

Agenda item:

**Cabinet On 12th June 2012
(Appendix C - Equalities Impacts and Results of Consultation)**

Report Title: Changes to the Supply of Community Equipment in Haringey

The key findings from the assessment of the staffing Equalities Impact are as follows:

Analysis of the characteristics shows the following:

- Ethnicity – 57% of the staff of this Grade/Group are of a BME background as compared with 71% across the Council and therefore the impact is not disproportionate on this group of staff. 43% of staff are white or white ‘other’ so these groups are disproportionately affected when compared to the Council generally but not the Borough profile.
- Gender – 43% of the staff are female as compared to 69% across the Council Grade Group and therefore the impact is not disproportionate on this group of staff when compared to the Council generally. Females are disproportionately affected at the SC6-SO2 level (100%) and PO4-PO7 level (100%) when compared to grade ranges across the council generally (76% and 65% respectively). Males at the SC1-SC5 (100%) and PO1-PO3 (100%) levels are disproportionately affected.
- Age – Overall there is a disproportionate impact on the 35-34 (29%) and 45-54 age ranges (43%) as compared with the Council Grade Groups generally (25% and 37% respectively).
- Disability – Overall, there is a higher level of staff with a disability in this staff group (29%) as compared to the Council profile (8%).

Formal consultation with service users, staff and the trade unions, health colleagues and others in the voluntary and independent sector ran for the best practice period of one month from 1^{4th} February-14th March 2012.

Our consultation complied with our own Consultation Charter and Guiding Principles of Effective Consultation by:

- being carefully planned;
- being clear about what the consultation was about;
- being targeted at the community affected;
- using the right consultation methods;
- providing sufficient time for people to have their say;
- providing feedback; and
- being monitored and coordinated within the Councils consultation management system

Our consultation sought to reach a wide-ranging audience. Letters were sent to all current/identified users of the service as well health colleagues specifically affected by the proposal and staff in the service affected by the proposal. We also identified and targeted a range of other voluntary sector and statutory partners and local independent sector providers of services. We used organisations such as Haringey Association of Voluntary Organisations, MENCAP, Age UK, other community group representatives and the local online community in Haringey, including those organisations working to improve the way Health and Social Care Services are delivered, to get the message across.

The consultation was also promoted via the Older People's, Carers', Mental Health, Autistic Spectrum and Learning Disabilities Adult Partnership Boards and other such forums (the Personal Budget Users' Forum) so that the message could be cascaded to as wide as possible an audience or considered by their membership.

Correspondence was sent out to coincide with information about these proposals being published on the Councils website.

There were several main channels for the consultation, as set out below:

- Emails and letters and telephone helpline
- A web page was created to ensure people were able to read about the proposals and were kept informed of the consultation. The web was viewed 75 times.

Meetings

Meetings were held with staff where they were informed of the proposals and the consultation and given the opportunity to discuss and comment on various aspects.

Consultation Questions

We produced a targeted consultation questionnaire to hear from users, carers, staff, relatives, members of the public, voluntary sector colleagues and others who either did not chose to write-in or provide a formal response to the consultation. It was also a way of capturing equalities data that would help us to determine alongside the other information we had collated, the Equalities Impact of our proposals and for people who wanted to, to have their say anonymously.

Overall structure of the questionnaires

The questionnaire invited respondents to indicate:

1. Their support or opposition to the proposals.
2. Reassurance to the questions.
3. Provide details about themselves.

In total, more than 300 questionnaires were produced. These were produced in both printed and electronic forms with copies made available for completion via the web page or sent out to users by post.

The availability of these questionnaires was communicated via the webpage, email or through the post. Freepost envelopes were made available so that people could return completed questionnaires 'free of charge'.

We made sure that details of the web page as well as other details, including a single point of contact within the council were also made widely available should they wish, for more information or in order to have their say. We ensured that this information was included in initial correspondence and on the web page.

Equalities

To fully understand who would be affected by proposed changes we completed comprehensive Equalities Impact Assessment as part of the surveys.

Accessibility

We offered to produce information about the consultation in a number of accessible forms on request.

Summary of responses:

The outcomes of this consultation have been included along with the equalities impact.

Our consultation sought to reach a wide-ranging audience and we received a good number and varied set of responses.

There was a total of 40 responses to the consultation questionnaire. Unison as well as several NHS clinical leads and voluntary organisations responded.

Survey Questionnaires

Where numbers do not tally this equates to the fact that, for whatever reason, people did not choose to answer all of the questions. Percentages are either rounded up or down. It is evident from the numbers and comments that some people 'reassured' nonetheless took the opportunity to comment when asked to say why they were not reassured by the proposals. These views have still been included.

Analysis of the Questionnaire responses

About the respondents:

Of those who completed the questionnaires 42.5% (17) indicated that they used the service, 37.5% (15) were a relative or carers of a person who used the service and 12.5% (5) completing the questionnaire on behalf of a community group or statutory organisation including the Older People's Partnership Board, Haringey Forum for Older People, and the Whittington Hospital. One person (5%) was unsure.

