

Appendix K Full Equality Impact Assessment

For a policy, project, service or other decision that is new, changing or under review

What is being assessed?		Impact of PBB3 (Budget setting for 2016/17) on the workforce profile	
Lead Assessor	HR Manager (Business Partnering and Policy Development)	Assessment team	Daniel Nugent Clare Davies Richard Protheroe Emma Barron Sue Vanneck Kirsten Frew
Start date	28 October 2015	End date	2018
When will the EqIA be reviewed?	On-going reviews over the next 3 years and specifically as consultation in each SDU commences.		

Who may be affected by it?	Early indications from the proposals for the Budget 2015/16 are that there may be in the region of 10 redundancies. The proposals for 2016/17 onwards require further investigation and will consider the impact on the equality profile of and diversity within the workforce.
What are the key aims of it?	<p>Since 2014 Stevenage Borough Council's has taken priority based approach to budgeting (PBB) to achieving the necessary corporate savings and there are now further proposals for 2016/17 and 2017/18. The savings will be made through service related savings and staff related expenditure, comprising of organisational restructures and potential redundancies.</p> <p>There are policies in place to support staff through these periods of change including a redundancy and redeployment policy. This helps to ensure that there are clear procedures in place for staff and training is being provided to managers and appropriate staff. Each of these policies has had an EqIA.</p> <p>The purpose of this EqIA is to identify the joint impact on the workforce profile of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff affected by the savings proposals for 2016/17 • Impact of the proposed savings for 2016/17 on the workforce profile. <p>This is intended to guide decision making in considering the savings proposals over the next three years. The Council values diversity in its workforce. We recognise that the composition, skills, understanding and commitment of our workforce adds to our ability to deliver responsive, personalised</p>

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

	<p>services to our equally diverse community.</p> <p>The Council is committed to supporting all staff that are affected by change, in the first instance through their line managers and HR&OD. Staff can take advice from their trade union representative who may accompany them to meetings. In addition, further support is also available to staff in the form of our Employee Assistance Programme (Optum) and Outplacement support for those staff impacted by redundancy.</p>
--	---

What positive measures are in place (if any) to help fulfil our legislative duties to:					
Remove discrimination & harassment	<p>A Redundancy Policy –to ensure fair and non-discriminatory selection methods.</p> <p>A Redeployment Policy to ensure there is a streamlined procedure for identifying suitable alternative employment wherever possible.</p>	Promote equal opportunities	<p>Redeployment opportunities are considered for all staff at risk of redundancy.</p>	Encourage good relations	<p>Consultation with Trade Unions and staff on the proposals.</p>

What sources of data / information are you using to inform your assessment?	<p>Workforce profile data (correct as at 27 October 2015), broken down by protected characteristics including: age, gender, religion, and full time/part time working, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation and pay grade.</p> <p>Where possible and appropriate, comparisons of the workforce profile are made with the make-up of the local community (Census 2011).</p> <p>Profile information for staff potentially at risk of redundancy in 2016/17, as at October 2015.</p> <p>NB: There was insufficient information about gender reassignment for analysis.</p>
---	--

In assessing the potential impact on people, are there any overall comments that you would like to make?	<p>This will be a working document that will need to be reviewed at regular intervals to consider the impact of the proposed changes as more information becomes available.</p>
--	---

Evidence and impact assessment

Explain the potential impact and opportunities it could have for people in terms of the following characteristics, where applicable:

