

Appendix F**Haringey Council**

**Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)
for Organisational Restructures**

Date: 18th March 2011
Department and service under review: Single Frontline Service
Lead Officer/s and contact details: Caroline Humphrey (x1174).
Contact Officer/s (Responsible for actions): Caroline Humphrey
Summary of Assessment (completed at conclusion of assessment to be used as equalities comments on council reports) This is a draft document and will be completed further. The document undertakes the analysis of existing staff under the relevant equality strands. The final report will come to the General Purposes Committee on the 12 th or 19 th May (date to be confirmed) and it is at this time that we will present the potential implications of the ring fencing arrangements following the expression of interest for other opportunities.

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?

This EqIA considers a restructure to create the Single Frontline Service which affects 243 members of staff in the Urban Environment Directorate. The 243 staff excludes those posts that are due to transfer over to Planning, Regeneration and Economy and those staff subject to TUPE transfer as a result of the award of the new waste contract to Veolia. The main aim of the restructure is to achieve £2.2m of savings whilst continuing to provide key frontline services, by minimising the impact on residents and other customers, ensuring that the council fulfils its statutory responsibilities.

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

The proposals set out to deliver the required savings and to minimise the impact of the Frontline Services. The key benefit is to deliver the required savings whilst protecting services as much as possible and ensuring the council fulfils its statutory responsibilities.

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

A project board sponsored by the interim Assistant Director for Frontline services is in place to manage this restructure and the associated reorganisation of services required to achieve the necessary savings. The project board is meeting weekly, and is carefully managing the necessary actions to ensure key milestones and outcomes are achieved.

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

Note – there is an Excel template that accompanies the EIA 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 HR if you cannot find it.

1. Are you closing a unit?

No, however, the restructure will result in redundancies within the services to achieve the necessary levels of savings.

Ring fencing arrangements	Total	%
Assimilation	159	65%
Early Retirement	1	0%
Open ring fence	79	33%
Voluntary Redundancy	4	2%
Grand Total	243	

At this stage (prior to consultation) Of all the staff (243) affected by the proposed changes for the new structure, 65% will be assimilated into posts, 33% will be ring fenced (open) to new posts and the remaining 2% consisting of a mixture of voluntary redundancies and early retirement.

- *If No, go to question 3.*
- *If Yes, please outline how many staff will be affected broken down by race, sex (gender), age and disability.*
- *In addition if you have information on the breakdown of your staff by the following characteristics: gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, sexual orientation; you must consider the impact on these groups.*

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

- *If Yes, identify how many by race, sex, age and disability. And where possible identify the number by gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, and sexual orientation.*

In order to protect posts which work directly with residents and traders the proposed reorganisation has focused on reducing management roles, administrative support and redesigning elements of service delivery. As a result certain roles are impacted greater than others.

DRAFT

In recognition of the financial pressures and impending service restructure the services have been holding a number of vacancies and filling key roles with agency staff as a result there are a number of opportunities for redeployment within the new service.

Table 1 below sets out the current structure posts and vacancies, both for posts and FTEs as the service has a number of part time roles.

Table 1 Current structure posts and vacancies

	Current Structure Posts	Current Structure FTE Posts	Current Structure Vacant Posts	Current Structure Vacant FTE Posts
SC1-SC5	114	98	45	43
SC6-SO2	71	71	16	15
PO1-PO3	97	96	23	23
PO4-PO7	31	31	3	3
PO8+	19	19	2	2
	332	314	89	86

Table 2 below sets out the FTE position impact by considering the number of posts to be deleted compared to the number of vacancies within the current establishment for different range grades.

Table 2 FTE posts and vacancies

	Current FTE Posts	Proposed FTE Posts	Variation	Vacancies Carried Forward
SC1-SC5	98	95	-3	39
SC6-SO2	71	53	-18	10
PO1-PO3	96	84	-12	6
PO4-PO7	31	28	-3	
PO8+	19	11	-8	
	314	270	-44	55

The total number of staff that will be affected by the deletions of posts from the existing Frontline service structure is 79. Table 3 below sets out the proposed ring fencing and assimilation by grade.

DRAFT

Table 3 Proposed assimilation and ring fencing arrangements by salary band.

Count of Ring fencing arrangements		
Salary Band	Ring fencing arrangements	Total
SC1-SC5	assimilation	71
	Open ring fence	1
	Voluntary Redundancy	1
SC1-SC5 Total		73
SC6-SO2	assimilation	35
	Open ring fence	24
	Voluntary Redundancy	1
SC6-SO2 Total		60
PO1-PO3	assimilation	40
	Open ring fence	24
	Voluntary Redundancy	2
PO1-PO3 Total		66
PO4-PO7	assimilation	12
	Early Retirement	1
	Open ring fence	14
PO4-PO7 Total		27
PO8+	assimilation	1
	Open ring fence	16
PO8+ Total		17
Grand Total		243

Table 4 shows overall indicative impact on posts within grade ranges by comparing the proposed posts with the staff being assimilated and shows the potential opportunities of the proposed new restructure.

