



Special General Purposes Committee

TUESDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 2011 at 19:00 HRS - CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH ROAD,
WOOD GREEN, N22 8LE.

MEMBERS: Councillors Meehan (Chair), Khan, Waters, Whyte, Wilson, Rice (Vice-Chair) and Bloch

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (IF ANY)

2. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late reports in relation to the items shown on the agenda.

(Please note that under the Council's Constitution - Part 4 Section B paragraph 17 – no other business shall be considered).

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a personal interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest at the commencement of that consideration, or when the interest becomes apparent.

A member with a personal interest in a matter also has a prejudicial interest in that matter if the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the member's judgment of the public interest **and** if this interest affects their financial position or the financial position of a person or body as described in paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct **and/or** if it relates to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to them or any person or body described in paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct.

4. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS

To consider any requests received in accordance with Part 4, Section B, paragraph 29 of the Council's constitution.

5. PROPOSALS FOR THE DELETION OF MANAGEMENT POSTS AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE DECOMMISSIONING OF THE BUSINESS SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT BUSINESS UNIT (PAGES 1 - 30)

The committee will consider the proposals for the deletion of three posts in the current management structure for the Business Support and Development Business Unit.

6. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late reports in relation to the items shown on the agenda.

(Please note that under the Council's Constitution - Part 4 Section B paragraph 17 – no other business shall be considered).

Ken Pryor
Deputy Head of Local Democracy and
Member Services
5th Floor
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Ayshe Simsek
Principal Support Officer
Tel No: 020 8489 2929
Fax No: 0208 489 2660
Email: ayshe.simsek@haringey.gov.uk

Monday 14 February 2011



Agenda item:

[No.]**General Purposes Committee****On 22 February 2011**

Report Title: **Proposals for the deletion of management posts as a consequence of the decommissioning of the Business Support and Development business unit**

Report of: Director of Children and Young People's Service

Signed :

Peter Lewis

Contact Officer : Ian Bailey, Deputy Director, Business Support and Development

Wards(s) affected: **All**

Report for: **Non-Key decision**

1. Purpose of the report

1.1. To propose the deletion of three posts in the current management structure for the Business Support and Development (BSD) business unit.

2. State link(s) with Council Plan Priorities and actions and /or other Strategies:

2.1. The proposals in this report are designed to implement the council's budget strategy.

3. Recommendations

That Members:

- 4.1 Note that formal consultation on these proposals began on 4 January 2011 and was concluded on 4 February 2011
- 4.2 Note the comments received from staff and trades unions and the management response to these (Appendix 2).
- 4.3 Agree the proposal to delete three posts in the current management structure for the Business Support and Development (BSD) business unit.

4. Reason for recommendation(s)

4.1. The unprecedented scale of spending cuts imposed on local government means that the

Council will have around £50million less to spend on services in 2011/12 but its priority will be to protect services for the most vulnerable residents. The Council's annual general budget is approximately £245million and of this about 60% funds staff. The Council has taken measures to reduce non-staffing spend as far as possible. However, the size and timing of the cuts mean there is no alternative than to consider wholesale job reductions. In this context the Council issued a statutory notice of consultation with the trades unions on 18th November 2010 on a reduction in the workforce of more than 1,000 posts.

4.2. The attached consultation document (Appendix 1) sets out the background to this specific change and lists the posts affected.

4.3. Since the consultation was started, Cabinet has initiated formal consultation on the Re-Thinking Haringey council re-structure which will give effect to the deletion of the Business Support and Development business unit.

5. Other options considered

5.1. In view of the size of the cuts and the impact of overall organisational changes, retention of these posts was not a realistic option.

6. Summary

6.1. The Children and Young People's Service (CYPS) currently comprises four business units. From March 2011, this will reduce to two. The functions of BSD will either:

- be discontinued,
- move to another business unit in CYPS or
- be incorporated into functions located elsewhere in the council.

6.2 Two of these posts (Head of Commissioning and Business Management and Head of Administration) currently manage some of these functions. These posts will no longer be required when the functions they manage are discontinued or moved.

6.3 The third post, Special Projects Manager, supports the management of the business unit and is currently employed largely on management of a capital-funded project. This capital funding ends at 31 March 2010.

7. Chief Financial Officer Comments

7.1. The Chief Financial Officer has been consulted in the preparation of this report and comments that the savings set out are consistent with those agreed by Cabinet and are essential in achieving the budget strategy agreed by the Council.

8. Head of Legal Services Comments

8.1. The Head of Legal Services has been consulted on the contents of this report. Consultation with staff and recognised trade unions is an essential part of the responsibilities of an employer in the course of a business re-organisation. The requirement for consultation with employees and their trade union representatives is recognised within the report.

8.2. Due consideration should be given to responses received as a result of the consultation

before any final decision is reached concerning the proposals outlined. Further, due consideration must also be given to the authority's public sector equality duties before such a final decision, taking into account the outcome of the attached equality impact assessment.