The majority 22 (55%) of all respondents were 60 or over and of those, 14 (35%) 75 or over. Only one person was under 30 and 10 people (25%) were between the ages of 35 and 60. Over 60% (24 people) indicated that they had a disability. 72.5% (29 people) said they were from a white background, 1 person (2.5% of respondents) was Asian or Asian British, 2 people (5%) Black or Black British, none said they were mixed race, Chinese or from another ethnic group. 13 respondents were male and 20 female. Close to 50% of respondents indicated that they were best described as Christian, 20% had no religion and 3 (7.5%) people cited another religion and 10% were Turkish, French or other language speakers.

Responses to specific questions:

Statistical results

Asked if they agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal 11 (27.5%) said they did whereas as many (11 (27.5%)) disagreed or strongly disagreed. 15 (37.5%) neither agreed nor disagreed or said they did not know.

Asked to what extent they were reassured that the proposal could see a provider with many years experience of providing similar services managing this service and/or us working with

other London Boroughs; 16 (40%) said they were reassured; 16 (40%) were not reassured and 6 (15%) said they did not know.

Asked if they were reassured that the assessment process for the provision of equipment would remain the same, 26 (65%) people were reassured; 10 (25%) were not and 1 person (2.5%) said they did not know.

33 (82.5%)) were reassured that any equipment would continue to remain on permanent loan until no longer required and that they did not therefore need to go through the process of handing it back and obtaining a replacement.

29 (72.5%) of those completing the survey were also reassured that there would continue to be no charge for the equipment they used and a further 19 (47.5%) that there would be no reduction in the delivery times that it takes to receive standard items of complex community equipment.

Narrative comments

Proposal

To some, this proposal seemed very clear. Some people said that they did not understand why we needed or wanted to change when the current service works well or, in their view, 'could not be bettered'; there were concerns the 'personal touch' and relationships formed with the current drivers and administrative staff would be lost. Others said the current service was 'excellent' and staff there 'outstanding'. According to others, the current arrangement was already slow and cumbersome and 'mysterious'. There were worries that access to a central system, which might also be geographically remote, would involve a further layer of communication and become even slower and more cumbersome.

Of those not, reassured by the proposal:

Some queried the experience of the prospective providers or pointed to, as they perceived it, the problems resulting from contracting out of services. Others were anxious that the new service would not deliver equipment as speedily as now or wanted more reassurance that things would stay the same or improve than we were seemingly providing. Others thought the time it took too long now and/or would only really be reassured if any change led to an improvement in the time that it currently took to receive equipment. Whereas others thought splitting the responsibilities or the assessment and provision processes would reduce levels of accountability for sorting things when things went wrong or getting the right equipment or service in the first place. One user with a longstanding personal experience of the service, recounted how he had found the current service difficult to deal with in terms of who was responsible for what, what equipment came from where and what to do when things went wrong and considered any changes needed to streamline and improve communication and improve the speed of service.

One or two people indicated that they did not fully understand the questions or found the wording of some of the questions ambiguous and/or did not complete them.

Voluntary Sector and Partners

NHS colleagues pointed out that the stores was used by children with severe and complex disabilities, some of whom have life limiting disabilities and relied heavily on this equipment (primarily complex seating) in order to be cared for in a safe way. Any new model of provision would need, in their view, to ensure that the needs of these children continued to be met in a safe and timely way as delays could result in posture or other serious medical problems for this group of users.

Health colleagues also asked for the provision, storage, delivery, collection, decontamination and issuing of children's complex and physiotherapy equipment which ceased to be handled by the Council in 2008 to be considered for inclusion in the redesign of equipment provision in the Borough. They highlighted the significant impact on costs of not being able to decontaminate and re-issue expensive equipment and wondered what the procedures would be under any new proposal and for clarification as to what would happen to all of the equipment in the current store.

Staff understandably wanted practical information about the impact for them, including job losses, redundancy opportunities.

Unison's response is attached; however, in summary, it both opposes outsourcing of services generally and specifically this proposal. In its opinion, there has been a lack of both information and transparency in that the consultation did not contain the actual detail of what was being proposed and staff had not been kept sufficiently informed of what was happening. In its view, communication with staff and Unions needed to improve from this point forward and there needed to be regular updates, including in writing. Furthermore, by focusing on 'reassurance', the Council was trying to sell the idea of 'privatisation/outsourcing' to the public and not inviting them to say whether they would like the service to continue or to be provided by Haringey Council.

Unison is also unconvinced by claims that there would be no reduction in standards of service when the Council would no longer be running the service and stated how outsourcing social care and health services could lead to lower quality services for those who use them. It also wanted clarification of the decision-making process and felt that Cabinet was the appropriate decision-making body.

Appendix D (exempt)

1. Unison responses to the consultation.
2. Responses provided to Unison.

Consultation on proposed changes to the Supply of Community Equipment in Haringey

Currently the procurement, delivery, maintenance and collection of such complex daily aids to living as beds, hoists, pressure mattresses, reclining chairs which are essential in helping disabled or older people retain their independence are managed by Haringey Council Adult Services. We propose to change the way in which we meet the needs of those who receive or would receive such community equipment from Haringey Council in the future when the lease on the building from which the service currently operates expires in December 2012. Have your say about the proposed changes by completing the questions below by **14 March 2012**. **Please start the survey on the next page.**

Please note, the survey needs session cookies enabled on your browser, otherwise you may experience problems filling in the survey. We use session cookies to allow you to page through the survey without losing any information. No personal information is stored or obtained from your computer. If you're unsure how to enable session cookies, please visit www.haringey.gov.uk/cookies.