Table 4 – Proposed structure potential available posts.

	Proposed Posts	Staff Assimilating	Posts available
SC1-SC5	111	71	40
SC6-SO2	53	35	18
PO1-PO3	85	40	45
PO4-PO7	28	12	16
PO8+	11	1	10
	288	159	129

Table 5 shows the available posts against the staff that are involved in ring fencing arrangements.

Table 5 Posts available by salary band against staff displaced by salary band.

DRAFT

	Posts available	Staff displaced	Posts available
SC1-SC5	40	1	39
SC6-SO2	18	24	-6
PO1-PO3	45	24	21
PO4-PO7	16	14	2
PO8+	10	16	-6
	129	79	50

Whilst there is not a direct correlation between the posts available and the gradings due to the bandings shown (ring fencing opportunities are limited to +/- 1 grade), a key fact is that the posts that are mostly affected are the senior roles (PO8+) and administrative roles within the SC6 to SO2 range. Inevitably there will be fewer opportunities for those on higher grades. In addition it is important to note that comparable grading in itself does not necessarily meet an appropriate match.

The majority of the existing opportunities for redeployment will be within the Traffic Management service relating to CEO's (28 x SC3) and Parking correspondence officers (4 x SC6).

The consultation is intended to run from 21st March until 6th May and it is at this time that we will have a better understanding of the impact on the different groups. The final report will come to the General Purposes Committee in May and it is at this time that we will present the potential implications of the ring fencing arrangements.

All appointments will be made following the Councils redeployment policy. In addition due to the current level of vacancies it is proposed that in addition to the outlined ring fences that staff will have an opportunity to comment on as part of the consultation. We will also provide an opportunity for an expression of interest in existing vacant posts that are within one grade of their substantive post. This will only be made available to staff that are subjected to ring fencing.

Race

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

DRAFT

Grade Group	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other		BME sub total		White		White Other		Not declared		TOTAL	BME % in Council	BME % Borough Profile
	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	STAFF		
Sc1-5	11	15%	32	44%	4	5%	3	4%	50	68%	13	18%	10	14%	0	0%	73	23.10%	
Sc6-SQ2	9	15%	25	42%	2	3%	1	2%	37	62%	12	20%	11	18%	0	0%	60	11%	
PO1-3	8	12%	23	35%	2	3%	2	3%	35	53%	22	33%	9	14%	0	0%	66	4.80%	
PO4-7	1	4%	7	26%	1	4%		0%	9	33%	15	56%	3	11%	0	0%	27	4.30%	
PO8+	0	0%	2	12%	1	6%	1	6%	4	24%	11	65%	2	12%	0	0%	17	1.10%	
TOTAL	29	12%	89	37%	10	4%	7	3%	135	56%	73	30%	35	14%	0	0%	243	44.30%	51%

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.

No grade groups are under-represented when compared to the council profile.

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?

Note this is provisional analysis and will be reviewed following the consultation feedback and analysis.

Count of Eth	Eth
--------------	-----

DRAFT

Group		Group							
Salary Band	Ring fencing arrangements	ASIAN	BLA CK	MIX ED	OTH ER	BME Total	WHI TE	WHITE OTHER	Grand Total
SC1-SC5	assimilation	11	31	4	3	49	12	10	71
	Open ring fence		1			1			1
	Voluntary Redundancy						1		1
SC1-SC5 Total		11	32	4	3	50	13	10	73
SC6-SO2	assimilation	6	16		1	23	6	6	35
	Open ring fence	3	9	2		14	6	4	24
	Voluntary Redundancy							1	1
SC6-SO2 Total		9	25	2	1	37	12	11	60
PO1-PO3	assimilation	6	17		1	24	11	5	40
	Open ring fence	2	6	2	1	11	9	4	24
	Voluntary Redundancy						2		2
PO1-PO3 Total		8	23	2	2	35	22	9	66
PO4-PO7	assimilation		5	1		6	5	1	12
	Open ring fence	1	2			3	9	2	14
	Early Retirement						1		1
PO4-PO7 Total		1	7	1		9	15	3	27
PO8+	assimilation			1		1			1
	Open ring fence		2		1	3	11	2	16
PO8+ Total			2	1	1	4	11	2	17
Grand Total		29	89	10	7	135	73	35	243

- *If No, go to question 8.*
- *If Yes, how many of these staff might be displaced?*

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

Given the available opportunities and the proposal to offer staff that are ring fenced the opportunity to have an expression of interest for posts within one grade of their substantive post it is felt that this analysis would be more appropriate once the consultation process is completed.

