



Agenda item:

[No.]

General Purposes Committee

On 19 May 2011

Report Title. Completed Equalities Impact Assessment to be considered following agreement of the - HR Review on 29.03.2011

Report of Assistant Chief Executive

Signed :

Contact Officer : Steve Davies, Head of Human Resources – 020 8489 3172

Wards(s) affected: **[All / Some (Specify)]**

Report for: **[Key / Non-Key Decision]**

1. Purpose of the report

- 1.1. To consider the Equalities Impact Assessment arising out of the restructure of the council's Human Resources service in order to meet a council approved level of savings of £822k in 2011/12.

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

- 2.1. The service are responsible for supporting and helping to deliver the following priorities and strategies
- Council's People Strategy.
 - Management of the Voluntary Redundancy scheme and Redeployment scheme
 - Supporting service and directorate reviews across the council

3. Recommendations

3.1. The committee notes the attached Equalities Impact Assessment at Appendix A.

4. Reason for recommendation(s)

4.1. The coalition government's policy agenda combined with reduced levels of funding mean that the council has to fundamentally rethink services. The range and type of services that HR provides are those that any good large employer provides. It is unrealistic to expect that any of the HR services can be stopped. However, given that the council will employ less staff directly there is a need to reduce the service level and at the same time achieve additional efficiencies.

5. Other options considered

5.1. The HR restructure provides the most realistic option for service delivery at this point in time for the benefit of the council.

6. Summary

6.1. This committee approved the proposals to review the Human Resources service on 29 March 2011. This report provides the completed Equalities Impact Assessment which was only partially complete at 29 March 2011 due to consultation and committee report timescales at that time.

6.2. Outlined in Appendix A is the full Equalities Impact Assessment.

7. Chief Financial Officer Comments

7.1. The Chief Financial Officer confirms that total savings to be achieved from HR budgets in 2011/12 are £822k which includes pre-agreed savings and the cessation of the corporate admin apprenticeship scheme.

7.2. There are no additional financial implications arising out of this report.

8. Head of Legal Services Comments

8.1. The Head of Legal Services has been consulted on the content of this report. The report is mainly concerned with the equalities impact assessment for this restructuring and confirms that the authority's public sector equalities duty has

been borne in mind in the process. The duty is an ongoing one and therefore should be given due regard by Members in considering this report. The duty should be considered further once the restructuring exercise has been completed, as Step 5 of the attached equalities impact assessment makes clear.

9. Equalities & Community Cohesion Comments

- 9.1. The proposals have been the subject of an Equality Impact Assessment. The assessment is attached at Appendix A.
- 9.2. The Equalities Impact Assessment found that the changes proposed in the HR services restructure carry no there are no disproportionate adverse equalities implications for any group of staff who share any of the protected characteristics set out in the Equality Act 2010.
- 9.3. This conclusion is re-enforced by a number of mitigation measures which have been adopted following consultation with staff and trade unions on the restructure proposals. They include:
- changes to some ringfence proposals, which have resulted in benefit to staff;
 - changes to the pension team structure, which have increased opportunities for positions at Sc6 levels;
 - options for external procurement of services to support managers in investigating individual cases.
- 9.4. However, as the selection processes are only taking place during May 2011 and it is not possible to pre-empt the outcome and its equalities implications, if there is an adverse impact on any particular protected groups, we will seek to improve the profile of these groups over the coming years.
- 9.5. The Council's arrangements for organisational restructure ensure that selection for the revised staffing structure is based on merit. The process of assessment is a mix of current employment record, assessment against future job, and general skills analysis. Using a mix of assessment techniques is generally recognised as the most objective form of selection.

10. Consultation

- 10.1. The proposals in this report have been the subject of consultation and discussion with affected staff in the services and the unions since the beginning of January 2011. A period of formal consultation was undertaken with staff and their representatives between 21 February and 21 March 2011.
- 10.2. Further dialogue took place during April on ringfencing arrangements and as a result of continued discussion revised proposals have been developed under delegated authority to change the Pensions team. In summary the proposal is

to delete a couple of posts with the agreement of pensions staff that could be affected and create 2 pensions officers Sc6. This proposal potentially creates additional posts at the Sc6 level in HR and will help mitigate redundancies at this level in the HR services. The unions have no objections to these proposals.