I am completing this questionnaire as.....

- 17 (42.5%) a person who uses the community equipment service
- 15 (37.5%) as a relative or carer of a person who uses the service
- 0 (0.0%) as an advocate on behalf a person who uses the service
- 3 (7.5%) on behalf of a community group/organisation
- 2 (5.0%) on behalf of a statutory organisation
- 2 (5.0%) None of the above

Please tell us which community group or statutory organisation you represent	6 (15.0%)	If none of the above, please specify	1 (50.0%)
--	-----------	--------------------------------------	-----------

Each of the statements below summarises a proposed change to the service. Please tell us whether or not you are reassured or concerned by these statements and why.

"Among the options that Haringey Council and NHS Haringey are proposing is to join a Framework Agreement, consortia or other form of collaborative arrangement for the procurement, delivery, collection, servicing, storage and recycling of complex equipment aids (such as beds and hoists) for daily living".

Q2 To what extent do you agree with this proposal?

- 2 (5.0%) Strongly Agree
- 9 (22.5%) Agree
- 13 (32.5%) Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 (10.0%) Disagree
- 7 (17.5%) Strongly Disagree
- 2 (5.0%) Don't know

Q3 If you disagree, strongly disagree or don't know, please tell us why:

12 (30.0%)

"The proposal could see a provider (with many years experience of providing similar services) managing this service and/or us working with other London Boroughs".

Q4 Are you reassured by this statement?

16 (40.0%) Yes
16 (40.0%) No
6 (15.0%) Don't know

Q5 If you are not reassured, or don't know, please tell us why:

16 (40.0%)

"The assessment process for the provision of equipment would remain the same, so if a vulnerable person is assessed as needing a service they will continue to receive one from Haringey Council"

Q6 Are you reassured by this statement?

26 (65.0%) Yes
10 (25.0%) No
1 (2.5%) Don't know

Q7 If you are not reassured, or don't know, please tell us why:

9 (22.5%)

"Equipment will continue to be on permanent loan to you until no longer required".

Q8 Are you reassured by this statement?

33 (82.5%) Yes
3 (7.5%) No
0 (0.0%) Don't know

Q9 If you are not reassured, or don't know, please tell us why:

2 (5.0%)

"There will continue to be no charge for the equipment you use."

Q10 Are you reassured by this statement?

29 (72.5%) Yes
7 (17.5%) No
2 (5.0%) Don't know

Q11 If you are not reassured, or don't know, please tell us why:

6 (15.0%)

"There would be no reduction in the delivery time that it takes to receive standard items of complex community equipment"

Q12 Are you reassured by this statement?

19 (47.5%) Yes
8 (20.0%) No
6 (15.0%) Don't know

Q13 If you are not reassured, or don't know, please tell us why:

14 (35.0%)

ANY OTHER COMMENTS

Q14 Please use this space to make any other comments about the proposed changes to the Community Equipment Service:

12 (30.0%)

About You

Puzzled as to why we ask you so many personal questions?

Asking personal questions can help to improve the services we deliver to the community. Diversity is a strength of our borough, and the following questions will help us monitor what different groups of people think about a particular service or issue. We'll use this information to ensure people have their say and can influence decisions that affect them - regardless of their age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, sex, race, religion, or belief, pregnancy and maternity, sexual orientation, refugees and asylum seekers and language

Remember that all the information you provide is confidential by law and your information is not passed onto anyone else; it's not used to check nationality or citizenship status; and you're not obliged to provide information.

What is your post code?

33 (82.5%)

Age

What is your age group?

0 (0.0%)	Under 20	5 (12.5%)	45-59	0 (0.0%)	85-89
1 (2.5%)	20-24	5 (12.5%)	60-64	3 (7.5%)	90+
0 (0.0%)	25-29	6 (15.0%)	65-74		
5 (12.5%)	30-44	11 (27.5%)	75-84		

Disability

Under the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) a person is considered to have a disability if she/he has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on her/his ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. This includes people with HIV, cancer and multiple sclerosis (MS).

Do you have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity? (long-standing means anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time)

24 (60.0%) Yes 12 (30.0%) No

Ethnic Group

Below we are asking you to let us know which ethnic group best describes you? (Please tick one box from each of the main categories below)

29 (72.5%)	White category	2 (5.0%)	Black or Black British category
0 (0.0%)	Mixed category	0 (0.0%)	Chinese or Any other ethnic group
1 (2.5%)	Asian or Asian British category		

Please select which ethnic group best describes you?

