

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT
FOR LEAN (and related) SAVINGS PROPOSALS

Section 1: General Information

1a) Savings proposal:

Lean (and related staff savings) proposals

1b) Service area:

All Service areas:

1c) Service manager:

All relevant service managers

1d) Officer completing EQIA:

Steve James

Section 2: Information about changes to services

2a) Savings proposals and the reasons for this change:

A significant number of savings proposals presented as part of the Council's transformation programme include the restructure of teams and service areas. These changes are designed to deliver a leaner, more flexible staffing structure which is affordable given the Council's reduced budget.

The aim of this Equality Impact Assessment is to ensure that in delivering the savings required by the reduction in the Council's budget, we maintain our focus on promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination for our workforce. Our Workforce to Reflect the Community strategy sets out targets to ensure representation at all levels within the Council. Undertaking this Equality Impact Assessment at this stage will enable us to:

- Understand the likely impact of the savings proposals on staff
- Assess any potential for the savings proposals to affect our progress against our Workforce to Reflect the Community targets

The staffing restructures which form part of the Council's Lean programme are designed to streamline the Council's management structure, strategic core and business back office to secure efficiencies and to protect front-line services. It is envisaged that these savings will result in the following changes to staffing:

- Overall staff numbers will reduce by approximately 500 posts over 3 years (excluding any staff savings required as a result of specific grant deletions), with the majority of these reductions taking place in 2011/12;
- A key driver of the Council's approach to managing organisational change is the desire to mitigate the need for compulsory redundancies. A significant number of posts to be deleted will be

2b) Cumulative equality impact of proposals

This Equality Impact Assessment aims to predict:

- The likely impact of the deletion of posts on the overall equalities profile of staff across the organisation.
- The projected profile of staff whose current roles will be deleted as part of the proposed restructures

At a service level, restructures will be managed in line with the Council's Organisational Change policy, with individual Equality Impact Assessments being undertaken for each restructure.

For the purpose of the EQIA we have:

- Analysed the current equalities profile of staff across three different pay bands (those earning £30k or less, those earning £30k-£40k and those earning £40k or more),
- Modelled the anticipated reduction in staff at each of those pay bands and projected the impact of this on the overall equalities profile of the organisation.

This modelling is intended to enable us to make high level predictions about the future equalities profile of staff in the organisation.

As actual figures of staff leaving the Council become available, these will be monitored by equality strand.

Given the points above, it is reasonable to consider the cumulative equality impact to be the consequence of the profile of posts to be deleted i.e. the extent to which deleting the number of posts proposed at the levels proposed will, or will not, have a disproportionate impact on any particular groups of staff as a result of that group's predominance at particular levels within the organisation.

Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment methodology

We have calculated the equality profile of staff (Full Time Equivalent (FTE) and headcount respectively) in each of the three pay bands (<£30k, £30k-£40k and £40k>) as set out in Appendix One. This data is drawn from Human Resources data for December 2010.

Using the data drawn from the directorate proposals and post deletion analyses presented to Cabinet on 1 February 2011 we have calculated the

net number of occupied posts being deleted from each of the three pay bands, which is 200 FTE posts at <£30k, 111 FTE posts at £30k-£40k, and 33 FTE posts above £40k. Using the data on the current equalities profile of the workforce we have therefore been able to make the projections set out in Appendix One of the likely profile of the people holding the posts which will be deleted and the impact this will have on the overall equality profile of the workforce.

These figures are based on the assumption that deletions of posts will affect all groups equally, resulting in the profile of staff within each pay band remaining the same following deletions of these posts. We set out mechanisms to monitor the actual outcome of post deletions in Section 5.

Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment findings

The data used in this Equality Impact Assessment illustrates the variation in the equalities profile of staff at different levels of the organisation. We know, for example, that 65 percent of posts in the £30K and under category are filled by women as compared to 47% of posts between £30-40K and 55% in the £40K+ pay band. We also know that the number of posts in the £30K and under salary band is more than twice the number of posts in the £40K+ pay band. Recognition of the inequalities within our workforce has driven our commitment to promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination in our workforce. In recent years we have made significant progress against targets to improve representation of equality groups at all levels of the organisation and this work will continue throughout this Transformation process.

Throughout this savings process, we have embedded a commitment to focus staffing savings on streamlining our management structure, strategic core and business back office and to protect front-line services for the most vulnerable. The gross number of posts deleted across the three salary bands equates to the following percentages:

Salary band	% reduction in FTE posts
Less than £30K	10.5%
More than £30K	17%

On the basis of the projections set out in this EQIA we predict a distribution of post deletions by equality strand which will be in line with the current equalities of profile of staff at the three pay bands:

Equality strand	% of the occupied FTE posts which are being deleted	% of workforce (December 2010)
Women	61%	60.1%
Men	39%	39.9%
BAME	51%	51.4%

Data for disability, sexual orientation and religion/belief is not currently accurate enough to make evidence based projections. We will be improving data quality over the course of 2011/12.

Appendix One shows the comparative summary of the EQIA. From this it is clear that there is no material impact on the overall profile of the Council, nor at any specific level within any of the equality strands. Whilst there is a minor adjustment to the overall profile this is not significant and is below a quarter of one percentage point change at any level.