Age								
Positive impact	In line with our policies we will aim to redeploy staff wherever possible to retain skills and experience	Negative impact	There is potential to lose older employees with the additional opportunity to request Voluntary redundancy as redundancy pay increases with length of service			Unequal impact		
Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment	Stevenage Borough Council workforce data as at 19/9/2013 and 19/9/2014 Local Community Data from Census 2011							
		Change from 2010 to 2012	2012 profile	2013 profile	2013 Potential staff affected out of total age range	2014 profile	2014 Potential staff affected out of total age range	% of Stevenage Community
	Under 25 (16-24)	- 1.7%	3.8% (27)	4.20% (31)	Nil	4.28% (29)	8.33%	11.8%
	25-29	+ 0.6%	9.3% (65)	18.02% (133)	7.52% (10)	17.26% (117)	41.67%	7.3%
	30-34	+ 0.5%	8.5% (60)					
	35-39	- 2.2%	6.8% (48)	19.24% (142)	11.97% (17)	17.70% (120)	8.33%	21.2%
	40-44	+ 0.6%	14.8% (104)					
	45-49	+ 0.2%	15.7% (110)	33.06% (244)	2.87% (7)	33.48% (227)	33.33%	20.3%
	50-54	- 0.4%	15.4% (108)					
	55-59	+ 1.6%	16.0%					

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

		(112)	(177)		25.66%		
60-64	+ 1.1%	8.7% (61)			(174)		4.9%
65 and over	- 0.2%	1.0% (7)	1.49% (11)	18.18% (2)	1.62% (11)	0%	14.1%
Total	-		100.00% (738)	(48)	100% (678)	100%	

The table reflects that Stevenage Borough Council has a higher representation across the age ranges between 25-44 & 45-54 when compared with the local community. However, Stevenage Borough Council has a lower representation in the age ranges “under 25” and “65 and over” when compared with the local community.

Comparisons for 16-25's can be misleading as many residents in this age range seek education and training as well as employment.

With regards to the age range 65+, comparisons for 65 and over can be misleading as health factors attributed to age may impact on a person's ability to work. Many people may also not want to work as they get older. To provide a point of comparison, in the East of England between September and November 2013, 12.2% of people over 65 were in employment (Office for National Statistics).

As demonstrated in the table, the indications are that the proposals may have a higher impact on staff in the age ranges 25-34 and 45-54. However; our workforce profile would remain largely reflective of the local community profile.

In terms of staff potentially affected by the proposals, Stevenage Borough Council workforce age profile will not be significantly impacted as the spread of staff potentially at risk is relatively even across the age range categories.

What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?

We will look to retain employees in line with the Redeployment Policy wherever it is possible to identify suitable alternative employment.

What do you still need to find out? Include in actions (last page)

We need to continue to keep the potential impact of the savings proposals under review, as further detail is known.

Disability e.g. physical impairment, mental ill health, learning difficulties, long-standing illness																																									
Positive impact	We will consider and make reasonable adjustments to support disabled staff with both selection process and appointment into available suitable alternative employment opportunities	Negative impact		Unequal impact																																					
Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment	Stevenage Borough Council workforce data as at 19/9/2013 and 19/9/2014. Local Community Data from Census 2011 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>SBC Headcount</th> <th>2013 SBC Percentage</th> <th>2013 Potentially at risk employees as %</th> <th>2014 SBC Percentage</th> <th>2014 Potentially at risk employees as %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>No</td> <td style="text-align: center;">619</td> <td style="text-align: center;">83.88%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6.78%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">85.84% (582)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">83.34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not stated</td> <td style="text-align: center;">65</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8.81%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7.37% (50)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prefer not to say</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.76%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.33% (9)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8.33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td style="text-align: center;">41</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5.56%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5.46% (37)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8.33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td style="text-align: center;">738</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100.00%</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">100% (678)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="margin-top: 10px;">As demonstrated in the table, employees who have self-declared themselves as disabled do not appear to be disproportionately impacted by the proposals. However, due to the numbers of employees who have not declared or have selected the “Prefer not to state” option, it is not possible to know if any of these employees have a disability.</p> <p style="margin-top: 10px;">In comparison with the local community, 7.5% of residents (aged 16-64) have declared themselves as having a disability and 5.46% of employees have declared themselves as having a disability. It should also be highlighted that 8.7% of employees have chosen not to declare whether they consider themselves to have a disability. However, this figure has been reducing since 2010, with a higher number of staff declaring whether</p>						SBC Headcount	2013 SBC Percentage	2013 Potentially at risk employees as %	2014 SBC Percentage	2014 Potentially at risk employees as %	No	619	83.88%	6.78%	85.84% (582)	83.34%	Not stated	65	8.81%	3%	7.37% (50)	0.00%	Prefer not to say	13	1.76%	15%	1.33% (9)	8.33%	Yes	41	5.56%	5%	5.46% (37)	8.33%	Total	738	100.00%		100% (678)	100%
	SBC Headcount	2013 SBC Percentage	2013 Potentially at risk employees as %	2014 SBC Percentage	2014 Potentially at risk employees as %																																				
No	619	83.88%	6.78%	85.84% (582)	83.34%																																				
Not stated	65	8.81%	3%	7.37% (50)	0.00%																																				
Prefer not to say	13	1.76%	15%	1.33% (9)	8.33%																																				
Yes	41	5.56%	5%	5.46% (37)	8.33%																																				
Total	738	100.00%		100% (678)	100%																																				