18 (62.1%)	British	0 (0.0%)	Irish Traveller
1 (3.4%)	Greek Cypriot	0 (0.0%)	Turkish/Cypriot
2 (6.9%)	Turkish	0 (0.0%)	Kurdish
0 (0.0%)	Gypsy/roma	3 (10.3%)	Other
2 (6.9%)	Irish		

Other,please write in the box	3 (100.0%)	Chinese or any other ethnic group	
		0 (0.0%) Chinese	
		0 (0.0%) Any other ethnic group	
Mixed		Any other ethnic group	0 (0.0%)
0 (0.0%) White and Black Caribbean			
0 (0.0%) White and Asian			
0 (0.0%) White and Black African			
0 (0.0%) Other			
Other, please write in the box	0 (0.0%)		

Asian or Asian British	
0 (0.0%) Indian	
0 (0.0%) Bangladeshi	
0 (0.0%) Pakistani	
0 (0.0%) East African Asian	
0 (0.0%) Other	
Other, please write in the box	0 (0.0%)

Black or Black British	
0 (0.0%) African	
2 (100.0%) Caribbean	
0 (0.0%) Other	
Other, please write in the box	0 (0.0%)

Gender	
Are you ?	
13 (32.5%) Male	
20 (50.0%) Female	

Religion/Belief	
Do you have a religion or belief that you would like to mention?	
8 (20.0%) No religion	0 (0.0%) Muslim
19 (47.5%) Christian	0 (0.0%) Sikh
1 (2.5%) Buddhist	0 (0.0%) Rastafarian
0 (0.0%) Hindu	2 (5.0%) Other
0 (0.0%) Jewish	

Sexual Orientation	
How would you describe your sexual orientation?	
25 (62.5%) Heterosexual	
1 (2.5%) Bisexual	
1 (2.5%) Gay	
0 (0.0%) Lesbian	

Pregnancy and Maternity

	Yes	No
Are you pregnant?	1 (2.5%)	26 (65.0%)
Are you nursing a baby under 12 months old?	2 (5.0%)	23 (57.5%)

Marriage and Civil Partnership

Are you:

	Yes	No
Married?	12 (30.0%)	6 (15.0%)
In a same sex civil partnership?	0 (0.0%)	5 (12.5%)
Co-habiting?	5 (12.5%)	2 (5.0%)
Single?	11 (27.5%)	6 (15.0%)

Refugees and Asylum Seekers?

Are you a refugee or asylum-seeker?

	Yes	No
Refugee	1 (2.5%)	28 (70.0%)
Asylum-seeker	0 (0.0%)	21 (52.5%)

What country or region are you a refugee/asylum seeker from 0 (0.0%)

Language

Please tick the box which best describes your language

0 (0.0%)	Albanian	29 (72.5%)	English
1 (2.5%)	French	0 (0.0%)	Lingala
2 (5.0%)	Turkish	0 (0.0%)	Somali
0 (0.0%)	Arabic	1 (2.5%)	Other

Other, please write in 1 (2.5%)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Haringey Council

Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) for Organisational Restructures affecting Staff only

Please note that if there is an impact on Service provision a separate EqIA template needs to be completed for Service Reviews – see the website.

Notes and Statement of purpose

The Equalities Impact Assessment for service restructures should assess the likely impact of restructuring on protected equalities groups of employees by: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (gender), sexual orientation.

The assessment is to be completed by the business unit manager with advice from HR. It is to be undertaken by an assessment of the basic employment profile data and then answering a number of questions outlined below.

There is an Excel template that accompanies the EqIA Service Restructure template on Harinet. This is to help you complete the tables of staff information and % calculations. You will also find the latest Annual Council Employee Profile on Harinet (based on data for a financial year) to help complete the council and borough profile information. Ask the HR Metrics team – x3346 - if you cannot find it.

Date: 12th March 2012
Service under review: Haringey Integrated Community Equipment Service (HICES)
Directorate: Adult & Housing Services
Lead Officer/s (author(s) of the proposal) and contact details: Pauline Walker-Mitchell 020 8489 1655
Contact Officer/s (Responsible for enquiries and actions): Pauline Walker-Mitchell 020 8489 1655
Summary of Assessment (completed at conclusion of assessment to be used as equalities comments on council reports) This EqIA was completed for the 7 members of staff affected by the changes.

Race - 57% of the staff (4 staff members) are of a BME background as compared with 71% across the Council and therefore the impact is not disproportionate on this group of staff. 43% of staff (3 staff members) are white as compared with 27% across the Council and 51% against the Borough profile concluding this group is disproportionately affected within the Council but not against the Borough profile. To mitigate against compulsory redundancies the service will identify volunteers for redundancy and apply the council's redeployment procedure to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible.

Age – Overall there is a disproportionate impact on the 35-44 – 2 staff members (29%) compared with the Council grade groups of 25%; whilst to mitigate against compulsory redundancies the service will identify volunteers for redundancy and apply the council's redeployment procedure to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible. There is also a disproportionate impact on the 45-54 age ranges – 3 staff members (43%) against the Council's profile of 37%. One of the post holders would TUPE to the new provider. The service has identified the need for a contracts manager to monitor the performance of the new provider. This post will be available on a closed ring fence to the remaining post holder (Stores Manager). Whilst to mitigate against compulsory redundancies the service will identify volunteers for redundancy and apply the council's redeployment procedure to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible.

