

Haringey Council

**Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)
for Organisational Restructures affecting Staff only**

Please note that if there is an impact on Service provision a separate EqIA template needs to be completed for Service Reviews – see the website.

Notes and Statement of purpose

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.

There is an Excel template that accompanies the EqIA 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 the HR Metrics team – x3346 - if you cannot find it.

Date: 8 th February 2012
Service under review: Children and Families – Commissioning and Placements - Residential Homes
Directorate: Children and Young People’s Service
Lead Officer/s (author(s) of the proposal) and contact details: Debbie Haith Deputy Director Children and Families
Contact Officer/s (Responsible for enquiries and actions): Wendy Tomlinson Head of Commissioning and Placements
Summary of Assessment (completed at conclusion of assessment to be used as equalities comments on council reports) These proposals affect a total of 27 members of permanent staff. The highest proportion of staff affected are aged 35-44 (30%) and 45-54 (48%). Overall 81% of staff affected are BME, compared to 71.2% of the wider council, 63% are female,

compared to 69% in the wider council profile and 11% are declared as disabled, compared to 7% in the wider council profile.

The proposals represent a service closure, all staff affected will be referred to the council's redeployment pool.

**STAFF RESTRUCTURES - EqIA SCREENING TOOL
TO IDENTIFY IF A FULL STAFF EqIA IS NEEDED**

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 the questions below are no you do not need to undertake a Full Staff EqIA, however you will need to provide a detailed explanation for this decision at Q5 below.

1. **Could the proposed staff restructuring have an adverse impact of 5% or more on the service/ business unit profile for any of the equalities protected characteristics age, disability, race, sex (gender)?** Yes – Please see full Staffing Equality Impact Assessment
2. **Could the proposed staff restructuring have an adverse impact on staff with other protected characteristics of pregnancy / maternity, religion or belief, sexual orientation, or gender reassignment?** Yes – Please see full Staffing Equality Impact Assessment
3. **Does the proposal have an affect on service users or the wider community?** Yes– Please see full Service Delivery Equality Impact Assessment
4. **By taking particular measures could a positive impact result?**
Staffing – No: With regards to staffing, the proposal relates to a service closure
Service Delivery – Yes: Please see Service Delivery Equality Impact Assessment.
5. **If the answers to the above questions are no you do not need to undertake a Full Staff EqIA. However, you will need to provide a clear explanation for not doing this below.** Please see full Staffing Equality Impact Assessment

**FULL STAFFING EqIA - PART 1
TO ASSIST WITH PLANNING THE RESTRUCTURE AND ISSUED AS PART OF
THE CONSULTATION WITH STAFF/ UNIONS ON THE STRUCTURE**

Step 1: Background

Please summarise and provide brief answers in order to provide the reasons for these changes.

Please also provide a copy of the committee report or delegated authority as appropriate.

1. Summarise the proposals/ changes you are proposing to make? (for example opening a new unit or closing an existing one)

The proposal set out in the Cabinet report 'Options for the Future of Directly Provided Children's Homes' is for consultation on the closure of the two Local Authority run children's homes in Haringey.

2. What are the reasons for making these changes?

The proposals have been developed in response to concerns that outcomes for young residents are less positive in some cases than might be expected, the homes are not well placed strategically, do not provide value for money within the current market availability of residential homes, and are under used. It is believed that there is sufficient good quality accommodation for Haringey's looked after young people in the local private and voluntary sector and that some of the money saved can be reinvested in early intervention services to help prevent young people entering the care system. The intention is to provide care at a higher quality than previously provided for this group. This is in line with the determination to ensure that all placements for Haringey's looked after children are recognised by external assessment as good or outstanding within a short timeframe, and to secure better value for money in service delivery.

The timescales of these proposals and the short/medium term statements of purpose of the homes, mean that the children currently resident at Homes A and B will have already finished their placements at the homes and moved into their new planned placements ahead of any proposed closures and would not therefore be impacted by the proposals. The proposed closures will therefore only affect a small number of children (up to a maximum of 14 across both homes at any one time) who may have in future been placed in these homes.

The Council has a general duty to children in need within the Borough to provide accommodation in accordance with the criteria prescribed by Sections 20 and 21 of the Children Act 1989. However, the council is not required to fulfill this duty through direct provision.