11. Service Financial Comments

- 11.1. A budget reduction target of £822k (£759k new + £63k pre-agreed savings) for HR services will be achieved by a review of HR services posts as outlined in these papers along with the cessation of the corporate admin apprenticeship scheme.
- 11.2. As part of the HR service review there is an expectation that some of the budget target will be achieved through Increased income from providing services to Waltham Forest.
- 11.3. It should be noted that the Schools Personnel Service are a traded service and that the costs for this service are recouped through charges to schools who buy the service. Any adjustments to their budget and income targets have been identified by the Children & Young People's Service (CYPS) prior to transfer to HR and have already been accounted for by other reports on service change in CYPS.

12. Use of appendices

- 12.1. Appendix A – Equalities Impact Assessment of the HR restructure

13. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

- 13.1. No documents that require to be listed were used in the preparation of this report.

Appendix A

Haringey Council

Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) for Organisational Restructures

Date: 17 February 2011
Department and service under review: Human Resources, People & OD
Lead Officer/s and contact details: Steve Davies, Head of Human Resources 020 8489 3172
Contact Officer/s (Responsible for actions): Steve Davies, Head of Human Resources
Summary of Assessment (completed at conclusion of assessment to be used as equalities comments on council reports) The Equalities Impact Assessment found that there are no adverse equalities implications arising out of the changes to the HR services restructure.

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?

CEMB identified the level of savings required within directorates and HR services were asked to find a total saving of £822k in 2011/12. The aim of the review is to achieve this saving.

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

The review of HR services will provide a revised service offer that will deliver the support and service that the organisation needs to manage its people resource within the constraints of a reduced and limited cash budget.

The scope includes current centralised HR service, plus Schools Personnel service, Schools Health & Safety and devolved payroll staff.

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

Proposals for a review of the staff and service provision are being consulted upon with staff and appropriate stakeholders. Staff will be appointed to the revised service in accordance with the final approved staffing structure. The revised service will achieve the required saving of £822k in expenditure.

Once the revised structure has been appointed to a revised service offer will be communicated to various stakeholders.

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.

HR & Schools Personnel Racial Group analysis

Grade Group	Total No Staff	No. of Race Not Declared Staff	% of Grade Group	White Staff	% of Grade Group	White Other Staff	% of Total No of Staff	BME Staff	% of Total No of Staff
SC1-SC5	5	0	0	1	20	1	20	3	60
SC6-SO2	28	0	0	5	18	7	25	16	57
PO1-PO3	28	0	0	7	25	7	25	14	50
PO4-PO7	16	0	0	5	31	7	44	4	25
PO8+	8	0	0	4	50	3	38	1	13
TOTAL	85	0	0	22	26	25	29	38	45

Council & Borough racial group comparison figures

Grade Group	No of White in Grade Group	White % in Grade Group	No of White Other in Grade Group	White Other % in Grade Group	No of BME in Grade Group	BME % in Grade Group	BME% Borough Profile
SC1-SC5	364	21	202	12	1137	66	
SC6-SO2	281	24	218	19	669	57	
PO1-PO3	225	34	128	19	310	47	
PO4-PO7	244	39	134	21	243	39	
PO8+	168	63	39	15	52	20	
TOTAL	1282	29	721	16	2411	54	34

Note – Sc1-5 – approx £14,900 - £23,300; Sc6 – SO1 approx £23,950 - £28,000; PO1-3 approx £28,800 - £36,300; PO4-7 approx £36,300 - £47,200; PO8+ approx more than £48,500.

4. Highlight any grade groups that are very under represented compared with the council profile and where relevant the borough profile.

- White staff in grades Sc6 and above.
- BME staff in grades PO4 and above.

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? **NO**

- 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 %.

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 %.