Disability – Overall, there is a higher level of staff with a disability in this staff group (29%) – 2 staff members, as compared to the Council profile (8%) whilst not retaining these posts within the Council one would TUPE to the new provider, whilst to mitigate against compulsory redundancies the service will identify volunteers for redundancy and apply the council's redeployment procedure to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible.

STAFF RESTRUCTURES - EqIA SCREENING TOOL

TO IDENTIFY IF A FULL STAFF EqIA IS NEEDED

Is a full Equalities Impact Assessment required?

- If the answer to any of the questions below is yes, consideration must be given to undertaking a full EqIA.
- If the answers to the questions below are no you do not need to undertake a Full Staff EqIA, however you will need to provide a detailed explanation for this decision at Q5 below.

1. Could the proposed staff restructuring have an adverse impact of 5% or more on the service/ business unit profile for any of the equalities protected characteristics age, disability, race, sex (gender)? YES
2. Could the proposed staff restructuring have an adverse impact on staff with other protected characteristics of pregnancy / maternity, religion or belief, sexual orientation, or gender reassignment?
If Yes please identify the issues.
Relevant data is not available for these groups.
3. Does the proposal have an affect on service users or the wider community?
If Yes please identify the issues.
No. Service users will see no change to the assessment process so if a vulnerable person is assessed as needing a service that service will be provided by Haringey Council. The delivery of equipment will be from an alternative provider but will continue to be on permanent loan to the user until no longer required.
4. By taking particular measures could a positive impact result? YES / NO
Service users will see no change to the assessment process. Delivery of equipment will be from an alternative provider but will continue to be on permanent loan to the user until no longer required.
5. If the answers to the above questions are no you do not need to undertake a Full Staff EqlA. However, you will need to provide a clear explanation for not doing this below.

**FULL STAFFING EqIA - PART 1
TO ASSIST WITH PLANNING THE RESTRUCTURE AND ISSUED AS PART OF
THE CONSULTATION WITH STAFF/ UNIONS ON THE STRUCTURE**

Step 1: Background

Please summarise and provide brief answers in order to provide the reasons for these changes.

Please also provide a copy of the committee report or delegated authority as appropriate.

1. Summarise the proposals/ changes you are proposing to make? (for example opening a new unit or closing an existing one)

Procurement, delivery, maintenance and collection of complex daily aids to living such as beds, hoists, pressure mattresses and reclining chairs (community equipment) which are essential in helping disabled or older people retain their independence is managed currently by Haringey Integrated Community Equipment Services (HICES) from a depot located within the Borough.

We propose to change the way in which we meet the needs of those who receive/would receive community equipment. The provision & delivery of community equipment will be provided by an alternative provider from an alternative site.

2. What are the reasons for making these changes?

There are three driving forces that require the change to the delivery of complex equipment to the vulnerable service users in Haringey.

(i) Requirement to deliver Adult and Community Services required HESP (Haringey Efficiency Service Programme)'s target by 2012/13

(ii) The lease on the unit at St George's industrial estate where the store is currently located is due to expire in December 2012. In our view this is unnecessary Council expenditure, particularly since most of the staff originally located there have now moved into Cumberland Road, or are home/smart working. So, apart from the store and store staff, it is effectively an empty building and one which Adult Services no longer needs;

(iii) Finally, services constantly need to improve in terms of greater quality and performance and deliver value for money. The current service is effective and has a very good level of performance but could be delivered even more cost effectively through joining a shared-service arrangement with other Boroughs, especially now the prescription model has come into effect.

These factors combined have critical implications for the way that Haringey procures, delivers, maintains and collects complex daily aids to living and means that we have little choice than to change the way in which we meet the needs of those who receive/would receive such community equipment from Haringey Council in the future.

3. Are existing staff likely to be affected and if so how many and in what ways?

Step 2: Workforce profile analysis

The specific duty introduced by the government to support the Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to publish annual workforce data covering the age, disability, gender and race profile of staff at every level of the organisation. You should therefore gather all relevant data that will help you assess whether presently, there are differential outcomes i.e. non, under or over represented in relation to the Council staff profile (for the most recent financial year of the proposal) and the Borough Profile. Analyse the information in terms of representation and grade for age, disability, race, sex (gender).

The HR Metrics team can help you with this data.

These proposals will impact on 7 members of staff who arrange and deliver community equipment, from stores technicians and driver fitters to managers and customer care officers, as follows:

- a. One post (the store technician) whose work will continue and this post holder will be subject of TUPE transfer to the new provider if agreement to a new provider is given.
- b. A new post which will be created in order to monitor the new service provider, for performance, quality management and performance reports as well as value for money. This post will be available on a closed ring fence to the Stores Manager.
- c. Two posts for which there is no longer a requirement and whose incumbents would be displaced if approval is given to transfer the service to another provider.
- d. Four posts to be deleted as part of the HESP savings identified for the service (one driver/fitter post is vacant and the other three post holders 2 driver/fitters and the manager of the service have requested voluntary redundancy). If approval is given to the redundancy of the driver/fitters then these posts will be deleted. The manager of the service has already requested voluntary redundancy and this has been actioned as an efficiency measure in advance of any decisions on future proposals for the structure.