3. Are existing staff likely to be affected and if so how many and in what ways?

27 members of permanent staff would be affected by these proposals. In addition there is one member of casual staff affected and 16 vacant posts that would be deleted. All staff will be referred to the redeployment pool. 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,

Step 2: Workforce profile analysis

The specific duty introduced by the government to support the Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to publish annual workforce data covering the age, disability, gender and race profile of staff at every level of the organisation. You should therefore gather all relevant data that will help you assess whether presently, there are differential outcomes i.e. non, under or over represented in relation to the Council staff profile (for the most recent financial year of the proposal) and the Borough Profile. Analyse the information in terms of representation and grade for age, disability, race, sex (gender).

The HR Metrics team can help you with this data.

The tables below detail equalities information for the (insert number) officers included in the restructure by equality strands.

Table 1: Age

Highlight any grade groups that are under / over represented (5% or more) compared with the council profile or where relevant the borough profile.

Age group		16 - 24		25 - 34		35 - 44		45 - 54		55 - 64		65+	
Grade Group	Total No. 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	1							1	100%				
SC6-SO1	15			1	7%	5	33%	7	47%	2	13%		
PO1-PO3	9			3	33%	3	33%	3	33%				
PO4-PO7	2							2	100%				
PO8+													
Totals	27	0	0%	4	15%	8	30%	13	48%	2	7%	0	0%
Council Profile	3612	58	2%	644	18%	911	25%	1324	37%	636	18%	39	1%
*Borough Profile	225,000	26300	11.7	46700	20.7	41100	18.3	29100	13	17600	7.8	20600	9.5

* Mid year estimates 2010

Overall, the staffing profile indicates that most staff affected are aged 35-44 (30%) and 45-54 (48%). The proportions of staff in these age groups are both higher than the wider council profile (25% and 37% respectively). Staff aged 55-64 are under represented in the staff group affected compared to the wider council profile (7% compared to 18%).

When analysed by grade-group, 100% of the staff in the lowest grade group (Sc1-Sc5) and the highest grade group (PO4-PO7) are aged 45-54, this represents a total of 3 members of staff.

Table 2: Disability

Highlight any grade groups that are under / over represented (5% or more) compared with the council profile or where relevant the borough profile.

Grade Group	Total No. staff	Disabled Staff		Non disabled staff		Not declared		% Disabled in Council Grade Group
		No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	
SC1-SC5	1					1	100%	8%
SC6-SO1	15	3	20%	9	60%	3	20%	9%
PO1-PO3	9			4	44%	5	56%	6%
PO4-PO7	2			1	50%	1	50%	6%
PO8+								3%
Totals	27	3	11%	14	52%	10	37%	7%

Overall 11% of the staff affected are declared as disabled – this compares to the wider council profile of 7%. These staff are all SC6-SO1, which represents 20% of the grade group (compared to 9% in the wider council profile for this grade group).

Table 3: Race

Highlight any grade groups that are under / over represented (5% or more) compared with the council profile or where relevant the borough profile.

Grade Group	Total Staff	Black		Asian		Mixed		Other		White Other		BME Total		White UK		Not Declared	
		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-SC5	1													1	100%		
SC6-SO1	15	9	60%	1	7%					1	7%	11	73%	4	27%		
PO1-PO3	9	8	89%							1	11%	9	100%				
PO4-PO7	2	2	100%									2	100%				
PO8+	0																
Totals	27	19	70%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	7%	22	81%	5	19%	0	
Council Profile	3612	1478	41%	277	8%	125	3%	110	3%	581	16%	2571	71%	988	27%	53	1%

Borough Profile	225,500	35900	15.9	21500	9.5	9900	4.4	8500	3.8	34200	15.1	110000	48.8	115600	51.3	---	---
-----------------	---------	-------	------	-------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	-------	------	--------	------	--------	------	-----	-----

* Mid year estimates 2009

Overall 81% of staff affected are BME, compared to 71% of the wider council profile – the majority of BME staff affected are of black ethnicities (70%) this is compared to 41% of the council profile. When broken down by grade group, 73% of Sc6-SO1 staff affected are BME and 100% of both PO1-3 and PO4-7 staff affected are BME.

Overall white UK staff are under represented in the staff group affected compared to the wider council profile (19% compared to 27%) (this accounts for 100% of the Sc1-5 grade group – representing 1 member of staff and 27% of the Sc6-SO1 grade group, representing 4 members of staff).

White Other staff represent 7% of the overall staff group and 7% and 11% of the Sc6-SO1 and PO1-PO3 grade groups respectively. This is lower than the wider council profile of 16%. One member of staff affected is of Asian ethnicity which represents 4% of the staff group affected, compared to 8% of the wider council profile. There are no staff of mixed, or other ethnicities in the staff group affected.

Table 4: Sex (formerly Gender)

Highlight any grade groups that are under / over represented (5% or more) compared with the council profile or where relevant the borough profile.