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

	they have disability or not.		
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?	It may be possible to work with a charity and other organisations to assist with identifying and funding appropriate reasonable adjustments (such as Access to Work)	What do you still need to find out? Include in actions (last page)	<p>We need to continue to keep the potential impact of the savings proposals under review, as further detail is known.</p> <p>We will need to ask all staff to review and update their personal records, including declaring their disability status.</p>

Gender reassignment					
Positive impact	n/a	Negative impact	n/a	Unequal impact	n/a
Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment		There is insufficient data to analyse the workforce profile in relation to gender reassignment and possible impact.			
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?		What do you still need to find out? Include in actions (last page)			

Marriage or civil partnership																							
Positive impact		Negative impact		Unequal impact																			
Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment		<p>In 2013 there was insufficient data to report on this area.</p> <p>Stevenage Borough Council workforce data as at 19/9/2014</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2014 SBC Percentage</th> <th>2014 potentially at risk employees (% to total affected)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Civil Partnership</td> <td>0.44%</td> <td>0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Divorced</td> <td>4.57%</td> <td>8.33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Engaged</td> <td>0.59%</td> <td>0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Form not returned</td> <td>0.15%</td> <td>0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Living with Partner</td> <td>6.05%</td> <td>0.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					2014 SBC Percentage	2014 potentially at risk employees (% to total affected)	Civil Partnership	0.44%	0.00%	Divorced	4.57%	8.33%	Engaged	0.59%	0.00%	Form not returned	0.15%	0.00%	Living with Partner	6.05%	0.00%
	2014 SBC Percentage	2014 potentially at risk employees (% to total affected)																					
Civil Partnership	0.44%	0.00%																					
Divorced	4.57%	8.33%																					
Engaged	0.59%	0.00%																					
Form not returned	0.15%	0.00%																					
Living with Partner	6.05%	0.00%																					

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

	Married	51.33%	41.67%
	Not Stated	2.65%	0.00%
	Prefer not to say	0.74%	0.00%
	Separated	1.47%	0.00%
	Single	31.12%	41.67%
	Widowed	0.88%	8.33%
	Total	100.00%	100.00%
As demonstrated in the table, the proposals do not appear to have any significant disproportionate impacts.			
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?		What do you still need to find out? Include in actions (last page)	

Pregnancy & maternity				
Positive impact	Redeployment policy provides priority status to those redeployee's who are on a period of maternity/adoption leave when their post is being made redundant. Pregnancy related absence will not form any part of redundancy selection criteria	Negative impact		Unequal impact
Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment	<p>There were no employees impacted by the 2014/15 proposals who were pregnant or on maternity leave.</p> <p>At this point in time we are unaware of any employees impacted by the 2015/16 proposals who may be pregnant and will subsequently be on maternity leave.</p> <p>Consideration will need to be given to whether there is any potential impact in future years.</p>			
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?		What do you still need to find out? Include in actions (last page)	We need to continue to keep the potential impact of the savings proposals under review, as further detail is known and consider whether there are any pregnancies or maternity leave considerations.	

