

Equality Impact Analysis

This equality impact analysis establishes the likely effects both positive and negative and potential unintended consequences that decisions, policies, projects and practices can have on people at risk of discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The analysis considers documentary evidence, data and information from stakeholder engagement/consultation to manage risk and to understand the actual or potential effect of activity, including both positive and adverse impacts, on those affected by the activity being considered.

To support completion of this analysis tool, please refer to the equality impact analysis guidance.

Section 1 – Analysis Details (Page 5 of the guidance document)

Name of Policy/Project/Decision	Unauthorised Absence
Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)	Tim Normanton
Department/Team	HR
Proposed Implementation Date	1 ST June 2025
Author of the EqIA	Mel Cunningham / Andrew Smith
Date of the EqIA	1/5/25

1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?

To have a policy in place to manage deductions of pay in a fair and consistent way in situations where employees fail to attend work and do not provide a reason for absence.



Section 2 – Impact Assessment (Pages 6 to 10 of the guidance document)

2.1 Who could the proposed policy/project/decision likely have an impact on?

Employees: Yes

Community/Residents: No - not applicable

Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: No

If the answer to all three questions is 'no' there is no need to continue with this analysis.

2.2 Evidence to support the analysis. Include documentary evidence, data and stakeholder information/consultation Documentary Evidence:

Occasional issues arise, mainly with frontline employees who fail to contact Management to advise of non-attendance or simply leave the Council without a formal resignation.

Data:

Not available

Stakeholder information/consultation:

Discussions held with senior managers and HR colleagues affected by these issues.

2.3 Consider the following questions in terms of who the policy/project/decision could potentially have an impact on. Detail these in the impact assessment table (2.4) and the potential impact this could have.



- Could the proposal prevent the promotion of equality of opportunity or good relations between different equality groups?
- Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic?
- Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic?
- Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal?
- Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?
- Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)?
- Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council?

2.4 Characteristic	Potential Impacts	Evidence (from 2.2) to demonstrate this impact	Mitigations to reduce negative impact	Impact level with mitigations Positive, Neutral, Negative
Age	Older or younger employees may have difficulty with digital communication, potentially delaying absence notifications.		Provide varied communication methods (phone, SMS, in-person) and ensure reasonable adjustments for technology access.	Neutral
Disability	Disabled employees (e.g. mental health, cognitive impairments) may be unable to communicate during absence.		Build flexibility and reasonable adjustments into policy; allow communication via representatives or post-event clarification	Neutral



			Council
Gender Reassignment	Employees transitioning	Reinforce confidentiality,	Neutral
	may avoid	establish safe contact	
	contact due to	channels, train	
	stigma or	managers in sensitivity	
	medical leave.	and inclusion.	
Marriage and Civil	No direct	and inclusion.	Neutral
Partnership	impact; indirect		INEURAL
raithership	-		
	through potential care		
	'		
Drognanov and	responsibilities.	Doliny should	Noutral
Pregnancy and	Medical issues	Policy should	Neutral
Maternity	during or post-	acknowledge	
	pregnancy may	pregnancy-related	
	delay	issues and allow	
	communication.	flexibility in absence	
Descri		reporting.	
Race	Language	Promote culturally	Neutral
	barriers may	inclusive	
	delay or alter	communication; train	
	communication	managers in cultural	
		competence.	
Religion and Belief	No direct impact		
Sex	No direct impact		
Sexual Orientation	No direct impact		
Carers	Carers may	Allow for flexibility,	
	experience	promote carer-friendly	
	emergencies	guidance in absence	
	that delay	policies.	
	contact.		



Looked After Children and Care Leavers	Risk of reduced support or lack of advocacy in communication	HR policies to explicitly consider care leavers' needs and allow advocacy if needed	
Socio-economically vulnerable	lapses May lack access to digital tools for timely contact.	Provide accessible communication channels and consider postal or alternative options.	
Veterans	May experience PTSD or other barriers to timely contact.	Provide trauma- informed manager training and flexible contact policies.	

Actions required to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts or to complete the analysis

2.5 Characteristics	Action	Action Owner	Completion Date
Disability	Include explicit flexibility and adjustments in absence policy.	HR	Dec 2025
Pregnancy & Maternity	Add pregnancy-related medical exemption guidance to policy.	HR	Dec 2025
Race/Ethnicity	Deliver manager training on culturally competent communication.	HR	Dec 2025
Religion/Belief	Add holiday observance clause into absence communication section.	HR	Dec 2025
Gender Reassignment	Include confidential and inclusive communication options in guidance.	HR	Dec 2025
Age	Offer varied methods of contact and raise awareness with managers.	HR	Dec 2025
Carers	Update policy to recognise emergency caregiving scenarios.	HR	Dec 2025
All Characteristics	Add unconscious bias refresher to annual HR manager training.	HR	Dec 2025

Section 3 - Impact Risk

Establish the level of risk to people and organisations arising from identified impacts, with additional actions completed to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts.

3.1 Identifying risk level (Pages 10 - 12 of the guidance document)



	Impact x Likelihood = Score		Likelihood				
_			1	2	3	4	
= 50			Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very likely	
	4	Very High	4	8	12	16	
ıt	3	High	3	6	9	12	
Impact	2	Medium	2	4	6	8	
느	1	Low	1	2	3	4	
	0	Positive / No impact	0	0	0	0	

Risk Level	No Risk = 0	Low Risk = 1 - 4	Medium Risk = 5 – 7	High Risk = 8 - 16
3.2 Level of risk identified	Low/Neutral			
3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation	Without mitigations, there pregnancy, and ethnicity. and defensible.			J .

Section 4 - Analysis Decision (Page 11 of the guidance document)

4.1 Analysis Decision	X	Reasons for This Decision
There is no negative impact therefore the activity will proceed		
There are low impacts or risks identified which can be mitigated or	Х	Potential negative impacts were identified but all can
managed to reduce the risks and activity will proceed		be mitigated with clear policy wording, reasonable



	adjustments, and training for managers. The proposal can proceed with actions in place.
There are medium to high risks identified which cannot be mitigated following careful and thorough consideration. The activity will proceed with caution and this risk recorded on the risk register, ensuring continual review	

Section 5 – Sign Off and Revisions (Page 11 of the guidance document)

5.1 Sign Off	Name	Date	Comments
Lead Officer/SRO/Project Manager			
Responsible Asst. Director/Director			
EDI			

EqIA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details