Gender

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

Service Profile						HGY & Borough Profile				
Grade Group	Total No Staff	No. Male Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Female Staff	% of Grade Group	No of Female Staff	% Female in Grade Group	No of Male Staff	% Males in Grade Group	% Females in Borough
SC1-SC5	5	2	40	3	60	1164	68	558	32	
SC6-SO2	28	4	14	24	86	867	74	311	26	
PO1-PO3	28	10	36	18	64	410	62	255	38	
PO4-PO7	16	4	25	12	75	401	64	229	36	
PO8+	8	1	13	7	88	139	52	126	48	
TOTAL	85	21	25	64	75	2981	67	1479	33	49.9

Note – Sc1-5 – approx £14,900 - £23,300; Sc6 – SO1 approx £23,950 - £28,000; PO1-3 approx £28,800 - £36,300; PO4-7 approx £36,300 - £47,200; PO8+ approx more than £48,500.

9. Highlight any grade groups that are very under represented compared to the % of females/males in the council.

- Males at grades PO8 and above.

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

NO

- 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 %.

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 %.

Age

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

Grade Group	TOTAL	16-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+	
	STAFF	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group
SC1-SC5	5	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	0	0
SC6-SO2	28	0	0	7	25	7	25	9	32	5	18	0	0
PO1-PO3	28	0	0	2	7	6	21	15	54	5	18	0	0
PO4-PO7	16	0	0	2	13	5	31	7	44	2	13	0	0
PO8+	8	0	0	0	0	1	13	4	50	3	38	0	0
TOTAL	85	1	1	12	14	20	24	36	42	16	19	0	0
Council Profile	4460	117	3	784	18	1108	25	1574	35	821	18	56	1
Borough Profile	225600	29779	13	49858	22	31736	19	44669	20	16694	7	21206	9

Note – Sc1-5 – approx £14,900 - £23,300; Sc6 – SO1 approx £23,950 - £28,000; PO1-3 approx £28,800 - £36,300; PO4-7 approx £36,300 - £47,200; PO8+ approx more than £48,500.

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

- PO1-3 Age 45-54

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?

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.?

- 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:

Area Profile				HGYProfile	
Grade Group	Total No Staff	No. Disabled Staff	% of Grade Group	Total No of Staff Disabled in Band	% of Staff Disabled in Grade Group
Sc1-5	5	1	20	121	7
Sc6-SO2	28	0	0	110	9
PO1-3	28	2	7	47	7
PO4-7	16	1	6	43	7
PO8+	8	0	0	7	3
TOTAL	85	3	4	328	7

Note – Sc1-5 – approx £14,900 - £23,300; Sc6 – SO1 approx £23,950 - £28,000; PO1-3 approx £28,800 - £36,300; PO4-7 approx £36,300 - £47,200; PO8+ approx more than £48,500.

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

NO

- 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.?

- 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

There is no anticipated impact on these groups arising out of the restructuring.

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 - 18 February 2011.

Note - Consultation due to end Fri 11 March. Part 2 to be completed soon after this date.

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).

The proposals for restructure been the subject of consultation and discussion with affected staff in the services and the unions since the beginning of January 2011. A period of formal consultation was undertaken with staff and their representatives between 21 February and 21 March 2011.

Outlined below are comments from UNISON on the HR restructure proposals which helped to pull together comments made by individual staff during the consultation process. The Head of HR's response has been incorporated against each section of comment. The other unions did not supply comments.

Head of HR response to UNISON comments on the HR restructure proposals

Head of HR comments after each section

UNISON Comments on Proposals for Re-organisation of Human Resources

These comments are based upon both our officers' review of the proposals and discussions with UNISON members within the service. As one would expect when sections are being brought together there were some areas where a single viewpoint was not formed due to competing views. We have also encouraged individuals to submit individual comment where there are specific concerns effecting them as we do not feel it would be appropriate to put such comments in a collective and public response.

General Comments

We remain concerned at the extent of the cuts being proposed, it is recognised that the Council is facing unique funding challenges this year as a result of the ConDem governments cuts in 2011/12. However cuts of this magnitude to key services that are required to support change appears to be short sighted and reckless. In particular reductions in HR advice, Health and Safety and Occupational Health Services may lead

to higher levels of sickness absence, stress and riskier work environments. The whole premise that key tasks can be delegated to managers to deal with effectively has repeatedly been shown across organisations to lead to more failures to deal with issues. This point is particularly pertinent at a time when management capacity in the majority of service is also being reduced significantly.

