

Helen Chapman,
Principal Committee
Co-ordinator

020 84892615

helen.chapman@haringey.gov.uk

10 April 2017

To: All Members of the Staffing and Remuneration Committee

Dear Member,

Staffing and Remuneration Committee - Tuesday, 18th April, 2017

I attach a copy of the following document for the above-mentioned meeting which was not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

8. SENIOR MANAGERS PAY REVIEW (PAGES 1 - 10)

Appendix D to the report of the Interim Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service to provide the Committee with a summary of the outcomes of the Senior Managers' Pay Review April 2017.

Yours sincerely

Helen Chapman,
Principal Committee Co-ordinator

This page is intentionally left blank

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The **Equality Act 2010** places a ‘**General Duty**’ on all public bodies to have ‘**due regard**’ to the need to:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
- Advancing equality of opportunity for those with relevant ‘protected characteristics’ and those without them
- Fostering good relations between those with relevant ‘protected characteristics’ and those without them.

In addition the Council complies with the Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Act 2013.

Stage 1 – Screening

Please complete the equalities screening form. If screening identifies that your proposal is likely to impact on protected characteristics, please proceed to stage 2 and complete a full Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA).

Stage 2 – Full Equality Impact Assessment

An EqIA provides evidence for meeting the Council’s commitment to equality and the responsibilities under the Public Sector Equality Duty.

When an EqIA has been undertaken, it should be submitted as an attachment/appendix to the final decision making report. This is so the decision maker (e.g. Cabinet, Committee, senior leader) can use the EqIA to help inform their final decision. The EqIA once submitted will become a public document, published alongside the minutes and record of the decision.

Please read the Council’s Equality Impact Assessment Guidance before beginning the EqIA process.

1. Responsibility for the Equality Impact Assessment

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Name of proposal | Senior Managers Pay Review Outcomes |
| Service area | HR |
| Officer completing assessment | Christiana Kyriacou |
| Equalities/ HR Advisor | Julie Amory |
| Cabinet meeting date (if applicable) | 18 th April 2017 |
| Director/Assistant Director | Richard Grice |

2. Summary of the proposal

Please outline in no more than 3 paragraphs

- *The proposal which is being assessed*
- *The key stakeholders who may be affected by the policy or proposal*

• *The decision-making route being taken*

At the Staffing & Remuneration (S&R) Committee meeting on the 7th February 2017, the parameters for the conduct of the Senior Manager Pay Review for April 2017 were approved. The Committee was advised that a further report would be brought back on the outcome of this pay review exercise.

The key stakeholders who are affected by the outcomes of the Pay Review are the senior manager population.

The My Conversation tool has been used to collate evidence of an individual's contribution to the Council and the results have populated a pay decision matrix.

The final Pay Decision Matrix illustrates the pay award allocated to each My Conversation outcome. However, where it has not been possible to obtain a My Conversation outcome for a small proportion of the senior manager population (18%) due to various reasons e.g. on probation, new to role, a 1% market adjustment has been made in line with the increase to pay bands.

The Head of Paid Service signed off the Senior Manager Pay Review on 3rd April 2017 and the outcomes of the review were implemented in April 2017 pay.

3. What data will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on protected groups of service users and/or staff?

Identify the main sources of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, that supports your analysis. Please include any gaps and how you will address these

This could include, for example, data on the Council's workforce, equalities profile of service users, recent surveys, research, results of relevant consultations, Haringey Borough Profile, Haringey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and any other sources of relevant information, local, regional or national. For restructures, please complete the restructure EqIA which is available on the HR pages.

| Protected group | Service users | Staff |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Sex | N/A | Workforce data from HR System |
| Gender Reassignment | N/A | Workforce data from HR System |
| Age | N/A | Workforce data from HR System |
| Disability | N/A | Workforce data from HR System |
| Race & Ethnicity | N/A | Workforce data from HR System |
| Sexual Orientation | N/A | Workforce data from HR System |
| Religion or Belief (or No Belief) | N/A | Workforce data from HR System |
| Pregnancy & Maternity | N/A | Workforce data from HR System |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership | N/A | Workforce data from HR System |

Outline the key findings of your data analysis. Which groups are disproportionately affected by the proposal? How does this compare with the impact on wider service users and/or the

borough's demographic profile? Have any inequalities been identified?

Explain how you will overcome this within the proposal.

Further information on how to do data analysis can be found in the guidance.

Overall, there is no evidence to suggest that any group of employees with a specific protected characteristic have been disproportionately affected by the Senior Manager Pay Review.

The My Conversation tool has been used for all senior managers (except those that are new in role or probation etc) to determine their contribution to the Council and these results have been moderated for consistency. In turn the outcomes of the Moderation exercise have informed the Senior Managers Pay Review and individual's eligibility for a pay award.

