

Haringey Council

Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) for Organisational Restructures

Date: March 2011
Department and service under review: Complaints and Feedback functions
Lead Officer/s and contact details: Eve Pelekanos 020 8489 2508
Contact Officer/s (Responsible for actions): Dylan Todd Ian Christie
Summary of Assessment (completed at conclusion of assessment to be used as equalities comments on council reports) It is not possible at this stage to say with absolute certainty, what the equalities composition of the new structure of Complaints and Feedback Function will be. However, we believe from our analysis of the current staff profile and the profile of the proposed ring fence that the proposal is not likely to change significantly the current equalities profile of the service. This means that it is not likely that any particular group of employees in the service (persons sharing a protected characteristic within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010) will be disproportionately affected either in terms of benefit or detriment. The full picture will be determined after the restructure has been completed and the new structure is in place and Part 2 of assessment has been completed.

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?

A report outlining plans to revise the management of complaints was presented to CEMB on 9th November 2010 and agreement was given to:

- Implement the proposed two stage complaints process
- Revise timescales for responding to complaints to 15 days for stage 1 and 25 for stage 2 – a total of 40 days end to end.
- Commission a review to centralise all complaints, Members' Enquiries, Freedom of Information (FOI), Data Protection enquiries, and information governance functions, which will be situated in the new Strategic Planning and Support Unit

Twenty-six people from across the Council have been identified to take part in the centralisation restructure, however funding to be centralised is limited to seventeen posts. ACCS have pre-agreed the deletion of one Complaints Officer post; the funding for which will not be transferred but the post holder will be included in the centralisation pool. Front Line Services in Urban Environment have put forward funding for 2.5 FTE posts from a team of 7.6 FTEs. The remaining 5.1 FTE posts are subject to One Frontline Services restructure, from which savings will be gained. In addition, there are a number of posts which currently undertake feedback and information functions but funding for which will not be centralised due to them being subject to other reviews.

Three officers currently undertaking the Records Management function for the Council have also been included as the new Feedback and Information Governance Team now has responsibility for this function.

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

The restructure is in line with the current Council approach to centralise support services where possible given the need for financial savings. A centralised service will provide better cover arrangements and improved consistency.

In addition to the restructure, it is proposed that the complaints process is reduced from three to two stages. This will lead to the end to end process being shorter by 15 days, which will benefit the complainant. It is also expected that the quality of responses at Stage 1 will improve as investigators have more time to investigate and there will be

greater management oversight. If dissatisfied the complainant will have the option to appeal for an Independent investigation.

Not only will the complainant benefit from these changes, the service managers who previously investigated stage 2's will also be freed up to have more time to manage their service.

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

There will be a review of the revised working arrangements within the first year of operation. Performance on complaints answering will continue to be monitored.

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

- 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.

Race

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

Grade Group	Total Staff in Group	No. of Race Not Declared Staff	% of Group Total	White Staff	% of Group Total	White Other staff	% of Group Total	BME Staff	% of Group Total	BME % in Council ¹	BME% Borough Profile
Sc1-5	2	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	67	
Sc6 - SO2	10	0	0	3	30%	1	13%	6	60%	57	
PO1-3	11	0	0	6	55%	1	10%	4	36%	46	
PO4-7	2	0	0	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	39	
PO8+	1	0	0	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	19	
TOTAL	26	0	0	11	42%	3	13%	12	46%	54%	49%

¹ Excludes manual grade staff

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.

Using the prescribed template, there are two groups where staff are from one racial group only, although the numbers are very low. Both staff in the grade group Scale 6 to SO2 are Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) and the one officer in grade group PO8+ is White..

BME staff are under-represented in the total pool (46%) compared to the BME Council staff profile (54%). In particular, BME staff are under-represented in grade groups PO1-3 and PO4-7 when compared to the BME Council percentages. White staff are over-represented in these grade groups.

Although the total number of posts in each grade is low, in % terms, there are two grade bands where significant disparities are identified when compared to the borough profile:

- There is significant under representation of White as a group in the Sc6-SO1 grade band (30% compared to their borough profile of 49%). BME as a group is over represented with 57% compared to their borough profile of 51%
- There is significant under representation of BME as a group within the PO1-3 grade band (36% compared to their borough profile of 51%). White as a group is over represented at 55% compared to their borough profile of 49%.

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? Yes

There is over representation of White officers in the total ring fence. Of the six officers in the ring fence for Feedback Review Team Leader post, only one (17% of the total in the ring fence) is BME, the remaining five (83%) are White. The race profile of this ring fence is reflective of the under-representation of BME as a group in the PO2-4 grade group from which the Team Leader will be drawn.

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

Potentially, the sole (1) BME officer could be displaced or the all five White officers could be displaced.

Recruitment opportunities have been maximised by ensuring the officers displaced are also eligible for the two other ring fences within their appropriate grade range elsewhere in the proposed structure.

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

With regards to BME staff, this potentially could reduce their total number in the new structure by one and White staff by five

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 %.

It is not possible to say with any degree of confidence until the restructure as been completed and the new structure has been implemented and Part 2 of the Form has been completed.