The proposal to delegate job evaluations to managers is contrary to the contents of the Single Status agreement. It is also likely to lead to higher levels of appeals and a greater risk of unequal pay re-emerging as an issue due to inconsistencies in grading. If nothing else we seek an absolute guarantee that proper and appropriate training will be afforded to managers and that Trade Unions will continue to receive job evaluation score sheets. Equally to comply with the agreement all first time evaluations will need to be carried out centrally. There is a very real risk of the independence of the job evaluation process being compromised by the approach suggested.

Head of HR comments - The review of HR is proportional and in line with cuts across all council services and in particular in support of the aim of the council to mitigate the impact on frontline services through support service reviews.

The proposal to delegate job evaluations to managers is to be reviewed following a number of concerns raised by various officers during the consultation process.

Communication Of Changes

UNISON would wish to express its concerns about the consultation process followed to date. While we recognise early informal consultation with staff is welcome in generating ideas and proposals it is not helpful when it includes ring-fence proposals that are contrary to established Council policy or provides incomplete or contradictory signals. Particularly the overuse of email to communicate risks losing the personal touch, it would certainly be preferable that staff did not see charts with their posts deleted in advance of being spoken to about such sensitive matters.

Head of HR comments - The consultation process has been followed in line with council processes. It is acknowledged that communication can always be improved, but what is a concern for one person can be viewed as a good communication process by someone else. I have also met with all staff to explain the thinking behind the structure and met with individuals and groups of staff to hear their concerns.

Management Tiers

UNISON is concerned that in spite of a general approach to reduce management (or review spans of control as it is rather grandly titled) that the new structure concentrates reductions at lower graded posts. For example bringing the two services together might have been expected to identify some synergies from posts at PO8 and above. While we note the proposal to reduce Business Partners by one FTE there is no reduction proposed within the three existing SM graded posts. A saving of any sort at this level would have realised significant saving which could have potentially been recycled to retain additional posts at an operational level. We are making an assumption that this

will be reviewed at an early opportunity to see if savings can be made that can be redirected into additional operational resources.

Head of HR comments - The reduction in services and senior officers are proportional to the reduction in staff and relate to the number of functions, staff and services that will continue to be delivered and managed. It needs to be acknowledged that the SM graded staff are also professional officers that undertake a significant amount of HR work themselves and are not just managerial posts.

Redundancies

We recognise the difficult financial situation the Council is currently in; however in all such proposals we are formally restating our complete opposition to compulsory redundancies as a way of achieving reductions. It is our belief that the Council should be operating a joined up approach to managing change this should include creative use of "bumping" to facilitate Voluntary redundancy applications and avoid compulsory redundancies. Allied to this proactive consideration of options such as voluntary reductions in hours, flexible working etc should be considered where staff support these the normal business case process should not be applied. The presumption as a family friendly good employer should be that the manager is required to make a business case AGAINST the staff's proposals. We are concerned that the current approach in this respect may in fact cause unnecessary redundancies rather than preventing them. In essence it requires staff to be appointed then to apply for reductions in hours rather than allowing them true creative and meaningful consultation on alternatives to the cuts.

We are advised a number of staff currently work less than full time and would seek clarity on how they will be dealt with in the recruitment process?

Head of HR comments – The council restructuring policy and recruitment to stay process will be followed which accommodates staff working less than full time at present. The recruitment to stay process is not detrimental to staff working part time hours and I am happy to consider any proposals from staff for part time working going forward.

Recruitment Methods

Clear information needs to be provided to all staff on how posts will be recruited to in a timely fashion so as to allow them maximum preparation time. Tests or presentations requested should have direct relevance to the posts applied for. We are conscious that part of the proposals indicates a delay in implementation so a clear timetable for enacting any ring-fences or internal recruitment needs to be provided.

Please confirm who will be on the interview panels for the various roles, in terms of the Schools roles will there be any representation from the client side as it is a traded service?