As an organisation we would anticipate to find the majority of employees indicated as Haringey Gold (HG) on the My Conversation tool with smaller numbers sitting in other My Conversation boxes. The Pay Decision Matrix has awarded HG a 2% pay award and the 3 boxes that are deemed to have a higher contribution than HG – Ambitious Achiever, Strong Achiever and Excellent Achiever were given a pay award of 2.2%, 2.2 % and 2.4%. 4 of the remaining boxes were awarded a pay award of less than 2% (1.5% and 1.8%) and the Scope to Improve box was awarded 1%.

From what we have ascertained from the analysis the majority of employees with specific protected characteristics were awarded a pay award of 2% or more and where some employees with specific protected characteristics were awarded a pay award of less than 2% this was mainly due to them being new in role or on probation, and they were only awarded a pay award of 1% market adjustment in line with the increase to pay bands.

From our analysis we can highlight the following:

Sex

There is no evidence that either men or women were disproportionately affected by the outcomes of the Pay Review.

Gender Reassignment

The Council currently does not hold sufficient information on Gender Reassignment, therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that any employees undergoing or who have undergone gender reassignment were disproportionately affected by the outcomes of the Pay Review.

Age

50% of employees in age band 25-34 received a pay award of less than 2% and 50% received a pay award of 2% or more. Employees in this age band received a pay award of less than 2% as a result of being new in role and receiving a 1% market adjustment only and not as a result of their contribution to the Council.

The majority of employees in other age bands received a 2% or more pay award.

Disability

There is no evidence that employees with a disability were disproportionately affected by the outcomes of the Pay Review.

Race & Ethnicity

The majority of employees in each ethnic group received a 2% or more pay award.

Sexual Orientation

66% of employees in group Gay Man and 100% in group Lesbian received a pay award of less than 2%. This is mainly as a result of these employees being new in role and receiving a 1% market adjustment only and not as a result of their contribution to the Council.

73% of employees in the Heterosexual group and 70% in the Not Recorded group received a 2% or more pay award.

Religion or Belief (or No Belief)

100% of employees in group Other received a pay award of less than 2%. 50% of these employees received a pay award of less than 2% as a result of being new in role and receiving a 1% market adjustment only and not as a result of their contribution to the Council.

Pregnancy & Maternity

There are currently no senior managers on maternity leave.

Marriage and Civil Partnership

There is no evidence that any employees who are married or who are in a civil partnership were disproportionately affected by the outcomes of the Pay Review.

4. a) How will consultation and/or engagement inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on protected groups of residents, service users and/or staff?

Please outline which groups you may target and how you will have targeted them

Further information on consultation is contained within accompanying EqIA guidance

In the new senior manager contract which was issued to all senior managers in April 2016 onwards it was made clear that senior managers' pay will be reviewed but not necessarily increased each year.

The senior manager population have been using the My Conversation tool to assess both their performance outcomes and values and behaviours. The outcomes of this have been used as evidence of an individual's contribution to the Council and the results have fed in to the outcomes of the Senior Manager Pay Review.

Over the last year we have gathered evidence of My Conversation outcomes for the senior manager population.

There have been three data collection exercises as follows: July/August 2016; December 2016 and March 2017.

The March 2017 data collection involved obtaining a My Conversation outcome for that month and an overall outcome for the year 2016/17.

Subsequently after each data collection exercise the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) have met to moderate the outcomes of the senior manager population to ensure consistency across the organisation and to challenge where appropriate.

A final moderation meeting was held on the 3rd April 2017 of My Conversation outcomes for 2016/17 and final outcomes were agreed.

At this stage there is no intention to change the processes used to determine senior managers' eligibility for a pay award or the value of the pay awards. A robust process has been used to determine and review the outcomes of My Conversation and determining pay awards based on what the Council can afford and no adverse impact has been identified on any group of employees sharing a specific protected characteristic, therefore, currently no changes are required.

4. b) Outline the key findings of your consultation / engagement activities once completed, particularly in terms of how this relates to groups that share the protected characteristics

Explain how will the consultation's findings will shape and inform your proposal and the decision making process, and any modifications made?

All senior managers have signed and accepted the terms of their senior manager contract stating that senior managers' pay will be reviewed but not necessarily increased each year.

5. What is the likely impact of the proposal on groups of service users and/or staff that share the protected characteristics?

Please explain the likely differential impact on each of the 9 equality strands, whether positive or negative. Where it is anticipated there will be no impact from the proposal, please outline the evidence that supports this conclusion.