8.3. The process by which the restructuring exercise is to be achieved must comply with the Council's procedures regarding organisational change. Further the position of any members of staff at risk of displacement must be considered under the Council's procedures regarding redundancy and redeployment. The criteria adopted for redundancy selection must be fair, objective and non-discriminatory.

9. Head of Procurement Comments

9.1. Not applicable

10. Equalities & Community Cohesion Comments

10.1. An Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) of the changes affecting these posts is attached as Appendix 2. This assessment considers the staffing and employment implications of this proposal. Appendix 2 also contains the Equalities Impact Screening tool, showing that the proposal does not meet the criteria for an EIA of its service implications.

10.2. The EIA assessment relates to a number of staffing changes in addition to those relating to the BSD managers addressed in this report team. Reports on the other changes will be the subject of separate reports.

11. Consultation

11.1. Informal consultation has included team meetings at which the proposals were explained to staff.

11.2. Formal consultation took place between 4 January 2011 and 4 February 2011. Further meetings with staff and unions were held during this period.

11.3. Appendix 3 sets out the comments raised during the consultation and the management response to these.

12. Use of appendices /Tables and photographs

12.1. Appendix 1: Consultation Document

12.2. Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment

12.3. Appendix 3: Comments received during consultation, with management responses.

13. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Not applicable



Appendix 1

CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

Proposals for the deletion of management posts as a consequence of the decommissioning of the Business Support and Development business unit.

Date: 4th January 2011

1. Introduction

The effect of the proposals outlined in this consultation is to delete three posts in the current management structure for the Business Support and Development (BSD) business unit. BSD will cease to exist from March 2011 (this is the subject of a separate consultation).

The staff concerned are all based at 48 Station Rd.

A copy of these proposals will be provided to all affected members of staff and the relevant recognised trade unions as part of the consultation process. Formal written responses from all affected staff and the trade unions including any counter-proposals or concerns around the proposal from individual or groups of affected staff should be sent to Ian Bailey, Deputy Director, BSD by 4th February 2011.

Staff affected by these proposals will have the opportunity to meet with their line manager and/or with Ian Bailey during the consultation period. If they wish, they may be accompanied by their Trade Union representative.

Subject to the results of the consultation and the consideration of counter-proposals, it is intended to formally ratify the proposals by 15th February 2011 with full implementation of the proposals involving deletion of posts by no later than 31 March 2011.

2. Background – The Need for Change

The unprecedented scale of spending cuts imposed on local government means that the Council will have around £50million less to spend on services in 2011/12 but its priority will be to protect services for the most vulnerable residents. The Council's annual general budget is approximately £245million and of this about 60% funds staff. The Council has taken measures to reduce non-staffing spend as far as possible. However, the size and timing of the cuts mean there is no alternative than to consider wholesale job reductions. In this context the Council issued statutory notice on 18th November 2010 on a reduction in the workforce of more than 1,000 posts. The information in this document contains more details of the proposed workforce reduction.

The Children and Young People's Service (CYPS) currently comprises four business units. From March 2011, this will reduce to two. The functions of BSD will either:

- be discontinued,
- move to another business unit in CYPS or
- be incorporated into functions located elsewhere in the council.

Two of these posts (Head of Commissioning and Business Support and Head of Administration) currently manage some of these functions. These posts will no longer be required when the functions they manage are discontinued or moved.

The third post, Special Projects Manager, supports the management of the business unit and is currently employed largely on management of a capital-funded project. This capital funding also ends at 31 March 2010.

3. Purpose of Consultation

The purpose of this consultation is:

- to listen to staff and trade union comments and suggestions;
- to consider alternatives that meet the identified objectives;
- to find possible ways of avoiding or reducing redundancies.

4. The Objectives of this Consultation

The objectives of this consultation are:

- to achieve savings of £164,000.
- to avoid unbudgeted expenditure of £45,000.

5. Staffing implications from these proposals

As a result of the requirement to find savings the following posts are proposed for deletion/review.

Title	Grade
Head of Commissioning and Business Management	SM4
Head of Administration	PO5
Special Projects Officer	PO3

6. Proposed Implementation Timetable

During the consultation and implementation we will take steps to ensure that members of staff are dealt with fairly and consistently and to minimise uncertainty for all concerned.

The proposed timetable is outlined below:

Dates	Action
-------	--------

4 th January 2011	Consultation pack (this document) issued to affected staff and Trades Unions.
4 th January to 4 th February 2011	Individual meetings with staff
4 th January to 4 th February 2011	Consultation meeting with TUs
4 th January to 4 th February 2011	Consultation meeting with staff + TUs
4 th February 2011	End of consultation period. Final submission for written responses from staff/TUs
9 th February 2011	Management response to comments/counter proposals.
15 th February 2011	Formal ratification of proposals. Staff advised. Commencement of implementation of the proposals.
18 th February 2011	Displaced employees referred to corporate redeployment pool
18 th February 2011	Commencement of formal redeployment period and issue of notices of redundancy.
31 st March 2011	Latest effective date for full implementation of new structure.