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

Race						
Positive impact	Negative impact			Unequal impact		
Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment	Stevenage Borough Council workforce data as at 19/9/2013 and 19/9/2014 Local community data, Census 2011					
		Headcount	2013 Percentage	2013 Potentially at risk employees as %	2014 Percentage	2014 Potentially at risk employees as %
	BME	41	5.56%	14.63%	6.64% (45)	0.00%
	Not stated	70	9.49%	4.29%	8.26% (56)	0.00%
	Other Background	25	3.39%	4%	5.60% (38)	0.00%
	Prefer not to say	4	0.54%	25%	0.59% (4)	0.00%
	White - British	598	81.03%	6.19%	78.91% (535)	100.00%
Total	738	100.00%	100%	100% (678)	100%	
<p>Stevenage Borough Council has a combined representation of people from a BME or other background of 12.24%. While this is lower than the representation among the population of Stevenage at 16.9% (according to Census 2011) it has increased over recent years (from 8.4% in 2012).</p> <p>Whilst the potentially at risk employees all fall within the White – British category, due to the small number of staff at risk (up to 10) across Stevenage Borough Council , there is no indication that selection for Redundancy has not been applied in a fair & non-discriminatory manner.</p>						
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?	A Recruitment and Selection Policy is in place, to promote equality.		What do you still need to find out? Include in actions (last page)	We need to consider how the savings proposals may impact upon this profile, once further detail is known.		

Religion or belief					
Positive impact	Negative impact			Unequal impact	

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment

	SBC Headcount	2013 SBC Percentage	2013 Potentially at risk employees as %	2014 SBC Percentage	2014 Potentially at risk employees as %
Buddhist	*	0.54%	25%	0.15% (1)	0%
Christian	365	49.46%	5.75%	49.12% (333)	50.00%
Hindu	*	0.41%	-	0.59% (4)	0%
Jewish	*	0.14%	100%	-	-
Muslim	6	0.81%	-	1.18% (8)	0%
No Religion	213	28.86%	6.57%	30.24% (205)	33.33%
Not stated	89	12.06%	4.49%	10.62% (72)	0%
Other	*	0.27%	-	0.29% (2)	0%
Prefer not to say	50	6.78%	10%	6.78% (46)	16.67%
Sikh	5	0.68%	-	1.03% (7)	0%
Total	738	100.00%		100% (678)	100%

*Figures are anonymised to protect the identity of employees within group

As demonstrated in the table, the proposals do not appear to have any significant disproportionate impacts. However, it should be noted the combined total percentage of categories 'not stated' & 'prefer not to say' totals 17.4%. It is not therefore possible to be certain of the impact.

Religion	% of Stevenage Community
Christian	54.4
Buddist	0.5
Hindu	1.2
Jewish	0.2
Muslim	2.0
Sikh	0.4
Other	0.5
No religion	34.1
Not stated	6.7

What opportunities are there to promote

What do you still need to find out? Include in

We need to consider how the savings proposals may impact upon this profile,

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

equality and inclusion?

actions (last page)

once further detail is known.

Sex							
Positive impact	In line with our policies we will aim to redeploy staff wherever possible to retain skills and experience regardless of sex.	Negative impact		Unequal impact			
Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment	Stevenage Borough Council Workforce data as at 19/9/2013 and 19/9/2014 Local community data, Census 2011						
		2013 Headcount	2013 Percentage	2013 Potentially at risk employees as %	2014 Headcount	2014 Percentage	2014 Potentially at risk employees as %
	Female	364	49.32%	9.07%	345	50.88%	58.33%
	Male	374	50.68%	4.01%	333	49.12%	41.67%
Total	738	100.00%		678	100%	100%	
<p>As demonstrated in the table, there is potentially a more significant impact upon female employees. Stevenage Borough Council currently have a slightly larger percentage of female employees and this is reflective of the Stevenage local community profile (49.4% of residents were male and 50.6% of residents were female).</p> <p>It should be noted that in 2013-14 the proposals also had a more significant impact upon female employees, compared with male employees.</p>							
	2013 SBC Headcount	2013 SBC Percentage	% of community aged 16-24 (Census 2011)	2014 SBC Headcount	2014 SBC Percentage		
Female Full Time	252	34.15%	27.2%	230	33.92%		
Male Full Time	359	48.64%	46%	319	47.05%		

