with best practice | |
| Health and wellbeing (consider both the wider determinants of health such as education, housing, employment, environment, crime and transport, as well as the possible impacts on lifestyles and the effect there may be on health and care services) | No impact | | |
| Procurement/partnership (if project due to be carried out by contractors/partners etc, identify steps taken to ensure equality compliance) | | Principles apply to partnerships etc too. | |

Evidence:

Recruitment policy
 Recruitment and selection code of practice
 Recruitment toolkit

Action plan:

| Actions required | Key activity | Priority | Outcomes required | Officer responsible | Review date |
|--|---------------------|-----------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Monitor impact of decision to advertise some posts internally on workforce diversity | Gather data | Medium | Data showing impact | Nicola Pierce | 31 March 2014 |
| Investigate whether policy in | Research | Medium | Policy either confirmed or lack of policy | Rosemary Hodgson | 31 March 2014 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| place (and consistently applied) for reimbursing interview expenses | | | confirmed – review analysis accordingly | | |
| | | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Sign off | |
| Lead Officer: | Nicola Pierce |
| Approved by Head of Service: | Sam Brousas |
| | |
| Moderation and/or Scrutiny | |
| Date: | Resources equality meeting 9 October 2013 and subsequent virtual moderation of draft |
| Date analysis to be reviewed based on rating (high impact – review in one year, medium impact - review in two years, low impact in three years) | Two years |

Please forward the completed Equality Analysis to the Equality and Diversity Managers for publishing on the Council's website