9. Redundancy Notices

Under these proposals the earliest date of issue of redundancy notices would be 18th February 2011 with no dismissals taking effect before 22 February 2011. Every effort will be made to minimise dismissals on the grounds of redundancy through the measures detailed in the following paragraphs.

10. Voluntary Redundancy

To facilitate staff reductions the Chief Executive has written to all Council employees asking them to put themselves forward if they are interested in volunteering to take redundancy/early retirement. Applications were to be submitted by 31 December 2010.

11. Opportunities with CYPS

It is proposed that affected staff will be considered for suitable alternative opportunities within CYPS, including vacant posts/posts being covered by agency workers, during the consultation period.

12. Formal Redeployment

Following a change to the redeployment policy agreed by General Purposes Sub Committee on 28 October 2010, the formal period for redeployment now runs concurrently with an employee's notice period. Whilst the Council is committed to the principle of trying to redeploy

staff facing redundancy into suitable alternative posts in the current financial situation opportunities are likely to be limited. HR will circulate any vacancies and staff are also encouraged to identify to HR any posts they feel may offer suitable alternative employment, this may include temporary posts and assignments as well as permanent posts.

13. Provision for Trial Periods

If employees are redeployed into an alternative position, they may feel uncertain about whether the post will be suitable for them and vice versa. The Council operates an 8 week trial period, commencing from the date of appointment to the new post and incorporating the statutory trial period of four weeks. The 8 week period may be extended by agreement by all parties.

The trial period will allow time for the redeployee to assess the suitability of the new post and for their suitability to be assessed by their new manager. During this time, should the employee or the Council decide on reasonable grounds that the post is not suitable, then redundancy provisions as outlined below will apply. During the trial period, support and training as appropriate will be made available to the redeployee.

14. Redundancy

If an employee's post is deleted under the proposals and s/he is not appointed to another post or redeployed elsewhere, s/he will be dismissed, with notice, on the grounds of redundancy. Redundancy pay will be based on the terms outlined in the Council's Redundancy and Compensation Payments, details of which are available on Harinet together with a redundancy calculator.

15. Support

The Council is running a series of workshops to support staff during this change period including careers advice and assistance with applying for jobs. Details of these can be found on Harinet, 'Support', as well as Frequently Asked Questions and other useful information/links.

Ian Bailey
Deputy Director, BSD
4th January 2011

Haringey Council

Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) for Organisational Restructures

Date: 25/01/2011 (updated 10/02/2011)

Department and service under review:

Children & Young People's Service, Business Support & Development – back-office functions

Lead Officer/s and contact details:

Ian Bailey
ian.bailey@haringey.gov.uk
 020 8489 2450

Contact Officer/s (Responsible for actions):

Ian Bailey
ian.bailey@haringey.gov.uk
 020 8489 2450

Summary of Assessment (completed at conclusion of assessment to be used as equalities comments on council reports)

This assessment considers the impact on staff of three restructuring proposals within the Business Support & Development business unit in relation to the protected equalities groups of ethnicity, gender, age and disability. It does not consider issues relating to sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, and religion or belief, as the relevant data is not available for these groups.

Ethnicity – relative to the council profile, there is an overrepresentation of White Other, an underrepresentation of White UK, and a broadly proportionate representation of BME staff.

Gender - Overall, the percentage of staff involved in this review who are female is broadly similar to the council profile

Age - Overall, the affected staff have a broadly similar age profile to the council profile.

Disability – none of the affected staff have declared that they are disabled.

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.

PART 1
TO BE COMPLETED DURING THE EARLY STAGES OF CONSULTATION WITH STAFF/ UNIONS ON THE STRUCTURE

Step 1 – Aims and Objectives

1. Purpose – What is the main aim of the proposed/new or change to the existing service?

As part of the savings the council is required to make as a result of government spending cuts, a number of staffing restructures are being proposed. This document relates to three savings proposals where the savings are being made to back-office functions within the Business Support & Development business unit of the Children & Young People's Service, which will not have a direct, measurable impact on the public.

The proposals follow on from the decision to disband the Business Support & Development business unit, with its functions either transferring elsewhere within C&YPS, to other parts of the council, or being discontinued. The proposals are as follows:

1. The deletion of 3 management posts resulting from the breaking up of the BS&D BU.
2. The reduction of PAs to C&YPS senior management from 6 to 3 posts – again linked to the breaking up of the BS&D BU and the wider C&YPS restructuring.
3. The discontinuation of the Education ICT support team. This team provides a traded ICT support service to schools. It is however also supported by council core funding and also by the Harnessing Technology Grant, which is coming to an end. The most likely outcome of continuing trading is that the service would operate at a substantial loss. Under current circumstances the council cannot bear such a risk. Schools will therefore need to purchase any IT support needed from external providers in future.

2. What are the main benefits and outcomes you hope to achieve?

The main benefit of the restructure will be a reduction in the cost of management, administrative and support functions, enabling resources to be prioritised on front-line service delivery.

3. How will you ensure that the benefits/ outcomes are achieved?

This restructure will reduce the number of staff and thereby achieve the intended cost saving.