Further information on assessing impact on different groups is contained within accompanying EqIA guidance

1. Sex

| % of Senior Managers by Sex and Pay Award Outcome | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Sex | 1.0% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 2.2% | 2.4% | % Total |
| Female | 25 | 6 | 0 | 27 | 38 | 4 | 56 |
| Male | 15 | 7 | 7 | 27 | 41 | 2 | 44 |
| Total | 20 | 6 | 3 | 27 | 40 | 3 | 100 |

The gender analysis of those affected by the review shows that the majority of females (69%) and the majority of males (70%) received a pay award of 2% or more which aligns well when compared to 70% of the senior manager population receiving 2% or more.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| Positive | | Negative | | Neutral Impact | X | Unknown Impact | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|

2. Gender reassignment

The Council currently does not hold sufficient information on Gender Reassignment. There is no evidence to suggest that the outcomes of the pay review have had a negative effect on this group, as it has been designed to treat all groups consistently and there is no evidence this group are overrepresented in the affected group, comparing it with the Council workforce as a whole.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| Positive | | Negative | | Neutral impact | X | Unknown Impact | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|

3. Age

| % of Senior Managers by Age Band and Pay Award Outcome | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Age Band | 1.0% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 2.2% | 2.4% | % Total |
| 16-24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-34 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 2 |
| 35-44 | 17 | 13 | 9 | 17 | 43 | 0 | 25 |
| 45-54 | 21 | 2 | 2 | 29 | 40 | 6 | 52 |
| 55-64 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 22 |
| 65+ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 20 | 6 | 3 | 27 | 40 | 3 | 100 |

The age group analysis of those affected by the review shows that the majority of staff in each of the age bands received a pay award of 2% or more except for age band 25-34 where there was a 50%/50% split. This split is a result of employees who are new in role receiving a 1% market adjustment only and not as a result of their contribution to the Council. 75% of staff in age band 45-54 and 70% of staff in age band 55-64 received a pay award of 2% or more and this aligns well when compared to 70% of the senior manager population receiving 2% or more.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| Positive | | Negative | | Neutral impact | X | Unknown Impact | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|

4. Disability

| % of Senior Managers by Disability and Pay Award Outcome | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Disability | 1.0% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 2.2% | 2.4% | % Total |
| Disabled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 1 |
| Not Declared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 68 | 0 | 20 |
| Not Disabled | 26 | 8 | 4 | 26 | 32 | 4 | 78 |
| Total | 20 | 6 | 3 | 27 | 40 | 3 | 100 |

A 100% of disabled staff and 62% of non disabled staff received a 2% or more pay award compared to 70% in the senior manager population.

All staff that did not declare a disability status received a 2% or more pay award.

It should be noted that 20% in this population have not declared their disability status, therefore, there may be other employees who have a disability but prefer not to say.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| Positive | | Negative | | Neutral impact | X | Unknown Impact | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|

5. Race and ethnicity

| % of Senior Managers by Ethnicity and Pay Award Outcome | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Ethnicity | 1.0% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 2.2% | 2.4% | % Total |
| BAME | 11 | 5 | 0 | 53 | 26 | 5 | 20 |
| WHITE OTHER | 43 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 14 | 0 | 8 |
| WHITE | 23 | 8 | 5 | 17 | 45 | 2 | 65 |
| NOT DECLARED | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 57 | 14 | 8 |
| Total | 20 | 6 | 3 | 27 | 40 | 3 | 100 |

The majority of staff in each ethnicity group received a 2% or more pay award. 84% BAME, 57% White Other, 64% White and 100% Not Declared compared to 70% in the overall population.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| Positive | | Negative | | Neutral Impact | X | Unknown Impact | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|

6. Sexual orientation

| % of Senior Managers by Sexual Orientation and Pay Award Outcome | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Sexual Orientation | 1.0% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 2.2% | 2.4% | % Total |
| Not Recorded | 16 | 7 | 7 | 30 | 35 | 5 | 46 |
| Bi-Sexual | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gay Man | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 3 |
| Heterosexual | 22 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 49 | 0 | 40 |
| Lesbian | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Prefer not to say | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Total | 20 | 6 | 3 | 27 | 40 | 3 | 100 |

The sexual orientation analysis of those affected by the review shows that 73% of employees in the Heterosexual group and 70% in the Not Recorded group received a 2% or more pay award which aligns well when compared to 70% in the senior manager population.

However, in the Gay Man and Lesbian group it shows that the majority received a pay award of less than 2%. It must be noted that this is mainly as a result of employees being new in role and receiving a 1% market adjustment only and not as a result of their contribution to the Council.

It should also be noted that 56% of those affected by the review, have not declared their sexual orientation, so this analysis needs to be viewed with this in mind.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| Positive | | Negative | | Neutral impact | X | Unknown Impact | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|

7. Religion or belief (or no belief)

| % of Senior Managers by Religion/Belief and Pay Award Outcome | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Religion | 1.0% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 2.2% | 2.4% | % Total |
| Not Recorded | 16 | 7 | 7 | 30 | 35 | 5 | 46 |
| Christian | 17 | 6 | 0 | 39 | 39 | 0 | 19 |
| Hindu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Muslim | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| None | 27 | 5 | 0 | 14 | 55 | 0 | 24 |
| Other | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Prefer not to say | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 38 | 13 | 9 |
| Total | 20 | 6 | 3 | 27 | 40 | 3 | 100 |

The Religion/Belief analysis of those employees affected by the review shows that the majority of employees in the following groups: Christian, None, Prefer not to say and Not Recorded received a pay award of 2% or more.