Grade Group	Total No. Staff	Male Staff		Female Staff		% Females in Council grade group	% Females in Borough
		No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group		
SC1-SC5	1	1	100%			71	
SC6-SO1	15	3	20%	12	80%	75	
PO1-PO3	9	5	56%	4	44%	63	
PO4-PO7	2	1	50%	1	50%	64	
PO8+						53	
Totals	27	10	37%	17	63%	69	49

Overall 37% of staff affected are male and 63% are female, this is a slightly lower proportion of female staff compared to the wider council profile of 69%. The highest proportion of female staff is in the SC6-SO1 grade group (80%). In the higher grade groups affected, 44% and 50% of staff are female.

Data Comparisons

In the table below, compare the existing profile of the staff affected by the reorganisation against both the Council staff profile and the borough profile according to equalities protected characteristics. Please provide a comment only where there is an impact of more than 5% difference compared to the council profile or where relevant the borough profile.

Protected Characteristics	Council staff Profile (Excl Schools) September 2011 %	Borough Profile (mid year estimate 2009) %	Staff affected Profile %	Comment
Age 16-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65+	1.6 17.8 25.2 36.7 17.6 1.1	11.7 20.7 18.3 13.0 7.8 9.5	0% 15% 30% 48% 7% 0%	Overall, the staffing profile indicates that most staff affected are aged 35-44 (30%) and 45-54 (48%). The proportions of staff in these age groups are both higher than the wider council profile (25.2% and 36.7% respectively). Staff aged 55-64 are under represented in the staff group affected compared to the wider council profile (7% compared to 17.6%).
Race Black / Asian / Mixed / Other Ethnic Group White Minorities BME Total (BME including Black / Asian / Mixed / Other Ethnic & White Minorities) White British	55.1 16.1 71.2 27.4	33.7 15.1 48.8 51.3	74% 7% 81% 19%	74% of staff affected are of black, asian, mixed or other ethnic groups, compared to 55.1% of the wider council profile. The majority of BME staff affected are of black ethnicities (70%) this is compared to 41% of the council profile. White Other groups are under represented in the staff group affected. Overall 81% of staff affected are BME, compared to 71.2% of the wider council. White British staff are under represented in the staff group affected compared to the wider council profile.
Gender Male Female	31.4 68.6	50.7 49.3	37% 63%	Overall 37% of staff affected are male and 63% are female, this is a slightly lower proportion affected compared to the wider council profile of 68.6% female staff.
Disability	7.3	7.6 (NOMIS Feb 2010 % of working age pop claiming ESA or incapacity benefits)	11%	11% of staff affected are declared as disabled, this slightly higher than the wider council profile (7.3%).

STEP 3: Assess the likely impact of the proposal and how this can be addressed

Using the information that you have gathered and analysed at step 2, outline the likely impact on staff and any mitigating actions that can be taken to address the impact.

This section will be completed prior to the sign off process for the new structure. This needs to be assessed at this stage as you need to measure the likely impact before you make the final decision to continue.

- 1. Highlight any protected groups/ grades that are likely to be under/ over represented in the new structure compared to their population size with Haringey workforce and the Borough profile? (Need to consider race, sex (gender), age and disability, plus the potential impact on pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, sexual orientation)***

No new structure is proposed as these proposals relate to a service closure. Please see response to question 4 for the identified impact on the wider CYPS directorate structure.

- 2. If yes, what groups are impacted upon and in what way?***

- 3. Has the ring fencing maximised the opportunity for all staff to apply for relevant jobs, please explain your answer?***

There are no ringfences as these proposals relate to a service closure.

- 4. If you are closing a service will this closure worsen any significant under representation of protected characteristics in the wider Business Unit or Directorate?***

The proposals relate to 27 staff which represents 3.4% of the CYPS directorate.

The highest proportion relates to BME staff (22 members of staff) however this group of staff are not under represented in the wider Directorate staff profile. The proposals would reduce the current proportion of BME staff in the CYPS directorate from 78% to 75%, this is still above the wider council profile of 71.2%.

Within the BME staff affected, when analysed by ethnic group, the greatest proportion of staff affected are of black ethnicities – this represents 19 members of staff and would reduce the proportion of black staff in CYPS from approximately 35% to 32% - this is lower than the wider council profile of 41%.

The proposals do not significantly affect the proportion of any other protected characteristic group in the directorate.

5. Can any of the impacted staff be accommodated elsewhere within the reorganised structure or can you amend the proposed new structure to accommodate them?

No, these proposals relate to a service closure.