The tables below detail equalities information for the 7 officers included in the restructure by equality strands.

Table 1: Age

Highlight any grade groups that are under / over represented (5% or more) compared with the council profile or where relevant the borough profile.

Age group		16 - 24		25 - 34		35 - 44		45 - 54		55 - 64		65+	
Grade Group	Total No. Staff	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group
SC1-SC5	3	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	0	0
SC6-SO2	2	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0
PO1-PO3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
PO4-PO7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
PO8+	0	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Totals	7	0	0	1	14	2	29	3	43	1	14	0	0
Council Profile	3612	58	2	644	18	911	25	1324	37	636	18	39	1
*Borough Profile	225,000	26300	11.7	46700	20.7	41100	18.3	29100	13.0	17600	7.8	20600	9.5

* Mid year estimates 2010

Table 2: Disability

Highlight any grade groups that are under / over represented (5% or more) compared with the council profile or where relevant the borough profile.

Grade Group	Total No. staff	Disabled Staff		Non disabled staff		% Disabled in Council Grade Group
		No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	
SC1-SC5	3	2	67	1	33	8
SC6-SO2	2	0	0	2	100	9
PO1-PO3	1	0	0	1	100	6
PO4-PO7	1	0	0	1	100	6
PO8+	0	0		0		3
Totals	7	2	29	5	71	7

Table 3: Race

Highlight any grade groups that are under / over represented (5% or more) compared with the council profile or where relevant the borough profile.

Grade Group SC1-SC5	Total Staff	Black		Asian		Mixed		Other		White Minorities		BME Total		White		Not Declared	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
SC1-SC5	3	2	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0
SC6-SO2	2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
PO1-PO3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
PO4-PO7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
PO8+	0	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
Totals	7	4	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	57	3	43	0	0
Council Profile	3612	1478	41	277	8	125	3	110	3	581	16	2571	71	988	27	53	1
Borough Profile	225,500	35900	15.9	21500	9.5	9900	4.4	8500	3.8	34200	15.1	110000	48.8	115600	51.3	---	---

* Mid year estimates 2009

Table 4: Sex (formerly Gender)

Highlight any grade groups that are under / over represented (5% or more) compared with the council profile or where relevant the borough profile.

Grade Group	Total No. Staff	Male Staff		Female Staff		% Females in Council grade group	% Females in Borough
		No.	% Grade Group	No.	% Grade Group		
SC1-SC5	3	3	100	0	0	71	
SC6-SO2	2	0	0	2	100	75	
PO1-PO3	1	1	100	0	0	63	
PO4-PO7	1	0	0	1	100	64	
PO8+	0	0	0	0	0	53	
Totals	7	4	57	3	43	69	49

Data Comparisons

In the table below, compare the existing profile of the staff affected by the reorganisation against both the Council staff profile and the borough profile according to equalities protected characteristics. Please provide a comment only where there is an impact of more than 5% difference compared to the council profile or where relevant the borough profile.

Protected Characteristics	Council staff Profile (Excl Schools) September 2011 %	Borough Profile (mid year estimate 2009) %	Staff affected Profile %	Comment
Age				
16-24	1.6	11.7		
25-34	17.8	20.7	14	Under representation – 1 staff
35-44	25.2	18.3	29	Over representation – 2 staff
45-54	36.7	13.0	43	Over representation – 3 staff
55-64	17.6	7.8	14	Under representation – 1 staff
65+	1.1	9.5		
Race				
Black / Asian / Mixed / Other Ethnic Group	55.1	33.7		
White Minorities	16.1	15.1		
BME Total (BME including Black / Asian / Mixed / Other Ethnic & White Minorities)	71.2	48.8	57	Under representation – 4 staff
White British	27.4	51.3	43	Over representation – 3 staff
Gender				
Male	31.4	50.7	57	Over representation – 4 staff
Female	68.6	49.3	43	Under representation – 3 staff
Disability	7.3	7.6 (NOMIS Feb 2010 Percentage of working age population claiming ESA or incapacity benefits)	29	Over representation – 2 staff

STEP 3: Assess the likely impact of the proposal and how this can be addressed

Using the information that you have gathered and analysed at step 2, outline the likely impact on staff and any mitigating actions that can be taken to address the impact.

This section will be completed prior to the sign off process for the new structure. **This needs to be assessed at this stage as you need to measure the likely impact before you make the final decision to continue.**

1. *Highlight any protected groups/ grades that are likely to be under/ over represented in the new structure compared to their population size with Haringey workforce and the Borough profile? (Need to consider race, sex (gender), age and disability, plus the potential impact on pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, sexual orientation)*

The following groups will be over represented under the new proposals

2. *If yes, what groups are impacted upon and in what way?*

Race - 43% of staff (3 post holders) are white as compared with 27% across the Council and 51% against the Borough profile concluding this group is disproportionately affected within the Council but not against the Borough profile. To mitigate against compulsory redundancies the service will identify volunteers for redundancy and apply the council's redeployment procedure to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible.

