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	NJC Job Evaluation Scheme and Procedure
Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)	Tim Normanton
Department/Team	People & Inclusion
Proposed Implementation Date	February 2026
Author of the EqIA	Catherine King
Date of the EqIA	January 2026

1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?
The Job Evaluation Procedure sets out in a single straightforward document how the Council aims to consistently and fairly grade its employees who are on NJC 'green book' terms and conditions.

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 – internal policy** Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: **No – Internal policy** 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: Our Employment Equality Report illustrates the demographics of the Council's workforce.
Data:
Stakeholder information/consultation: UNISON

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? **No** • Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic? **No** • Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic? **No** • Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal? **No** • Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation? **Neither more or less** • Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)? **No** • Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council? **No**

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				Neutral
Disability	This Word document pulls together several sets of information and guidance in a clear, easy to follow single document		The document could be provided in other formats if required	Neutral Positive
Gender Reassignment				Neutral
Marriage and Civil Partnership				Neutral
Pregnancy and Maternity				Neutral
Race	The document is in English		The document could be provided in other languages, if required.	Neutral
Religion and Belief				Neutral
Sex				Neutral
Sexual Orientation				Neutral
Carers				Neutral
Looked After Children and Care Leavers				Neutral
Socio-economically vulnerable				Neutral
Veterans				Neutral

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

2.5 Characteristics	Action	Action Owner	Completion Date

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
			Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very likely
Impact	4	Very High	4	8	12	16
	3	High	3	6	9	12
	2	Medium	2	4	6	8
	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	0
3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation	Positive impact, greater accessibility for staff to navigate the full remit of NJC grading in one document.

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	X	
There are low impacts or risks identified which can be mitigated or managed to reduce the risks and activity will proceed		
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	Catherine King	22/1/26	
Responsible Asst. Director/Director	Tim Normanton		
EDI	Lee Cawley		

EqIA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details