Date Part 1 completed - 17/02/12

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

STEP 4: Consultation

Consultation is an essential part of the impact assessment process. If there has been recent consultation which has highlighted the issues that you have identified in Steps 2 and 3 use it to inform your assessment. If there has been no consultation relating to the issues, then you will have to carry out consultation to assist your assessment. Make sure that you reach all of those who are likely to be affected by the proposal, ensuring that you cover all equality strands. Do not forget to give feedback to the people you have consulted, stating how you have responded to their issues and concerns.

You can refer to, or include comments from a committee report or delegated authority if relevant.

1) What involvement and consultation activities have you undertaken in relation to: senior management, staff and unions and where relevant, stakeholders?

Indicate where applicable:

- a) Senior Management - The formal staff consultation process in connection with the proposal to close the Residential Homes commenced on 8th February 2012 and ended on 9th March 2012.

Senior Managers met with Trade Union representatives on 24th January 2012 to explain the position. Trade Union representatives were present at the meetings with staff on 26th January and 8th February 2012. A meeting was held on 23rd March 2012 to verbally feedback to staff about the consultation.

Since that date, the Head of Service for Commissioning and Placements has been available to meet with staff on the following dates and has visited the Homes for that reason: 20th February, 24th February, 2nd March, 7th March. Follow up emails have been issued to all staff, on 8th February, 15th February, 24th February, 28th February, 1st March, 7th March, 19th March, 20th March and 27th March. Emails outlined the process for staff and provided regular updates on available vacancies, and related processes, as requested by staff.

- b) Staff – see above
- c) Unions – see above
- d) Stakeholders - Please see Service Delivery EqIA for details of the service user consultation undertaken.

The main issues raised through the staff and union consultation were around service delivery and can be found with responses below. The full consultation notes and management responses can be found in Appendix C and D of the report to Corporate Committee (15th May 2012).

- Some children received at the children’s homes are often very difficult to deal with and they wouldn’t necessarily fit into a foster care environment.
Specialist trained foster carers will be developed and recruited to meet the needs of any young person who needs foster care.
 - The availability and capacity of Haringey foster carers
The service is currently strengthening commissioning arrangements with Independent Fostering Agencies to secure additional capacity.
 - The assumption is that it is cheaper to use other Private and Voluntary Sector homes and however staff suggested that they believe there are hidden costs.
Additional costs (such as the differential in 1:1 staffing where needed) are minimal and can be negotiated. Overall, savings are very significant compared to the cost of running the LA children’s homes.
 - A need for short term bed space
We are working to equip foster carers who can respond to emergencies and can deal with specialist/difficult situations.
 - Staff raised concerns about closing homes before early intervention set up
There are a number of aspects of the early intervention work that are already in place and currently being developed:
 - ***The number of children in care has reduced by 50 over the last 6 months.***
 - ***We are examining our care population to make sure that the right young people are in care and that young people can be supported at home where that is safe.***
 - ***We have increased the number of fostering arrangements***
 - ***33 family members have had children placed with them in the last year.***
 - ***The Multi-systemic Therapy project will work with 14 children to explore and develop other services, including ongoing work from a rapid response.***
- 2) What changes will be made to the proposal as a result of the consultation?
No further changes to the proposal have been made.

STEP 5: Consider mitigation measures and their implications

You need to be able to show what actions you are / will take to mitigate against any adverse impact. If there is any adverse impact that cannot be justified, you need to consider any changes needed to the proposal to prevent this from happening, including stopping the proposal.

1) What have you done or will do to redress or reduce any likely negative impact for employees?

It is proposed that affected staff will be considered for any suitable alternative opportunities within CYPs during the consultation period whilst taking into account service delivery needs. 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.

2) Is there any evidence that the proposals could unlawfully discriminate against particular equality groups as employees unlawfully directly or indirectly, and if yes please explain what actions you are taking to prevent this?

No

3) Can any of the staff groups who have been displaced be accommodated elsewhere within the organisation?

Please see 1) above

4) Are there employment law issues which may have implications for your proposal?

The staff and union consultation process and staffing restructure has been undertaken in line with all current employment laws and regulations.

STEP 6: Assess and review the final structure

Once the final structure is in place please set out the equalities profile of the new structure and set out the future arrangements for monitoring and review.

- 1. Comparing the staff profile in the new structure with the previous structure, please indicate any changes that have resulted in a positive/ negative impact for any staff equality group, and if so which groups? Can the impact be justified and if so explain?**

No new structure is proposed as these proposals relate to a service closure.

The proposals relate to 27 staff which represents 3.4% of the CYPS directorate.