Please confirm the order in which the ring-fences will occur. One potential issue concerns the HR Support Team Leader ring-fences as if a person were successful in

obtaining one of the two posts for team leaders could they opt to apply for the Corporate HR vacancy (PO1-PO2) still thus freeing up the role as a team leader for a colleague?

Head of HR comments – The council restructuring policy and recruitment to stay process will be followed and details will be provided will in good time to staff for them to be able to prepare for the interview process.

Advice Team (corporate)

We note this post includes a proposed slot in for the advice Coordinator (PO5) please confirm when this post was originally created and how it was recruited to as we do not recall it being established previously. Please provide a copy of the delegated authority form or restructure document that established it. We would also request a copy of the job description for the role.

In the light of the proposed level of reductions in advice roles there seems to be an argument for the remaining substantive PO4 post-holder to be offered an opportunity to apply for this role in a ring-fence, this would be consistent with the Council's ring-fence policy and may prove a better match than the Schools role.

Within the staff we consulted there was some concern that the team was top-heavy in having a PO6 and a PO5 to manage advice. This was not however a consensus view so we do not represent it as being such.

We are concerned that the reduced service levels will have a longer term knock effect on staff since managers do not possess the expertise to deal with complex issues, which often arise in the course of individual casework such as disability discrimination, race discrimination. We are also concerned that a move away from dedicated officers dealing with Services may lead to a less consistent and comprehensive advice service. This should be considered in the context of the EIA to be carried out.

Head of HR comments – The appropriate process for the establishment and recruitment to of the advice co-ordinator role was undertaken in 2007. There is no proposed change to this role under this review therefore the post and assimilation is the appropriate process to be followed.

I note the other comments made about service provision.

Business Partners

Please clarify what the new role for BP's will be: On the structure it appears that they will no longer have management responsibility for any staff which would appear to be a substantive change to their current role. Such a change may have implications on the grade for the role. How will they interact with the Directors and how will it be decided what they will deal with in comparison to what will remain within the advice team. For example will all responsibility for restructuring or changes to service delivery rest here? Will B.P's be expected to cover individual casework or to advise Senior Managers hearing for example disciplinaries?

Head of HR comments – The role of the HR business partners will not change substantially in terms of responsibility and level of engagement in the council. They currently provide high level support and planning to directorate management teams on all aspects of HR people management, including restructuring advice, workforce planning and support on casework for senior people. Although they will not have line management responsibility for the advisors they will see an increase in the volume of work since 3 business partners will share the work of four.

Schools Personnel Service

We are aware that a number of staff have made representations with regard to the inclusion in the ring-fence of a person who was seconded to Schools Personnel some time ago. The policy appears to be silent on such an approach but it is of concern since in effect there has been a slot in to a post, which doesn't exist as a vacancy. This was compounded by the decision not to carry out a similar approach in respect of the acting Schools Personnel Manager who's post the person has effectively been slotted into. We recognise the complexities of taking either approach but feel this has disadvantage staff who were recruited as Schools Personnel advisors by putting them at risk of redundancy.

While the policy is explicit that staff should be considered only at their substantive grades it seems unfair that staff in Schools Personnel have been disadvantaged as a result of a failure to resolve a collection of acting up and interim arrangements that have been in place since 2008.

It appears that some staff have been included as FTE when they do not work at this level of hours.

Staff have also asked for clarity as to whether the role as to why the Deputy Head of Schools Personnel has not been reflected in the current structure although it is currently vacant. It is our understanding that there was an intent to recruit to this so that as such funding must have existed within the income available from traded services.

We are aware that staff have expressed concern with regard to the content of the revised Job description in that it omits certain key tasks delivered by the Schools team but includes a number of references to Corporate policies and activities. The misunderstanding in this disregard may have caused some mixed messages to be received by Schools who currently buy the service. We would request that at this point the contents of the existing job description for Schools staff is maintained and is subjected to a Single Status evaluation.

Please confirm whether the Schools Personnel manager post has been evaluated under Single Status.