However, in the Other group it shows that 100% received a pay award of less than 2%. It must be noted that this is not due to having a significant number of staff being placed in the 'scope to improve' box as part of the My Conversation process but more due to the fact that there are some staff who are new in role and have been given a 1% market adjustment.

It should also be noted that 55% of the affected population have chosen not to record their religion/belief therefore, there may be employees that fall within the other groups.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| Positive | | Negative | | Neutral impact | X | Unknown Impact | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|

8. Pregnancy and maternity

There are no senior managers affected by the review currently on maternity leave.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| Positive | | Negative | | Neutral impact | X | Unknown Impact | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|

9. Marriage and Civil Partnership *(Consideration is only needed to ensure there is no discrimination against people in a marriage or against people in a civil partnership)*

10% of those employees affected by the review have indicated they are married compared to 7% of the Council profile.

It should be noted 73% of employees affected by the review have not indicated their marital status which is identical to the percentage of the Council profile who have not indicated their marital status.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| Positive | | Negative | | Neutral impact | X | Unknown Impact | |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------|---|----------------|--|

Outline the overall impact of the policy for the Public Sector Equality Duty:

- Could the proposal result in any direct/indirect discrimination for any group that shares the protected characteristics?
- Will the proposal help to advance equality of opportunity between groups who share

a protected characteristic and those who do not?

This includes:

- a) Remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons protected under the Equality Act
 - b) Take steps to meet the needs of persons protected under the Equality Act that are different from the needs of other groups
 - c) Encourage persons protected under the Equality Act to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low
- Will the proposal help to foster good relations between groups who share a protected characteristic and those who do not?

This analysis assesses impact of the pay review on the senior manager population. The Reward team have kept SLT fully informed of progress and highlighted any issues to their attention through regular communication.

The analysis of current post holders have been drawn from records held on SAP. It should be noted however, as this Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) is a public document, there are no details disclosed that could reveal an employee's identity.

Overall there is no evidence to suggest that any group will be disadvantaged by the outcomes of the Pay Review. The majority of employees under each protected characteristic received a pay award which met the standard 2% or more. The My Conversation tool has been used for all senior managers and the moderation process carried out by SLT has ensured that the process has been carried out effectively and outcomes have been challenged as part of this where appropriate. Therefore, the process to determine individual's eligibility for a pay award has been consistent, fair and robust.

6. a) What changes if any do you plan to make to your proposal as a result of the Equality Impact Assessment?

Further information on responding to identified impacts is contained within accompanying EqIA guidance

| Outcome | Y/N |
|--|-----|
| No major change to the proposal: the EqIA demonstrates the proposal is robust and there is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact. All opportunities to promote equality have been taken. <u>If you have found any inequalities or negative impacts that you are unable to mitigate, please provide a compelling reason below why you are unable to mitigate them.</u> | Y |
| Adjust the proposal: the EqIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. Adjust the proposal to remove barriers or better promote equality. Clearly <u>set out below</u> the key adjustments you plan to make to the policy. If there are any adverse impacts you cannot mitigate, please provide a compelling reason below | N |
| Stop and remove the proposal: the proposal shows actual or potential avoidable adverse impacts on different protected characteristics. The decision maker must not make this decision. | N |

6 b) Summarise the specific actions you plan to take to remove or mitigate any actual or potential negative impact and to further the aims of the Equality Duty

| Impact and which | Action | Lead officer | Timescale |
|------------------|--------|--------------|-----------|
|------------------|--------|--------------|-----------|

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------|----------------------|
| protected characteristics are impacted? | | | |
| All protected characteristics. | <i>To run a Council wide equalities data collection exercise to address the gaps in data.</i> | <i>HR</i> | <i>To be agreed.</i> |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Please outline any areas you have identified where negative impacts will happen as a result of the proposal but it is not possible to mitigate them. Please provide a complete and honest justification on why it is not possible to mitigate them.

N/A

6 c) Summarise the measures you intend to put in place to monitor the equalities impact of the proposal as it is implemented:

The My Conversation tool will continue to be used ascertain senior managers' eligibility for a pay award and the collection of data and the moderation process will continue to ensure that the Council has a robust process which determines senior manager pay awards.

7. Authorisation

EqlA approved by
(Assistant Director/ Director)

Date.....

8. Publication

Please ensure the completed EqlA is published in accordance with the Council's policy.

Please contact the Policy & Strategy Team for any feedback on the EqlA process.