The highest proportion relates to BME staff (22 members of staff) however this group of staff are not under represented in the wider Directorate staff profile. The proposals would reduce the current proportion of BME staff in the CYPS directorate from 78% to 75%, this is still above the wider council profile of 71.2%.

Within the BME staff affected, when analysed by ethnic group, the greatest proportion of staff affected are of black ethnicities – this represents 19 members of staff and would reduce the proportion of black staff in CYPS from approximately 35% to 32% - this is lower than the wider council profile of 41%.

The proposals do not significantly affect the proportion of any other protected characteristic group in the directorate.

- 2. What arrangements have been set up to monitor and review the implementation of the new structure?**

N/A – these proposals relate to a service closure

- 3. Consider any new additional information that has arisen that may require you to review the service(s) affected by this proposal, (i.e. future cuts, outcomes of other reorganisations, and the impact on services).**

N/A – these proposals relate to a service closure

- 4. Outline any steps to propose to take to address this below with appropriate timescales.**

N/A – these proposals relate to a service closure

STEP 7: 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.

ASSESSED BY (Author of the proposal)

NAME: Wendy Tomlinson

DESIGNATION: Head of Commissioning and Placements, Children and Families

SIGNATURE:

DATE: 04/04/12

QUALITY CHECKED BY (Policy, Equalities and Partnerships Team)

NAME: Arleen Brown and Helena Pugh

DESIGNATION: Senior Policy Officer/Policy and Equalities Manager

SIGNATURE: *Helena Pugh*

DATE: 16/04/12

SIGNED OFF BY (On behalf of the Directorate Management Team)

NAME: Debbie Haith

DESIGNATION: Deputy Director, Children and Families

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

Note – Please send an electronic copy of the EqIA to Policy Equalities and Partnerships Team; it will then be published on the council website.

Appendix 1 – Haringey Council Workforce Analysis (excluding Schools) Equalities Data September 2011

Race Analysis																	
Grade Group SC1-SC5	Total Staff	Black		Asian		Mixed		Other		White Minorities		BME Total		White		Not Declared	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
SC1-SC5	1345	742	55	97	7	43	3	48	4	149	11	1079	80	245	18	21	2
SC6-SO2	895	378	42	78	9	34	4	26	3	164	18	680	76	210	23	5	1
PO1-PO3	615	196	32	58	9	23	4	17	3	121	20	415	67	195	32	5	1
PO4-PO7	540	141	26	34	6	20	4	13	2	115	21	323	60	201	37	16	3
PO8+	217	21	10	10	5	5	2	6	3	32	15	74	34	137	63	6	3
Council Profile	3612	1478	41	277	8	125	3	110	3	581	16	2571	71	988	27	53	1
*Borough Profile	225,500	35900	16	21500	10	9900	4	8500	4	34200	15	110000	49	115600	51	---	---

*Mid year estimates 2009

Sex (formerly gender) Analysis					
Grade band	Total Staff	HGY			
		Female		Male	
		No.	%	No.	%
SC1-SC5	1345	957	71	388	29
SC6-SO2	895	673	75	222	25
PO1-PO3	615	385	63	230	37
PO4-PO7	540	348	64	192	36
PO8+	217	115	53	102	47
Council Profile	3612	2478	69	1134	31
*Borough Profile	225000	110900	49	114100	51

*Mid year estimates 2010

Appendix 1 – Haringey Council Workforce Analysis (excluding Schools) Equalities Data September 2011

Age Analysis													
Grade band	Total Staff	16<25		25<35		35<45		45<55		55<65		65+	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
SC1-SC5	1345	46	3	195	14	273	20	497	37	305	23	29	2
SC6-SO2	895	11	1	204	23	254	28	289	32	133	15	4	0
PO1-PO3	615	1	0	154	25	177	29	225	37	56	9	2	0
PO4-PO7	540	0	0	80	15	163	30	210	39	85	16	2	0
PO8+	217	0	0	11	5	44	20	103	47	57	26	2	1
Council Profile	3612	58	2	644	18	911	25	1324	37	636	18	39	1
*Borough Profile	225,000	26300	12	46700	21	41100	18	29100	13	17600	8	20600	10

*Mid year estimates 2010

Disabled					
Grade band	Total Staff	Disabled		Non Disabled	
		No.	%	No.	%
SC1-SC5	1345	104	8	1241	92
SC6-SO2	895	82	9	813	91
PO1-PO3	615	38	6	577	94
PO4-PO7	540	33	6	507	94
PO8+	217	6	3	211	97
Council Profile	3612	263	7	3349	93