

#### Stage 2 – FULL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

A full EIA will be needed if the initial assessment has identified the potential for impact. The attached Proforma will need to be completed for each process. It is suggested that the assessment should be carried out by at least three people and that at least one should be from the CDO Unit, to give any expert advice on the RES process. Each Unit will be responsible for organising the team of individuals to assist in completing the EIA.

#### Policy , Aims and Objectives

1. Name of Process: Exit process

#### 2. What is the aim and purpose of the process?

ACAS suggest that exit processes may help in highlighting problem areas within the organisation and in identifying any characteristics which may be common to early leavers. As well as recording classification details about leavers, they should be asked why they are leaving and what they think is good and bad about the firm, for example:

- the job itself
- supervision and management
- pay and other terms and conditions of work
- training and career prospects with the organisation
- working conditions and amenities
- equal opportunities.

**3. Who are the main stakeholders of the Process or proposed process? (e.g., MPA, MPS, GLA, HR, Internal Audit etc)** MPA and potential staff

**4. Who is the process or proposed process intended to benefit?** MPA and potential staff.

5. How will the process or proposed process be implemented and who will be responsible for

monitoring and reviewing it? Please be specific. The process has already been

implemented. The retirement, resignation and redundancy policy (of which this forms a

part) will be reviewed every three years or sooner if required by changes to legislation or the Authority members or SMT.



This process is intended to identify the reasons staff leave in order to inform the MPA priority to "recruit, retain and promote our own workforce to reflect the diverses communities of London."

ACAS suggest that exit processes may help in highlighting problem areas within the organisation and in identifying any characteristics which may be common to early leavers. As well as recording classification details about leavers, they should be asked why they are leaving and what they think is good and bad about the firm, for example:

- the job itself
- supervision and management
- pay and other terms and conditions of work
- training and career prospects with the organisation
- working conditions and amenities
- equal opportunities.

**7. How will this process inform or influence the MPA governance of the MPS?** N/A. The Career Management and Retention Unit in the MPS are pursuing a separate strategy that will include outsourcing some aspects of the exit process.

8. Please give any other comments you wish to make about this process or proposed process.

None.

### Assessing for Impact

**9.** Is there evidence or reason to believe that some groups could be differently affected by this process/function (e.g. higher levels of arrests, lower rate of Participation? If so which? No. The current exit interview process, the results of which have been published annually, has not highlighted any differential impact

**10.** Is there differential impact on particular racial groups in respect of qualitative or **quantitative data?** There is no consistent pattern identified by the published analysis of MPA 'leavers' processes.

**11.** Is the differential impact an adverse one, and for which groups? Please list. See 10.

**12. Is the process or proposed process directly or indirectly discriminatory**? No.

**13. If the process is indirectly discriminatory, is it justifiable under the Act?** No.



**14. What amendments could be made to the process to eliminate discrimination, if any has been identified?** The process complies with the ACAS Absence and Labour Turnover guidance in order to be non-dsccrimantory and comply with best practice.

#### 15. In what way does each process option further or hinder race equality?

The process complies with the ACAS Absence and Labour Turnover guidance in order to be non-dsccrimantory and comply with best practice.

16. What are the consequences for the affected groups, and for the Authority, of not adopting the option more favourable to race equality? N/A.

**17. What are the costs of implementing each option?** No costs.

18. In coming to the above decision, with whom have you consulted/ and or what information was gathered?

The process was the subject of consultation with the GLA and with all MPA staff. It follows the ACAS Absence and Labour Turnover guidance. The exit process has been the subject of consultation with the representative union.

**19. What arrangements have been/will be made for publishing the results of this EIA?** On website.

20. Please outline the arrangements that has been made/ will be made for monitoring the

process including the Committee or internal structure (e.g. SMT/CDO) that will be informed

about the outcomes of the monitoring arrangements.

The process will be reviewed in consultation with the representative union. The process will be reviewed every three years or sooner if required by changes to legislation or the Authority members or SMT.



 Signed:
 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 Date: 14 November 2003

Approved by the Clerk: \_\_\_\_\_ Callenne Cruffed \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 25 November 2003

Forwarded to the Head of Race and Diversity:

For further information and assistance please contact:

Julia Smith Ext: 57226

Tim Rees Ext: 57230

Cynthia Coleman Ext 57233