Age – Overall there is a disproportionate impact on the 35-44 (29%) – 2 post holders compared with the Council grade groups of 25%; whilst to mitigate against compulsory redundancies the service will identify volunteers for redundancy and apply the council's redeployment procedure to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible. There is also a disproportionate impact on the 45-54 age ranges (43%) – 3 post holders, against the Council's profile of 37%. One of the post holders would TUPE to the new provider. The service has identified the need for a contracts manager to monitor the performance of the new provider. This post will be available on a closed ring fence to the remaining post holder (Stores Manager), whilst for the other post holder the service will identify volunteers for redundancy and apply the council's redeployment procedure to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible.

Disability – Overall, there is a higher level of staff (2) with a disability in this staff group (29%) as compared to the Council profile (8%) whilst not retaining these posts within the Council one would TUPE to the new provider, whilst to mitigate against compulsory redundancies the service will identify

volunteers for redundancy and apply the council's redeployment procedure to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible.

3. Has the ring fencing maximised the opportunity for all staff to apply for relevant jobs, please explain your answer?

The service has identified the need for a contracts manager to monitor the performance of the new provider. This post will be available on a closed ring fence to the remaining post holder (Stores Manager). The store manager is currently on a PO2 grade, the new post i.e. contract manager is also graded at PO2. All other posts affected by these proposals are graded scale 4-6, therefore the council's redeployment procedures will be applied to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible for the remaining displaced posts

4. If you are closing a service will this closure worsen any significant under representation of protected characteristics in the wider Business Unit or Directorate?

Overall, there is a higher level of staff with a disability in this staff group (29%) – 2 post holders as compared to the Council profile (8%) whilst not retaining these posts within the Council the stores technician would TUPE to the new provider and the driver/fitter has requested voluntary redundancy.

5. Can any of the impacted staff be accommodated elsewhere within the reorganised structure or can you amend the proposed new structure to accommodate them?

The service has identified the need for a contracts manager to monitor the performance of the new provider. This post will be available on a closed ring fence to the remaining post holder (Stores Manager). The council's redeployment procedures will be applied to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible for the remaining post holders.

Date Part 1 completed - 19th March 2012

PART 2
**TO BE COMPLETED AT THE END OF CONSULTATION WITH STAFF/
UNIONS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS ON THE STRUCTURE**

STEP 4: Consultation

Consultation is an essential part of the impact assessment process. If there has been recent consultation which has highlighted the issues that you have identified in Steps 2 and 3 use it to inform your assessment. If there has been no consultation relating to the issues, then you will have to carry out consultation to assist your assessment. Make sure that you reach all of those who are likely to be affected by the proposal, ensuring that you cover all equality strands. Do not forget to give feedback to the people you have consulted, stating how you have responded to their issues and concerns.

You can refer to, or include comments from a committee report or delegated authority if relevant.

- 1) *What involvement and consultation activities have you undertaken in relation to: senior management, staff and unions and where relevant, stakeholders?***

Indicate where applicable:

- a) Senior Management

Senior management receives regular updates on the progress of the proposals

although the proposals do not affect them directly.

- b) Staff

An informal consultation meeting was held with staff in March 2012, Trade Union representation was also present. Staff understandably wanted practical information about the impact for them, including job losses, redundancy opportunities. Staff were issued with the timetable for the formal consultation on 18th April, which ended on 18th May 2012, setting out the detail of the changes to staffing structures as the result of changes in the way the community equipment service is planned to be provided and advised that, should formal approval be given, there would be a further one month period of formal consultation with staff specifically to do with any changes that would be subject to TUPE. At the end of that consultation a staff member has requested that the proposed new post should be closed ring fence. We have noted this view and can confirm the post will be available on a closed ring fence to the stores manager.

c) Unions

Unison opposes outsourcing of services generally and this proposal specifically. Unison is also unconvinced by claims that there would be no reduction in standards of service when the Council would no longer be running the service and stated how outsourcing social care and health services, in its view, led to lower quality services for those who use them. Comments received at the end of the consultation on 18th May 2012 are a repeat of the previous comments made to the consultation on 12th March 2012. A formal response to the initial consultation is attached. A formal response in relation to the recent consultation is also attached.

d) Stakeholders

N/A

2) What changes will be made to the proposal as a result of the consultation?

The post for contract manager will be available on a closed ring fence to the stores manager.

STEP 5: Consider mitigation measures and their implications

You need to be able to show what actions you are / will take to mitigate against any adverse impact. If there is any adverse impact that cannot be justified, you need to consider any changes needed to the proposal to prevent this from happening, including stopping the proposal.

1) What have you done or will do to redress or reduce any likely negative impact for employees?

To mitigate any negative impact we have provided the stores technician and the driver fitters with additional training to improve their skill base. All have had training on the maintenance & servicing of mobile hoists and the installation of minor adaptations e.g. grab rails, this training is on going. Other members of staff have made use of the extensive training available through OD&L. Further more staff are aware of the Supporting Change workshops available on Harinet

2) Is there any evidence that the proposals could unlawfully discriminate against particular equality groups as employees unlawfully directly or indirectly, and if yes please explain what actions you are taking to prevent this?