Gender

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

Grade Group	Total Staff in Group	No. Male Staff	% of Group Total	% Males in Council ²	No. Female Staff	% of Group Total	% Females in Council ³	% Females in Borough
Sc1-5	2	0	0%	32	2	100%	68	
Sc6 - SO2	11	3	27%	26	8	73%	74	
PO1-3	10	3	30%	38	7	70%	62	
PO4-7	2	0	0%	36	2	100%	64	
PO8+	1	1	100%	48	0	0%	52	
TOTAL	26	7	27%	33	19	73%	67	

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

When compared to the Council staff profile, males in the restructure pool are under-represented in all grade groups except Scale 6 – SO2 and PO8+. Females are over-represented in grade groups Scale 1-5, PO1-3 and PO4-7.

10. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on female or male staff? Yes. There is over representation of female in the total ring fence. Of the six officers in the ring fence for Feedback Review Team Leader post, only one (17% of the total in the ring fence) is male, 5 (83%) are female. The gender profile of this ring fence is reflective of the over-representation of females in the PO2-4 grade group from which the Team Leader will be drawn.

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

² Excludes manual grade staff

³ Excludes manual grade staff

Potentially, the sole male officer could be displaced or all five females could be displaced.

Recruitment opportunities have been maximised by ensuring the officers displaced are also eligible for the two other ring fences within their appropriate grade range elsewhere in the proposed structure.

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

With regards to male staff, this potentially could reduce their total number in the new structure by one and female staff by five.

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.?

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

It is not possible to say with any degree of confidence until the restructure as been completed and the new structure has been implemented and Part 2 of the Form has been completed.

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	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
Sc6 - SO2	0	0%	1	10%	4	40%	5	50%	0	0%	0	0%	10
PO1-3	0	0%	2	18%	3	27%	6	55%	0	0%	0	0%	11
PO4-7	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2
PO8+	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1
TOTAL	0	0%	4	15%	10	38%	11	42%	1	4%	0	0%	26
Council Profile ⁴	96	2	791	18	1108	25	1581	36	822	18	55	1	4453

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

There are more officers from the age groups 35-44 (13% more) and 45-54 (6% more) in the restructure pool than compared to the overall Council staff profile. There are less

⁴ Excludes manual staff

officers from the age group 55-64 (14% less) in the restructure pool than compared to the overall Council staff profile.

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

No.

- 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? N/A

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.? N/A

Final structure of proposed centralised team is still to be determined.

- If Yes, how many and what effect do they have on a particular age group? Show start and end %. N/A at this stage as the final structure of proposed centralised team is still to be determined

Disability

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

Disabled employees			
Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	Council profile
Sc1-5	0	0%	
Sc6 - SO2	0	0%	
PO1-3	0	0%	
PO4-7	0	0%	
PO8+	0	0%	
TOTAL	0	0%	7%
Borough Profile			

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

No, as there are no disabled staff in the recruitment pool.

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

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

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

At present there are no employment profiles relating to equalities characteristics of gender reassignment, religion and belief, sexual orientation and pregnancy and maternity

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.

In general, and in regard to service provision to the public, the proposal will have no effect on service offer to the public and so will have no negative impact on any persons or groups that have any of the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010. From service provision perspective therefore, the proposal have no relevance for equality. There are also no potential impact on good relations between groups in Haringey.

However, if as proposed, the complaints process is reduced from three to two stages, this will lead to the end to end process being shorter by 15 days, which will benefit the complainant. It is also expected that the quality of responses at Stage 1 will improve as investigators have more time to investigate and there will be greater management oversight. If dissatisfied the complainant will have the option to appeal for an Independent investigation.

Date Part 1 completed - 8 April 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).

Informal consultation on the proposals took place with between November 2010 and February 2011 through a series of meetings with officers providing feedback functions and their managers. Project officers also attended the Feedback Officers Group on a number of occasions to provide updates to officers.

A period of formal consultation started on 14 February 2011, initially for 28 days. This period was extended until 6 April 2011 in agreement with trade unions following the inclusion of the records management function and staff into the restructure.

A number of changes to the initial proposals were made as a result of the consultation process, the main ones are identified in response to question 2 in Step 4 below.

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?

Thus far we have received no requests for flexible working arrangements. Management's position is that any requests for flexible working will be considered in accordance with existing Council policy following 'recruit to stay'

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

A number of changes to the initial proposals have been made as a result of the consultation process. The proposed changes are as follow:

- Responsibilities for Information Governance have been amended to include records management. An additional Information Governance Officer post has been added to reflect this additional function

- Responsibilities for Feedback Response have been amended to include 'advising officers and members on procedures' and 'Petitions'
- Feedback Response Officer posts graded have been increased to SC6-PO1 (they were previously SC5-SO1)
- All Information Governance posts are now open ring fenced.
- 1 x Archivist and Records Manager and 2 x Record Managers from ACCS included in the restructure ring fence
- 1 x BLT Assistant removed from the restructure ring fence

Job Descriptions have been amended to reflect these changes.

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? Yes
5. Will the changes result in a positive/ negative impact for service delivery/ community groups – please explain how? See response to question 22 above.
6. How can you mitigate any negative impact for service users? Not applicable.

Date Steps 3 & 4 completed – 7th April 2011

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 EqlA)

NAME:
DESIGNATION:
SIGNATURE:
DATE:

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 EqlA to equalities@haringey.gov.uk; it will then be published on the council website