Step 2 – Current Workforce Information & Likely Impact of your proposals

1. Are you closing a unit?

In the case of (1) and (3) above the proposal involves the deletion of all posts affected. In the case of (2), the proposal is reduce the number of posts from 6 to 3.

2. Can any staff be accommodated elsewhere within the service, business unit or directorate?

As a number of restructures are taking place concurrently, the scope for accommodating affected staff elsewhere in the business unit is limited. Efforts are in train to help the ICT team find opportunities with another provider or with schools.

Race

3. Provide a breakdown of the current service by Grade Group and Racial Group following the format below.

Grade Group	Total Staff	Not declared		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other		BME sub total		White		White Other		BME % in group	BME % in Council
		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	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group		
Sc1-5	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	23.10%
Sc6-SO2	8	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	6	75.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	31.6%	11.00%
PO1-3	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	2	40.0%	2	40.0%	5.3%	4.80%
PO4-7	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	5.3%	4.30%
PO8+	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	5.3%	1.10%
TOTAL	19	0	0.0%	3	15.8%	3	15.8%	1	5.3%	2	10.5%	9	47.4%	4	21.1%	6	31.6%	47.4%	44.30%

Grade Group	Total Staff	% Grade Group	% in Council
Sc1-5	0	0.0%	45.1%
Sc6-SO2	8	42.1%	25.0%
PO1-3	5	26.3%	11.2%
PO4-7	3	15.8%	13.2%
PO8+	3	15.8%	5.5%
TOTAL	19	100.0%	100%

4. Highlight any grade groups that are very under represented (10% or more difference) compared with the council profile and where relevant the borough profile.

There is a 10% or more difference between the affected staff and the council profile for all grade groups with the exception of PO4-7. Overall, the staff affected by these proposals are at higher grades than the typical council distribution – 57.9% of affected staff are at PO1 or above, compared to 29.9% of staff across the council.

Appendix 2

The percentage of staff affected by this review who are of Black & Minority Ethnic origin is broadly similar to the overall council profile – 47.4% compared to 44.3%. Of the 9 BME staff, 6 are in the grade group Sc6-SO2.

Compared to the overall council profile, there is an overrepresentation of White Other staff (31.6% compared to 17.6%) and an under-representation of White UK staff (21.1% compared to 34.5%).

5. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on staff from one ethnic minority group (white, white other, asian, black, mixed race) or Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) staff only? If Yes, how many of these staff might be displaced?

The only ring fence involved in these proposals relates to the PA posts. This involves 3 White, 2 White Other, and 1 BME staff member applying for 3 posts. 3 out of these 6 staff will therefore be displaced.

6. By how much does these staff change the % (percentage) of BME staff in the structure? Show start and end %.

Currently 47.4% of the staff in the structure are BME. According to these proposals the only remaining positions will be 3 PA posts. The interviews for these posts have yet to take place. Depending on whether the 1 BME staff member is successful at interview, the percentage will change to either 33.3% (1 of the 3 remaining staff) or 0%.

7. Can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.?

In the case of the proposals relating to management savings and the closure of the Education ICT service, there is no new structure which could be amended as these are unit closures. Where posts can be matched to more than one staff member under ring-fencing, as is the case with the PA posts, staff will be subject to a competitive interview process conducted in line with the Council's Equal Opportunities Policy.

It is also proposed that affected staff will be considered for any suitable alternative opportunities within CYPS during the consultation period. The formal redeployment period runs concurrently with an employee's notice period, during which the Council is committed to trying to redeploy staff facing redundancy into suitable alternative posts, however in the current financial situation, opportunities are likely to be limited.

Gender

8. Provide a breakdown of the current organisation by Grade Group and Gender breakdown following the format below

Grade Group	TOTAL STAFF	Male		Female			
		No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	% Females in Council	% Females in Borough
Sc1-5	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	78.9%	
Sc6-SO2	8	4	50.0%	4	50.0%	73.8%	
PO1-3	5	1	20.0%	4	80.0%	68.2%	
PO4-7	3	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	71.5%	
PO8+	3	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	59.9%	
TOTAL	19	6	31.6%	13	68.4%	74.4%	49.8%

9. Highlight any grade groups that are very under represented (10% or more difference) compared to the % of females/males in the council.

Overall, the percentage of staff involved in this review who are female is broadly similar to the council profile – 68.4% compared to 74.4%. The relatively small size of the affected group means that drawing conclusions from the grade group level is not necessarily helpful.

10. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on female or male staff? If Yes, how many of these staff might be displaced?

The only ringfence relates to 6 female staff, 3 of whom will be displaced. The other 13 staff involved (6 male, 7 female) will not have a position in the future structure.

11. By how much do these staff change the % (percentage) of female/male staff in the whole structure? Show start and end %.

Current % of female staff is 68.4%. The future structure will be staffed by 100% female staff, as the recruitment method is closed ring fence.

12. Can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.?

In the case of the proposals relating to management savings and the closure of the Education ICT service, there is no new structure which could be amended as these are unit closures. Where posts can be matched to more than one staff member under ringfencing, as is the case with the PA posts, staff will be subject to a competitive interview process conducted in line with the Council's Equal Opportunities Policy.