At this stage we believe that the individuals that are most affected are at the PO8+ level and as all staff with the exception of one are subject to ring fencing it is not deemed that this is disproportionate.

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.?

- *If Yes, how many and what effect do they have on the BME %? Show start and end %.*

As previously stated staff will be given an opportunity to have an expression of interest in other posts and also an opportunity to discuss potential voluntary redundancy and flexible working arrangements. These will be reviewed as part of the consultation.

Gender

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

Gender Analysis

Grade Group	Female		Male		TOTAL	% Females in Council	% Females in Borough
	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	STAFF		
Sc1-5	24	33%	49	67%	73	68	
Sc6-SO2	29	48%	31	52%	60	74	
PO1-3	27	41%	39	59%	66	62	
PO4-7	9	33%	18	67%	27	64	
PO8+	6	35%	11	65%	17	52	
TOTAL	95	39%	148	61%	243	67	49%

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

- Females at Sc1-5 are under-represented in the service compared to the Council.
- Males and females at Sc6-SO2 are under-represented in the service compared to the Council.
- Females at PO1-3 are under-represented in the service compared to the Council.
- Females at PO8+ are under-represented in the service compared to the Council.

10. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on impact on female or male staff?

Note this is provisional analysis and will be reviewed following the consultation feedback and analysis.

Count of Ring fencing arrangements		Gender Key		
Salary Band	Ring fencing arrangements	Female	Male	Grand Total
SC1-SC5	assimilation	23	48	71
	Open ring fence		1	1
	Voluntary Redundancy	1		1
SC1-SC5 Total		24	49	73
SC6-SO2	assimilation	15	20	35
	Open ring fence	13	11	24
	Voluntary Redundancy	1		1
SC6-SO2 Total		29	31	60
PO1-PO3	assimilation	18	22	40
	Open ring fence	8	16	24
	Voluntary Redundancy	1	1	2
PO1-PO3 Total		27	39	66
PO4-PO7	assimilation	7	5	12
	Open ring fence	2	12	14
	Early Retirement		1	1
PO4-PO7 Total		9	18	27
PO8+	assimilation		1	1
	Open ring fence	6	10	16
PO8+ Total		6	11	17
Grand Total		95	148	243

- *If No, go to question 13.*
- *If Yes, how many female / male staff might be displaced?*

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

Given the available opportunities and the proposal to offer staff that are ring fenced the opportunity to have an expression of interest for posts within one grade of their substantive post it is felt that this analysis would be more appropriate once the consultation process is completed.

At this stage we believe that the individuals that are most affected are at the PO8+ level and as all staff with the exception of one are subject to ring fencing it is not deemed that this is disproportionate.

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.?

As previously stated staff will be given an opportunity to have an expression of interest in other posts and also an opportunity to discuss potential voluntary redundancy and flexible working arrangements. These will be reviewed as part of the consultation.

- *If Yes, how many and what effect do they have on the female/male%? Show start and end %.*

Age

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

Age Analysis

Grade Group	16-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+	% of Grade Group	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	8%	
Sc1-5	2	3%	12	16%	22	30%	18	25%	13	18%	6	2%	73
Sc6-SO2	1	2%	13	22%	21	35%	16	27%	8	13%	1	2%	60
PO1-3		0%	14	21%	20	30%	21	32%	10	15%	1	0%	66
PO4-7		0%	4	15%	11	41%	8	30%	4	15%		0%	27
PO8+		0%	1	6%	4	24%	10	59%	2	12%		3%	17
TOTAL	3	1%	44	18%	78	32%	73	30%	37	15%	8		243
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.

- 16-24 are under-represented in the service compared to the Council profile.
- 65+ are over-represented in the service compared to the Council.

15. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on staff from one age group only?

Note this is provisional analysis and will be reviewed following the consultation feedback and analysis.

Count of Age Band		Age Band						Grand Total
Salary Band	Ring fencing arrangements	16<25	25<35	35<45	45<55	55<65	65+	
SC1-SC5	assimilation	2	11	22	18	12	6	71
	Open ring fence		1					1
	Voluntary Redundancy					1		1
SC1-SC5 Total		2	12	22	18	13	6	73
SC6-SO2	assimilation	1	11	11	7	4	1	35
	Open ring fence		2	10	9	3		24
	Voluntary Redundancy					1		1
SC6-SO2 Total		1	13	21	16	8	1	60
PO1-PO3	assimilation		8	12	14	6		40
	Open ring fence		6	8	7	2	1	24
	Voluntary Redundancy					2		2
PO1-PO3 Total			14	20	21	10	1	66
PO4-PO7	assimilation		1	6	4	1		12
	Open ring fence		3	5	4	2		14
	Early Retirement					1		1
PO4-PO7 Total			4	11	8	4		27
PO8+	assimilation				1			1
	Open ring fence		1	4	9	2		16
PO8+ Total			1	4	10	2		17
Grand Total		3	44	78	73	37	8	243

- *If No, go to question 18.*
- *If Yes, how many of these staff might be displaced?*

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

Given the available opportunities and the proposal to offer staff that are ring fenced the opportunity to have an expression of interest for posts within one grade of their substantive post it is felt that this analysis would be more appropriate once the consultation process is completed.