Head of HR comments – The restructuring policy is silent on the issue of temporary roles and secondments in terms of how they should be treated in ringfencing and I have therefore determined the schools personnel advisor ringfence based on the fact that the seconded officer has been in the role for over 2 years.

The policy is clear on the treatment of staff acting up and therefore the officer who has been acting into the Schools Personnel Manager role has been ringfenced against their substantive post of schools personnel advisor.

The Deputy Head of Schools Personnel role no longer exists and has not been on the structures for some time. The Schools Personnel manager will be reviewed under single status arrangements.

HR Support

We are concerned at the level of reductions in this team in particular the 50% reduction in team leaders posts combined with a merger with Schools services. There will be a need to ensure there is a transparent recharge for the Schools element so as to ensure value for money can be evidenced. The absence of such transparency may lead to Schools feeling they are cross subsidising the Council 's Corporate services with consequent risks that they will opt to purchase their services elsewhere.

While we would accept that the number of posts in the team might diminish as reductions in the Council reduce the reduction proposed seems excessively drastic. It will obviously be some time before the Council reduces its size completely so it may be the case that some of these reductions should be deferred for a period of time.

In addition we are concerned that there has been a lack of consultation and explanation regarding the intent to centralise previously devolved payroll provision. UNISON has requested clarity on this point in separate consultation but has yet to receive a response. Clearly if these changes were to impact on posts held within Services either in terms of duties and responsibilities or numbers of psots then staff affected should have been consulted. In effect this team will be taking on more work while reducing the number of staff available to undertake it.

Head of HR comments – There is no intention to merge the schools and corporate HR teams under this review.

I note the comments on service provision and funding but can assure you that no cross subsidisation is proposed.

In terms of the devolved payroll staff I have met separately with these staff and their managers and it has been agreed that these staff will be covered within service reviews in their respective areas.

Health & Safety

We are concerned that the reductions in this team (while achieved without compulsory redundancies) will leave the Council with very minimal resources to perform what are extensive statutory duties. As Schools Health and Safety have been brought into the scope of the Corporate Team there may be a need to review jobs and responsibilities in this area. Please confirm how the Schools team was historically funded and whether there will be any transfer of income as a result of this centralisation.

We would wish to place on the record that Employeeside take Health and Safety very seriously and we will not tolerate a reduction in its enforcement across the Council in order to save money. In any case such a failure to enforce H&S effectively would be a short term saving as inevitably there would be an increased risk to the Council in respect of Personal injury or negligence claims from both staff and the public. Additionally there would be a clear risk of adverse publicity in the event of a major incident occurring in for example a School.

Head of HR comments – I have discussed the proposed service provision with the head of corporate health and safety and he is confident that the revised service is sufficient to fulfil the council's health and safety responsibilities.

Recruitment/Deployment

As with payroll functions please confirm how schools currently buy into this service and how the income will be accounted for. In terms of deployment will officers now be offering a joined up service across both the Council and areas covered by LMS. Clearly there will be significantly increased demand on this area of work over the next year and a proactive and persuasive resource is vital.

Head of HR comments – I note the comments on service provision and funding but can assure you that no cross subsidisation is proposed.

Job Evaluations

Please confirm which of the posts within the new service have been evaluated under the GLPC Scheme. We would seek an assurance that all roles that have been amended or created are evaluated at this point in time. Any posts that are currently on the PO10 will also need to be resolved. In the case of amended posts consideration will have to be given as to whether backdating is appropriate in line with the Single Status agreement where upgrades result.

There is a requirement where range grades are adopted for there to be distinct duties at each level of the role so there would be a requirement to review this in any roles with range grades.

Head of HR comments – Posts that need to be evaluated under single status will be.

Voluntary redundancies

We are aware a number of staff have opted for VR as part of the corporate scheme, which was concluded earlier this year. Please confirm whether any person who applied was declined at this point and whether any new applications have been received since the details of the proposals emerged. We would seek an assurance that any such applications will be considered and responded to in advance of RTS being implemented. Please confirm when any VR applicants will be issued with their notice.

Head of HR comments – The process for voluntary redundancy has followed council policy and any future requests for VR will be considered on a case by case basis.