It is also proposed that affected staff will be considered for any suitable alternative opportunities within CYPS during the consultation period. The formal redeployment period runs concurrently with an employee's notice period, during which the Council is committed to trying to redeploy staff facing redundancy into suitable alternative posts, however in the current financial situation, opportunities are likely to be limited.

Age**13. Provide a breakdown of the current organisation by Grade Group and Age breakdown following the format below**

	16-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+		TOTAL
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	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	STAFF
Sc1-5	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
Sc6-SO2	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	3	37.5%	2	25.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	8
PO1-3	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
PO4-7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	3
PO8+	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	3
TOTAL	0	0.0%	5	26.3%	5	26.3%	5	26.3%	4	21.1%	0	0.0%	19
Council Profile	3.80%		20.30%		26.80%		32.40%		15.50%		1.20%		
Borough Profile	13.90%		26.60%		22.80%		15.50%		9.50%		11.70%		

14. Highlight any grade groups with a high level of staff from a particular age group compared to the compared to the council profile.

Overall, the affected staff have a broadly similar age profile to the council profile.

15. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on staff from one age group only? If Yes, how many of these staff might be displaced?

The only ring fence does not disproportionately impact on a particular age group.

16. Does the displacement of these staff result in no representation of staff from a particular age group within the structure as a whole?

Following the implementation of these proposals there will only be 3 posts remaining, hence there will inevitably be some age groups that are not represented in the future structure.

17. If Yes, can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.?

In the case of the proposals relating to management savings and the closure of the Education ICT service, there is no new structure which could be amended as these are unit closures. Where posts can be matched to more than one staff member under

ringfencing, as is the case with the PA posts, staff will be subject to a competitive interview process conducted in line with the Council’s Equal Opportunities Policy.

It is also proposed that affected staff will be considered for any suitable alternative opportunities within CYPS during the consultation period. The formal redeployment period runs concurrently with an employee’s notice period, during which the Council is committed to trying to redeploy staff facing redundancy into suitable alternative posts, however in the current financial situation, opportunities are likely to be limited.

Disability

18. Identify the total number of disabled staff in the service following the format below:

Disabled employees						
Grade Group	TOTAL STAFF	No. declared disabled Staff	No. staff declared not disabled	No. staff disability not stated	% of Service declared disabled	Council profile
Sc1-5	0	0	0	0	0%	1.8%
Sc6 - SO2	8	0	4	4	0%	1.3%
PO1-3	5	0	3	2	0%	0.6%
PO4-7	3	0	1	2	0%	0.6%
PO8+	3	0	2	1	0%	0.1%
TOTAL	19	0	10	9	0%	4.5%
Borough Profile						7.6%

19. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on disabled staff?

None of the staff affected by these proposals have declared a disability.

20. Can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.?

N/A

21. In addition to the above analysis of race, sex, age and disability you will need to consider the impact on groups with the following characteristics: gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, sexual orientation. Please ask HR for help with the data on:

- Gender Reassignment

- Religion/ Belief
- Sexual Orientation
- Maternity & Pregnancy

HR do not collect data on these groups.

22. If you provide services to residents please also identify the potential impact/ issues relating to the change in service delivery as a result of your proposals.

N/A

Date Part 1 completed - 07/01/2011

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

Step 3 – Consultation

Outline below the consultation process you undertook, what issues were raised (especially any relating to the eight equalities characteristics).

Education ICT Support

Formal consultation with staff and unions on the closure of the Education ICT support service commenced on 13th December 2010 and was completed on 21st January 2011. A number of issues were raised and are detailed alongside the management response in Appendix 3 of the report to the General Purposes Committee meeting of 7th February 2011.

For the most part, the issues raised did not relate to the eight equalities characteristics, with the exception of the following comment from UNISON:

To the best of UNISON's knowledge Single Status has not been completed on any of these posts. Since the current proposal is for deletion of the entire service this leaves open the possibility that employees within the service may not have been receiving equal pay in accordance with the agreement. In addition Staff could potentially have claims for breach of contract since the agreement was incorporated into their contract when the agreement was adopted. We would request that in order to avoid such possibilities that posts are evaluated under the GLPC scheme in advance of any deletions being effected.

The management response was as follows:

Agreed. The posts will be evaluated.

C&YPS Admin & Business Support

Formal consultation with staff and unions on the reduction of PA posts to C&YPS senior management commenced on 23rd December 2010 and was completed on 28th January 2011. A number of issues were raised and are detailed alongside the management response in Appendix 3 of the report to the General Purposes Committee meeting of 15th February 2011. None of the issues raised related to the equalities strands.

Business Support & Development Unit Closure

Formal consultation with staff and unions on the staffing reductions associated with the closure of the BS&D business unit commenced on 4th January 2011 and was completed on 4th February 2011. A number of issues were raised and are detailed alongside the management response in Appendix 3 of the report to the General Purposes Committee meeting of 22nd February 2011. None of the issues raised related to the equalities strands.