Section 5: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan & Monitoring

Issue	Mitigating Action
The profile of posts being deleted, based on the three key pay bands, needs to reflect that currently being projected. Should the profile of posts change significantly from that projected the equalities impact may differ from that set out in the hypothesis above.	The post deletion profile, against the pay bandings, will be monitored regularly by the programme team as part of general programme reporting to the Corporate Transformation Board.
Compulsory redundancy selection decisions (i.e. those that do not secure a post in new structures and consequently become redeployees) need to be based on wholly objective criteria as set out in the Council's procedures. If this is not adhered to there may be a disproportionate impact on particular groups.	The redeployment list (i.e. those at risk of redundancy) will be monitored regularly by the Corporate Redundancy & Redeployment Panel in order to ensure that there is no imbalance with regard to those subject to redeployment.
Voluntary redundancy and early retirement selection decisions (i.e. those that have self selected to leave the organisation) need to be based on wholly objective criteria as set out in the Council's procedures. If this is not adhered to there may be a disproportionate impact on particular groups.	Decisions as to voluntary exit will be monitored regularly by the Corporate Redundancy & Redeployment Panel in order to ensure that there is no imbalance with regard to those leaving and/or remaining within the organisation.
The hypothesis outlined above is based on a series of assumptions that need to be met, the most significant of which are identified in the list above. The final measure is the change to the Council's equality profile over time and the extent to which it does, or does not, reflect that projected above.	HR & WD will continue to monitor the staff profile against each of the quality strands above and report on this to CMT as part of business as usual reporting cycles. Notwithstanding the Council's ongoing action plan to improve representation of certain groups, any specific impact as a result of the Lean (and related staff

	savings proposals) will be identified as part of this reporting activity and CMT will be alerted accordingly
--	--

Appendix One

EQIA Projection & Impact

	Deletions				Impact on profile after post deletions			
	FTE	%	Headcount	%	Before FTE	After FTE	Before Headcount	After Headcount
Gender								
Female	212	7.23%	271	7.38%	60.89%	60.82%	63.01%	62.95%
Male	132	6.98%	153	7.12%	39.11%	39.18%	36.99%	37.05%
Age Banding								
<= 20	4	8.30%	5	8.28%	1.03%	1.02%	1.08%	1.07%
21 - 24	20	8.20%	27	8.21%	4.99%	4.93%	5.58%	5.53%
25 - 34	84	7.48%	106	7.60%	23.36%	23.27%	23.96%	23.88%
35 - 44	84	7.12%	105	7.28%	24.46%	24.47%	24.82%	24.82%
45 - 49	54	6.98%	65	7.11%	16.12%	16.15%	15.75%	15.78%
50 - 54	46	6.77%	54	6.91%	14.19%	14.25%	13.40%	13.45%
55 - 59	30	6.54%	35	6.68%	9.58%	9.64%	9.09%	9.15%
60+	21	7.11%	25	7.19%	6.01%	6.02%	6.08%	6.09%
Ethic Group								
Asian	24	7.18%	28	7.29%	6.96%	6.96%	6.55%	6.54%
Bangladeshi	74	7.66%	94	7.76%	20.15%	20.04%	20.80%	20.70%
Black	73	7.46%	89	7.58%	20.25%	20.18%	20.22%	20.16%
Somali	4	7.86%	5	7.94%	1.06%	1.05%	1.12%	1.11%
White	150	6.72%	184	6.89%	46.29%	46.50%	45.83%	46.03%
Mixed	8	7.23%	9	7.32%	2.25%	2.25%	2.13%	2.13%
Other	3	7.34%	3	7.42%	0.77%	0.77%	0.76%	0.75%
Missing	0	7.39%	0	7.40%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%
No data	8	7.60%	12	7.76%	2.24%	2.23%	2.58%	2.56%
Disability								
Yes	9	6.97%	10	7.02%	2.70%	2.70%	2.47%	2.48%
No	153	6.86%	176	6.96%	46.38%	46.52%	43.45%	43.60%
Declined	29	7.33%	35	7.41%	8.14%	8.12%	8.09%	8.08%
No data	153	7.42%	203	7.59%	42.79%	42.66%	45.99%	45.84%
Sexuality								
Bisexual	4	7.90%	5	7.93%	1.10%	1.09%	1.12%	1.11%
Gay	4	6.29%	5	6.41%	1.40%	1.41%	1.29%	1.30%
Heterosexual	222	7.06%	269	7.20%	65.32%	65.38%	64.27%	64.32%
Lesbian	2	6.04%	3	6.19%	0.75%	0.75%	0.70%	0.71%
Decline to State	50	7.12%	62	7.27%	14.67%	14.67%	14.72%	14.72%
No data	61	7.54%	80	7.66%	16.76%	16.69%	17.90%	17.83%
Religion								
Buddhist	2	6.55%	3	6.73%	0.69%	0.70%	0.67%	0.67%
Christian	115	7.04%	140	7.20%	33.90%	33.93%	33.52%	33.55%
Hindu	5	7.22%	5	7.36%	1.34%	1.34%	1.27%	1.27%
Jewish	2	7.14%	2	7.20%	0.57%	0.57%	0.55%	0.55%
Muslim	73	7.59%	89	7.68%	19.84%	19.74%	20.00%	19.91%
No religion	35	6.47%	42	6.62%	11.28%	11.37%	11.01%	11.09%
Other	19	6.92%	23	7.09%	5.69%	5.71%	5.62%	5.63%
Sikh	3	7.08%	3	7.24%	0.83%	0.83%	0.79%	0.79%
Decline to State	31	6.83%	36	6.97%	9.27%	9.30%	8.93%	8.96%
No data	60	7.54%	79	7.65%	16.59%	16.52%	17.64%	17.57%