

NATIONAL PROBATION SERVICE HAMPSHIRE AREA

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Section One: Preliminary Screening

1. Function Name, Policy or Procedure:

2. Aims and Approach of Function/Policy/Procedure

Is it possible that the policy/procedure may be discriminating unlawfully?	Yes/No
Could some groups be excluded from the benefits of this policy/procedure or could it have a negative impact on them?	Yes/No
Is it possible that the policy/procedure may cause negative relations between groups?	Yes/No

If the answer to any of these questions is **Yes**, go on to the full Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

If the answer to all of the questions is **No**, please provide explanatory evidence and attach the following statement to be signed off by senior management.

“This policy and/or set of procedures have been written with a view to avoiding any adverse impact on an individual by reason of their ethnic origin, disability, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief. The policy has been screened for any illegal discrimination and to ensure that no group is excluded from any benefits or experiences any disadvantage. It is not believed that this policy will have any such adverse impact, but future reviews of policy and procedures will revisit this evaluation, drawing on data to monitor outcomes”

Section Two: Full Impact Assessment

This “Equality Impact Assessment” documents the outcome of a full impact assessment on the specified function, policy or procedure, addressing the equalities strands of: Race, Gender, Disability, Sexuality, Faith and Age. It is to be completed, published as specified, and appended to policy and/or strategy documents.

1. Function Name, Policy or Procedure:

Workload Priority and Employee Care Agreement

2. Aims and Approach of Function/Policy/Procedure

This agreement is based on the general principle that excessive workloads need to be managed within a flexible monitoring mechanism to achieve the necessary workload reduction. The Workload Priority and Employee Care Agreement (WPEC), with its workload calculations based on the Hampshire Workload Management Tool (HWMT) and its guidance for staff, provides the evidence from which informed decision about workload can be made. At present the tool and agreement only covers the workloads of staff in offender management teams.

This is a revised agreement, amended to take into consideration the introduction of the national Offender Management Model, which involves the separation of roles, the integration of DRR and UPW back into offender management, the tiering of offenders and a separation of functions into offender management and “interventions”.

The agreement provides the framework through which the Workload Management tool will operate, outlining the defining principles upon which the tool is based and its applications in practice, particularly in terms of action where workloads are shown to be in the “blue” or “red”. The document also covers employee care arrangements,.

3. What data/information is available & does it suggest differential impact for any of the groups identified as part of the impact assessment process?

(A range of different data may be used for this section – e.g. internal monitoring data, national reports/research, locally commissioned reports/audits/research,

results of previous consultations/workshops, statistical data such as census data, Home Office Statistics)

Race:

Gender (including transgender):

Disability:

Sexuality:

Religion or Belief:

Age:

If there are gaps in data provision how are these to be addressed in order to inform a full EIA?

There is currently no data upon which to draw for the purpose of this impact assessment. It is not felt that there is any staff monitoring data that is relevant to this process. However, it is felt that offender data is critical in understanding the impact on workload of offenders from different backgrounds. In particular there needs to be evidence to identify whether female offenders, those with language needs, those with learning difficulties, those with hearing impairments, those with mental health needs, consistently take up more time than the average weightings and therefore this needs to be factored into the calculations.

As this data is not currently available it is a recommendation of the consultation panel that further evidence is sought.

4. What consultation has been undertaken and with whom?

(include information on what was needed from the consultation, how it was carried out and with whom)

The WPECA and HWMT was taken to the Equalities Consultation Panel for discussion. NAPO and UNISON have also been consulted and sit on the Panel.

5. What are the main findings of the consultation undertaken (what positive or negative impacts were identified for any of the different groups)?

- Section 3.10 of the agreement identifies some factors that may reduce workload capacity that need to be considered in operating the tool. Disability related reasons is identified here and it is suggested that this be made more explicit by drawing attention to the impact of using Assistive Technology. The wording suggested is “ an example of this would be to reduce the FTE in the WMT for an officer who uses AT equipment to a level which takes account of any extra time they could need to undertake tasks over and above the weightings.”
- Again in Section 3.10 it was felt that attention should be draw to maternity issues and the need to attend antenatal appointments. Such appointments should be factored into workload as it is not a requirement that time be made up for these.
- It was felt that there were a number of offender groups that by the nature of their particular backgrounds required a higher levels of time to work with them. Those that fall into this category potentially are female offenders, those with mental health needs, those with learning difficulties, those with hearing impairments, those who need an interpreter. Further evidence on this needs to be gathered
- Equalities Consultation Panel needs to be added to “7. Consultation”
- No monitoring is currently in place or suggested by the agreement

6. Does this policy have the potential to cause unlawful discrimination, exclusion of some groups of people from its benefits or lead to negative relations?

As per points raised above, diversity issues need to be factored into workload measurement in order to ensure discrimination or disadvantage does not occur. Monitoring systems need to be put in place

7. What measures have been identified in order for the policy/procedures to achieve its aims without risking any adverse impact?

As per section 5.

8. What action is now to be undertaken?

- Amendments to be made to Section 3.10
- Establish a monitoring system
- Further evidence to be gathered through the work of the standing group on the impact of different backgrounds on workload so that adjustments can be made where necessary to the tool

9. Monitoring arrangements and review process

There is no established monitoring arrangements for this process (added at this stage as further action required.)

10. How results will be published

The assessment to date and further monitoring and action taken will be published on the website and intranet.

.

Signature of Policy Lead

Position

Date