Vacant Posts

Please confirm when the posts identified as not being part of ring-fences will be released for internal advert. If possible we would request that this occurs in advance of any RTS taking place as it may reduce or avoid the need for it to occur. We would have an expectation that these posts could all be filled from within the existing service, however if they are not please confirm they will be made available to corporate redeployees.

Similarly where open ring-fences exist will these posts be opened up to other candidates in the event that they are not successfully filled as this may reduce the need for compulsory redundancies through staff movement?

Head of HR comments – I am happy to actively consider the proposal for vacant positions to be offered in advance of the recruitment to stay process. I will confirm the approach to be taken nearer the time.

Location of Services

We note an intent to centralise the services in Alexandra House in order to increase the level of integration. While we have no in principle objection to this proposal there will need to be full consultation with both staff and the Trade Unions in line with the Accommodation Code of Practice. Particular concern has been expressed with regard to the need for adequate meeting space for one to one interviews and CRB checks. It should be noted that the vast majority of staff within Schools settings are required to have these which will significantly increase the demands for confidential space to carry out these. Additionally there is a significant need for filing space, which will need to be readily accessible in order to ensure an efficient and timely Personnel service. While it is recognised that such facilities exist in the current location there will be a need for significantly more secure file space to cover the Schools members.

Head of HR comments – I note the comments made.

Individual comments relating to the Equalities Protected Characteristics

Disability Related Comments

The Head of HR has received a complaint from an individual concerned by the method of communication by email saying this impacted on their disability symptoms.

Head of HR response - Apologies have been provided to staff for the email communication. I have also met with the specific officer concerned and apologised. The officers line manager has also offered appropriate support to the officer to help during the stressful restructure process.

Race Related Comments

An allegation was put forward by a member of staff that one of the ringfences was construed to the detriment of a black member of staff.

Head of HR response - It is denied that any ringfences have been deliberately constructed to detriment particular members of staff. Ringfences have been drawn up in line with council policy and no comments were received from unions that questioned the validity of the ringfence approach.

Other than the above comment there were no specific comments related to other equalities protected 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?

There is no need to change the proposals to reduce the impact on protected groups since no specific issues have arisen out of the proposals that have not already been accommodated within the structure proposals.

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

As a result of consultation some ringfence proposals were changed to the benefit of staff. Further, a recent proposal to change the Pensions team structure has resulted in an increased opportunity for positions at Sc6 level which should mitigate the need to make staff at this level compulsory redundant.

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 they fully comply with council policy and guidance.

5. Will the changes result in a positive/ negative impact for service delivery/ community groups – please explain how?

The HR service offer will change as a result of the changes. Although the service will change proportionately with the reduction and change in services across the council the biggest impact will be in terms of Managers not receiving the same level of advice and support to deal with employment issues and cases. However, it is not anticipated that this will adversely impact on any of the protected characteristics since the most likely implication is delays to HR related procedures and increased risks of claims by individuals against the council arising from poor people management by line managers.

6. How can you mitigate any negative impact for service users?

HR are reviewing the advice available to support managers on the intranet pages and we are proposing options for services to procure external professional support in investigating individual cases.

Date Steps 3 & 4 completed –

13 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.

Selection processes are taking place during May 2011.

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

If there is an adverse impact on a particular protected group we will seek to improve the profile over the coming years. It is difficult to assign a timescale to this since there will be further staffing reductions in HR over the next 2 years as a result of the reduced council budgets.

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

The new service will go live from 1 October 2011 but changes will start to occur during the next few months leading to this date.

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?

N/A

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

The HR structure will need to be reviewed again within the next 9 months to take account of further budget reductions as a result of the councils reduced budgets.

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: Steve Davies
DESIGNATION: Head of Human Resources
SIGNATURE:
DATE: 5 May 2011

QUALITY CHECKED BY (Equalities.)

NAME: Inno Amadi
DESIGNATION: Senior Policy Officer
SIGNATURE:
DATE: 9 May 2011

SIGNED OFF BY Director/ Assistant Director

NAME: Stuart Young
DESIGNATION: Assistant Chief Executive
SIGNATURE:
DATE: 10 May 11

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