There is no evidence to suggest the proposals could unlawfully discriminate against particular equality groups

3) Can any of the staff groups who have been displaced be accommodated elsewhere within the organisation?

Of the 7 members of staff, 2 will be displaced. The service will identify volunteers for redundancy and apply the council's redeployment procedure to avoid making compulsory redundancies if possible.

4) Are there employment law issues which may have implications for your proposal?

If Cabinet approve the service proposal one member of staff will be subject to Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE). All potential providers have confirmed that they will accept the TUPE of the member of staff – the stores technician.

STEP 6: Assess and review the final structure

Once the final structure is in place please set out the equalities profile of the new structure and set out the future arrangements for monitoring and review.

- 2. Comparing the staff profile in the new structure with the previous structure, please indicate any changes that have resulted in a positive/ negative impact for any staff equality group, and if so which groups? Can the impact be justified and if so explain?*

- 3. What arrangements have been set up to monitor and review the implementation of the new structure?*

Under the new structure we propose the creation of a contract manager post to monitor the performance, quality management and value for money of the new service provider

- 4. Consider any new additional information that has arisen that may require you to review the service(s) affected by this proposal, (i.e. future cuts, outcomes of other reorganisations, and the impact on services).*

No new information has come to light

- 5. Outline any steps to propose to take to address this below with appropriate timescales.*

STEP 7: Sign-off and publication

There is a legal duty to publish the results of impact assessments. The reason is not simply to comply with the law but to make the whole process and its outcome transparent and have a wider community ownership. You should summarise the results of the assessment and intended actions and publish them.

ASSESSED BY (Author of the proposal)

NAME: Pauline Walker-Mitchell

DESIGNATION: Head of Adaptations Service

SIGNATURE: Pauline Walker-Mitchell

DATE: 22nd May 2012

QUALITY CHECKED BY (Policy, Equalities and Partnerships Team)

NAME: Inno Amadi

DESIGNATION: Senior Policy Development Officer



SIGNATURE:

DATE: 23 May 2012

SIGNED OFF BY (On behalf of the Directorate Management Team)

NAME:

DESIGNATION:

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

Note – Please send an electronic copy of the EqlA to Policy Equalities and Partnerships Team; it will then be published on the council website.

Appendix 1 – Haringey Council Workforce Analysis (excluding Schools) Equalities Data September 2011

Race Analysis																	
Grade Group SC1-SC5	Total Staff	Black		Asian		Mixed		Other		White Minorities		BME Total		White		Not Declared	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
SC1-SC5	1345	742	55	97	7	43	3	48	4	149	11	1079	80	245	18	21	2
SC6-SO2	895	378	42	78	9	34	4	26	3	164	18	680	76	210	23	5	1
PO1-PO3	615	196	32	58	9	23	4	17	3	121	20	415	67	195	32	5	1
PO4-PO7	540	141	26	34	6	20	4	13	2	115	21	323	60	201	37	16	3
PO8+	217	21	10	10	5	5	2	6	3	32	15	74	34	137	63	6	3
Council Profile	3612	1478	41	277	8	125	3	110	3	581	16	2571	71	988	27	53	1
*Borough Profile	225,500	35900	16	21500	10	9900	4	8500	4	34200	15	110000	49	115600	51	---	---

*Mid year estimates 2009

Sex (formerly gender) Analysis					
Grade band	HGY				
	Total Staff	Female		Male	
		No.	%	No.	%
SC1-SC5	1345	957	71	388	29
SC6-SO2	895	673	75	222	25
PO1-PO3	615	385	63	230	37
PO4-PO7	540	348	64	192	36
PO8+	217	115	53	102	47
Council Profile	3612	2478	69	1134	31
*Borough Profile	225000	110900	49	114100	51

*Mid year estimates 2010

**Appendix 1 – Haringey Council Workforce Analysis (excluding Schools)
Equalities Data September 2011**

Age Analysis													
Grade band	Total Staff	16<25		25<35		35<45		45<55		55<65		65+	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
SC1-SC5	1345	46	3	195	14	273	20	497	37	305	23	29	2
SC6-SO2	895	11	1	204	23	254	28	289	32	133	15	4	0
PO1-PO3	615	1	0	154	25	177	29	225	37	56	9	2	0
PO4-PO7	540	0	0	80	15	163	30	210	39	85	16	2	0
PO8+	217	0	0	11	5	44	20	103	47	57	26	2	1
Council Profile	3612	58	2	644	18	911	25	1324	37	636	18	39	1
*Borough Profile	225,000	26300	12	46700	21	41100	18	29100	13	17600	8	20600	10

*Mid year estimates 2010

Disabled					
Grade band	Total Staff	Disabled		Non Disabled	
		No.	%	No.	%
SC1-SC5	1345	104	8	1241	92
SC6-SO2	895	82	9	813	91
PO1-PO3	615	38	6	577	94
PO4-PO7	540	33	6	507	94
PO8+	217	6	3	211	97
Council Profile	3612	263	7	3349	93