At this stage we believe that the individuals that are most affected are at the PO8+ level and as all staff with the exception of one are subject to ring fencing it is not deemed that this is disproportionate.

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.?

As previously stated staff will be given an opportunity to have an expression of interest in other posts and also an opportunity to discuss potential voluntary redundancy and flexible working arrangements. These will be reviewed as part of the consultation.

- *If Yes, how many and what effect do they have on a particular age group? Show start and end %.*

Disability

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

Grade Group	No. Disabled Staff	% of Grade Group	Council profile
Sc1-5	7	10%	7%
Sc6-SO2	5	8%	7%
PO1-3	2	3%	3%
PO4-7		0%	7%
PO8+		0%	9%
TOTAL	14	6%	7%

**19. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on disabled staff?
Note this is provisional analysis and will be reviewed following the consultation feedback and analysis.**

Count of Disability status		Disability status			
Salary Band	Ring fencing arrangements	Not declared	N	Y	Grand Total

DRAFT

SC1-SC5	assimilation	8	57	6	71
	Open ring fence		1		1
	Voluntary Redundancy			1	1
SC1-SC5 Total		8	58	7	73
SC6-SO2	assimilation	12	20	3	35
	Open ring fence	6	16	2	24
	Voluntary Redundancy		1		1
PO1-PO3	assimilation	13	26	1	40
	Open ring fence	3	20	1	24
	Voluntary Redundancy		2		2
PO1-PO3 Total		16	48	2	66
PO4-PO7	assimilation	4	8		12
	Early Retirement	1			1
	Open ring fence	3	11		14
PO4-PO7 Total		8	19		27
PO8+	assimilation		1		1
	Open ring fence	2	14		16
PO8+ Total		2	15		17
SC6-SO2 Total		18	37	5	60
Grand Total		52	177	14	243

- *If No, go to question 21.*
- *If Yes, how many of these staff might be displaced? Show start and end numbers and %.*

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.?

Given the available opportunities and the proposal to offer staff that are ring fenced the opportunity to have an expression of interest for posts within one grade of their substantive post it is felt that this analysis would be more appropriate once the consultation process is completed.

At this stage we believe that the individuals that are most affected are at the PO8+ level and as all staff with the exception of one are subject to ring fencing it is not deemed that this is disproportionate.

- *If Yes, what effect will this have on the number of disabled staff? Show start and end numbers and %.*

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

Seven women are, or will be, on maternity leave during this restructure.

“Only employees who have already commenced a period of statutory maternity or family leave and who have received their letter of dismissal due to redundancy must be offered suitable alternative employment () in preference to any other employee who is similarly affected by redundancy. A failure to do so will make any dismissal as a result of the redundancy programme automatically unfair.*

() Suitable alternative employment means the work to be done is suitable in relation to the employee and appropriate for her to do in the circumstances, and the provisions of the contract as to the capacity and place in which she is to be employed and the other terms and conditions are not substantially less favourable than they would have been if the employee had continued to be employed under the previous contract.”*

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. This will be considered as part of a separate Equalities Impact Assessment.

Date Part 1 completed - 18th March 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).

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?
2. What changes or benefits for staff have been proposed as a result of your consultation?
3. If you are not able to make changes – why not and what actions can you take?
4. Do the ringfence and selection methods you have chosen to implement your restructure follow council policy and guidance?
5. Will the changes result in a positive/ negative impact for service delivery/ community groups – please explain how?
6. How can you mitigate any negative impact for service users?

Date Steps 3 & 4 completed -

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.
2. If there are adverse impacts how will you aim to address these in the future?
3. Identify actions and timescales for implementation and go live of your new service offer.
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?
5. Identify the timescale and actions for review of the restructure to ensure it achieved the expected benefits/ outcomes.

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: Caroline Humphrey
DESIGNATION: Business Support and Development Manager
SIGNATURE:
DATE: 14th March 2011

QUALITY CHECKED BY (Equalities,)

NAME:
DESIGNATION:
SIGNATURE:
DATE:

SIGNED OFF BY Director/ Assistant Director

NAME:
DESIGNATION:
SIGNATURE:
DATE:

SIGNED OFF BY Chair Directorate Equalities Forum

NAME:
DESIGNATION:
SIGNATURE:
DATE:

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