Step 4 – Address the Impact

- 1. Are you in a position to make changes to the proposals to reduce the impact on the protected groups e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc. - please specify?**

No

- 2. What changes or benefits for staff have been proposed as a result of your consultation?**

With regards to the proposed closure of the Education ICT support service please see Appendix 3 of the report to the General Purposes Committee meeting of 7th February 2011.

With regards to the proposed reduction of PA posts to C&YPS senior management please see Appendix 3 of the report to the General Purposes Committee meeting of 15th February 2011.

With regards to the proposed the staffing reductions associated with the closure of the BS&D business unit please see Appendix 3 of the report to the General Purposes Committee meeting of 22nd February 2011.

- 3. If you are not able to make changes – why not and what actions can you take?**
N/A
- 4. Do the ringfence and selection methods you have chosen to implement your restructure follow council policy and guidance?**
Yes
- 5. Will the changes result in a positive/ negative impact for service delivery/ community groups – please explain how?**
The changes proposed in this document will not have a direct impact on front-line service delivery to residents.
- 6. How can you mitigate any negative impact for service users?**
N/A

Date Steps 3 & 4 completed – 26/01/11 (updated 10/02/11)

Step 5 – Implementation and Review

- 1. Following the selection processes and appointment to your new structure are there any adverse impacts on any of the protected groups (the eight equalities characteristics). Please identify these.**

Implementation of the proposals considered in this document will lead to the loss of 16 of the 19 affected staff (opportunities for redeployment notwithstanding).

- 2. If there are adverse impacts how will you aim to address these in the future?**

It is proposed that affected staff will be considered for any suitable alternative opportunities within CYPS during the consultation period. The formal redeployment period runs concurrently with an employee's notice period, during which the Council is committed to trying to redeploy staff facing redundancy into suitable alternative posts, however in the current financial situation, opportunities are likely to be limited.

- 3. Identify actions and timescales for implementation and go live of your new service offer.**

In the case of the closure of the Education ICT service and the savings in management costs resulting from the disbanding of the Business Support & Development business unit, there is no new service offer to be implemented.

With regards to the proposal to reduce PA posts, it is anticipated that recruitment to the remaining 3 posts will be completed by 2nd March 2011.

- 4. If you are not in a position to go ahead on elements of your action plan – why not and what actions are you going to take?**

At this stage we have no reason to presume that we will not be able to implement these proposals. Any alternative course of action proposed would depend on the nature of the barrier that presents itself.

- 5. Identify the timescale and actions for review of the restructure to ensure it achieved the expected benefits/ outcomes.**

The main benefit of the restructure will be a reduction in the cost of management, administrative and support functions, enabling resources to be prioritised on front-line service delivery. This will be achieved through the issuing of redundancy of relevant staff.

With regards to the PA posts, senior managers will monitor the workload of the remaining staff to ensure there is adequate capacity.

Step 6 – 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.

COMPLETED BY (Contact Officer Responsible for undertaking this EqIA)

NAME: Ian Bailey
 DESIGNATION: Deputy Director, Business Support & Development
 SIGNATURE:
 DATE: 26/01/2011

QUALITY CHECKED BY (Equalities,)

NAME: Arleen Brown
 DESIGNATION:
 SIGNATURE:
 DATE: 26/01/2011

SIGNED OFF BY Director/ Assistant Director

NAME: Ian Bailey
 DESIGNATION: Deputy Director, Business Support & Development
 SIGNATURE:
 DATE: 26/01/2011

SIGNED OFF BY Chair Directorate Equalities Forum

NAME: Ian Bailey
 DESIGNATION: Deputy Director, Business Support & Development
 SIGNATURE:
 DATE: 26/01/2011

Note - Send an electronic copy of the EqIA to equalities@haringey.gov.uk; it will then be published on the council website



Equalities Impact Assessments Screening Tool Guidance

The Council understands that a pragmatic approach to undertaking Equalities Impact Assessments (EqIA) is essential and that some policies, projects, functions or major developments/planning applications are more relevant to and have a greater impact on equality and diversity than others.

Because of this we have developed this screening tool to help officers to identify:

- the relevance of each policy, project, function or major development/planning application to equality
- whether an EqIA should be undertaken

The screening process must be used on ALL new policies, projects, functions, staff restructurings, major developments or planning applications, or when revising them. It should also be used to help identify existing policies or projects that should be subject to an assessment. An EqIA is a thorough and systematic analysis and should ensure that we give due regard to the effect the actions we take as an organisation could have on residents, customers and staff, in the delivery of services and employment practices.

Equality Impact Assessments are intended to:

- encourage a more proactive approach to the promotion of equality within public policy development
- identify any adverse equalities impact and detail actions to reduce this impact
- detail positive equalities impacts

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 all of questions below are no you do not need to undertake an EqIA, however you will need to provide a detailed explanation for this decision in the last column.**

In either case, please submit the e-form to equalities@haringey.gov.uk and include the explanation as part of the Equalities comments on any subsequent related report.

Equalities Impact Assessments (EqIA) Screening Tool	
2.	Name of the policy/project/function/major development/planning application: Staffing Restructure – C&YPS back-office functions
3.	<p>Brief summary of the above: (include main aims and proposed outcomes)</p> <p>As part of the savings the council is required to make as a result of government spending cuts, a number of staffing restructures are being proposed. This document relates to three savings proposals where the savings are being made to back-office functions within the Business Support & Development business unit of the Children & Young People’s Service, which will not have a direct, measurable impact on the public. The proposals flow from the fact that this business unit is being disbanded, with its functions either transferring elsewhere within C&YPS, to other parts of the council, or being discontinued. The proposals are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The deletion of 3 management posts resulting from the breaking up of the BS&D BU. 2. The reduction of PAs to C&YPS senior management from 6 to 3 posts – again linked to the breaking up of the BS&D BU and the wider C&YPS restructuring. 3. The discontinuation of the Education ICT support team. This team provides a traded ICT support service to schools. It is however also supported by council core funding and also by the Harnessing Technology Grant, which is coming to an end. The most likely outcome of continuing trading is that the service would operate at a substantial loss. Under current circumstances the council cannot bear such a risk. Schools will therefore need to purchase any IT support needed from external providers in future. <p>A staffing EqIA will be carried out to address the equalities impacts of the employment implications of these proposals.</p>
4.	<p>Lead Officer contact details: (name, job title, email, phone no.)</p> <p>Ian Bailey Deputy Director, Business Support & Development, C&YPS ian.bailey@haringey.gov.uk 020 8489 2450</p>

Equalities Impact Assessments (EqIA) Screening Tool

5.	Date: 25/01/2011			
	Response to Screening Questions	Yes	No	Please explain your answer. If answering YES but after consideration a full EqIA is not necessary please provide a detailed explanation¹ for NOT undertaking a full EqIA
6.	Could the proposed policy/project/function/staff restructuring/major development/planning application or the way it is carried out have an adverse impact on any of the key equalities protected characteristics age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation? Or relations between any equalities groups?	X		<p>These savings proposals relate to back-office functions – the staff are not involved in direct service delivery to the public. The proposals will not have any equalities impact for the general public and therefore a ‘service delivery EqIA is not necessary.</p> <p>A staffing EqIA will be carried out to address the equalities impacts of the employment implications of these proposals.</p>
7.	Is there any indication or evidence (including from consultation with relevant groups) that different groups have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to the particular policy/project/function/major development/planning application? Or do you need more information?	X		See above
8.	If there is or will be an adverse impact, could it be reduced by taking particular measures?	X		See above
9.	By taking particular measures could a positive impact result?	X		See above
10.	As a result of this screening is a full EqIA necessary?	X		A staffing restructure EqIA will be carried out.

¹NB This explanation **MUST** be included in the Equalities comments in all subsequent reports relating to this issue.

Appendix 3

Trade Union comments on BSD Managers proposals	Response
<p>Whilst we understand the need to make substantial savings, the deletion of the BSD Business Unit is clearly only about saving money with no other strategy or rationale/justification outlined. This is particularly the case with the deletion of the Head of CBM post, where many of the services it manages are statutory. Two of these – Catering and Transport – are merely moving from being under the Head of CBM post to the new post of Head of Direct Services within the Directorate of Place and Sustainability. As consultation on the “Rethinking Haringey” paper is ongoing it is unclear to what extent this post will provide a redeployment or slot in option for the post holder? Also, there is a Head of Commissioning post within this directorate – what will that cover and what level will that be?</p> <p>Additionally, what is the knowledge and track record of the Place and Sustainability Directorate to deliver passenger transport and catering services, and of generally working with Schools and Head teachers as these services do?</p>	<p>We have at no point denied that this proposal is intended to save money. Given the council’s overall budget settlement, many difficult decision are being made with that as the main objective.</p> <p>As the consultation process progresses there will be time and opportunity to assess whether the current Head of CBM will be eligible for ring-fencing to any post in the new Place and Sustainability Directorate.</p> <p>The existing management of the passenger transport and catering team will transfer and it is these managers who will continue to work with schools and head teachers. More than ever before the new leaner council will need to break down ‘silos’ between directorates and on more strategic educational issues relating to these services the appropriate leads within CYPS will continue to play their existing roles.</p>
<p>In reality the savings cited as a justification are not as great as may first appear since the Council proposal creates a new post to manage the Operations Manager (Passenger Transport) who will be at SM1. As the new post-holder will only be managing two departments in comparison to the five managed by CBM this is not in reality a saving.</p>	<p>There is a significant reduction in third tier posts in Place and Sustainability (compared to the current Urban Environment), so overall there will be a saving.</p>

Trade Union comments on BSD Managers proposals	Response
<p>The Head of Commissioning and Business Management post, currently manages/oversees the work of other commissioning staff, none of whom are mentioned in the new CYPS structure. The Commissioning and Contracts/External Funding team is in an interim structure situation, and people are working outside their JDs for operational reasons, due to staff shortages. The team has traditionally been under resourced, so any reductions in staffing levels will lead to further hardship, disillusionment etc and will mean that things will not be commissioned in time and to best effect, to deliver the work programme for the CYPS. Although part of this work may be taken into the procurement SFR it is not clear where the remainder (and for that matter the individuals who perform it) will they fit.</p> <p>We are unclear in particular where L F's post will sit post the disestablishment of BSD as she performs as a senior level (SM1) and therefore appears to be more vulnerable.</p>	<p>All other staff in Commissioning and Contracts / External Funding are in scope for the corporate support functions review of procurement. This includes LF.</p>
<p>Decommissioning of the unit should not necessarily have led to the deletion of the CBM post, without there having been a review of where we are and where we need to be as a Council in commissioning terms. There are posts with commissioning in their titles within the new Council structure, but there is no co-ordination of their work and they may not all be commissioners in the defined sense, with the exception of the post in Adult Services. If we are not careful, we will end up just procuring/purchasing things, and not meeting population needs.</p>	<p>Without the pressures created by the government's front-loaded cuts, many areas affected by savings proposals would have been subject to more lengthy strategic review. However, in the case of CYPS commissioning, the directorate has recently operated without the Head of CBM for over nine months and the commissioning responsibilities have been borne by the relevant service managers. This will continue and in the new leaner CYPS, the day-to-day leadership of commissioning will reside with the joint management team of the two new business units.</p>
<p>Commissioning is heavily underlined in the Rethinking</p>	<p>Responsibility for the management of the JSNA now</p>

Trade Union comments on BSD Managers proposals	Response
<p>Haringey Paper. Section 8 (page 10), talks of establishing a Council which “commissions and designs services based on a robust understanding of its population” as well as one which is focussed on outcomes and on customers. However, we cannot see how this will be done without either a review of commissioning or any apparent desire to establish any centralised commissioning unit. There is only a review of procurement across the Council, which explicitly excluded the commissioning process. If there is to be a uniform approach to the VCS and others, then there should be a strategy and systems in place across the Council. There is neither mention of a commissioning strategy, nor any memorandum of understanding with our partners. What about joint commissioning – there is no mention of this and the efficiencies that it can bring.</p> <p>There is also the statutory duty to develop and deliver the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment - unless we can gauge population needs and ensure that we are meeting them by effective commissioning, we will neither achieve quality nor VFM. We need a strategic overview across the Children’s Trust, to deliver the any commissioning strategy, joint commissioning intentions and to implement the governance arrangements across the Children’s Trust?</p> <p>Section 11 (Page 11) talks about “building up a strategic commissioning approach to service delivery” and later to “explore alternative models of service delivery, such as trusts, social enterprises or private partnerships”. The DfE’s Commissioning Support Programme has developed materials which can assist Councils in developing strategies</p>	<p>resides, following the implemented support functions review of policy and performance, with the new corporate Policy and Performance team.</p> <p>Regarding the other elements of commissioning strategy for CYPS, that is covered in our response to the previous questions, above.</p>

Trade Union comments on BSD Managers proposals	Response
<p>to create efficiencies, using some of the above mentioned models, but as stated above, this approach needs to be co-ordinated and strategic, to be effective.</p> <p>Who will commission all Children's Services provision? There are commissioning posts in all other relevant departments, yet we are getting rid of one of the most senior commissioning posts, that of the Head of CBM, and have not even shown where commissioning sits in the new CYPS structure. The current Head of Commissioning and Placements posts only commissions Looked After Children's Placements, but does not have any responsibility for commissioning all remaining children's services. This is a gap which cannot be met by the deletion of these commissioning posts. In other words, this work still has to be done, but it is not clear who will do it when contracts come to an end or when new monies are allocated which need to be commissioned.</p>	
<p>The effective date of the new arrangements is proposed as 31.3.11 yet the notice/redundancy period will run for 3 months from 18th February when the redundancy notices are issued, so what will happen between 1st April and 18th May 2011?</p>	<p>We will ask the postholders on notice to help the transition to the new arrangements and to work on other projects in support of overall changes. They will also be supported to seek redeployment and in seeking other job opportunities.</p>
<p>Additional training and support is needed for Head of CBM – so as to maximise her future prospects, for example she has indicated to me she would like to have a Prince 2 Project Management course funded as jobs at this level elsewhere are likely to require this qualification. Such development is</p>	<p>We will discuss this with the Director of CYPS and the Head of CBM.</p>

Trade Union comments on BSD Managers proposals	Response
<p>increased in importance as she has also been away from work for some time.</p>	
<p>We understand the rationale for the Head of Administration and Special Projects Officer posts being deleted, as many of their responsibilities have changed, but would again re-iterate that these are valued members of staff, whom we are aware are keen to be redeployed if possible.</p> <p>In particular we would wish posts within the CYPS Directorate to be carefully considered at this point and in advance of the formal redeployment period being commenced. We are conscious that both Employees have skills which are very transferable and which should be retained as far as is possible.</p>	<p>We intend to do this.</p>