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

	Total Full Time	611	82.79%	73.2%	549	80.97
	Female Part Time	112	15.18%	19.9%	115	16.96
	Male Part Time	15	2.03%	6.9%	14	2.06
	Total Part Time	127	17.21%	26.8%	129	19.02
	Total	738	100.00%		678	100.00
<p>Stevenage Borough Council has a higher percentage of full time employees and a lower percentage of part time employees when compared with the local community profile. This may be a result of the flexitime working arrangements that are available to employees which means employees are able to work flexibly without moving to a permanent part time contract. It should also be highlighted that in previous savings programmes part time staff have been more affected by redundancy than those who work full time, and in line with national trends, these are most notably women.</p> <p>A general observation of the trend of the workforce has shown that we have seen the biggest reduction in full-time employees since 2012 (71 officers) and an increase of 47 part-time employees. Given the difference in total numbers, the % representation of these staff has remained largely the same.</p>						
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?				What do you still need to find out? Include in actions (last page)	We need to consider how the savings proposals may impact upon this profile, once further detail is known.	

Sexual orientation e.g. straight, lesbian / gay, bisexual							
Positive impact	Negative impact			Unequal impact			
Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment	Stevenage Borough Council workforce data as at 19/9/2014						
		2013 Headcount	2013 Percentage	2013 Potentially at risk employees as %	2014 Headcount	2014 Percentage	2014 Potentially at risk employees as %
	Bisexual	*	0.41%	-	*	0.29%	0.00%
	Gay Man	*	0.14%	-	*	0.15%	0.00%

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

	Heterosexual	618	83.74%	6.80%	576	84.96%	100.00%
	Lesbian	*	0.27%	-	*	0.29%	0.00%
	Not Stated	78	10.57%	2.57%	68	10.03%	0.00%
	Prefer not to say	36	4.88%	11.1%	29	4.28%	0.00%
	Total	738	100.00%		678	100.00%	100.00%
<p>*Figures are anonymised to protect the identity of employees within group</p> <p>As demonstrated in the table above, the areas potentially impacted the most are the “Prefer not the state” option and “Not stated” option. By the very nature of these options, it is not possible to analyse the potential impact.</p> <p>There has been insufficient data in this area previously to draw comparisons and no data was gathered in the Census 2011 about the local community’s sexual orientation.</p>							
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?	Encourage staff to self-declare	What do you still need to find out? Include in actions (last page)	We need to consider how the savings proposals may impact upon this profile, once further detail is known.				

Socio-economic¹							
e.g. low income, unemployed, homelessness, caring responsibilities, access to internet, public transport users							
Positive impact	Stevenage Borough Council is a Living Wage Employer. Redundancy pay is based on contractual pay and exceeds the statutory minimum.	Negative impact		Unequal impact			
Please evidence the data and information you used to support	Stevenage Borough Council workforce data as at 19/9/2013 and (date)						
	2013 Headcount	2013 Percentage	2013 Potentially at risk	2014 Headcount	2014 Percentage	2014 Potentially at risk	

¹Although non-statutory, the council has chosen to implement the Socio-Economic Duty and so decision-makers should use their discretion to consider the impact on people with a socio-economic disadvantage.

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

this assessment				employees as %			employees as %
	Grade 1				29	4.28%	0.00%
	Grade 2				75	11.06%	0.00%
	Grade 3				117	17.26%	58.33%
	Grade 4				103	15.19%	16.67%
	Grade 5				82	12.09%	0.00%
	Grade 6				83	12.24%	8.33%
	Grade 7				46	6.78%	0.00%
	Grade 8				36	5.31%	16.67%
	Grade 9				16	2.36%	0.00%
	Grade 10				25	3.69%	0.00%
	Grade 11				15	2.21%	0.00%
	Grade 12				14	2.06%	0.00%
	Chief Officers				16	2.36%	0.00%
	Other Grades				27	3.98%	0.00%
Total					100.00%	100%	
<p>Please note that due to the introduction of Single Status pay and new grading structure we have removed the previous grade structure as the data is not comparable.</p> <p>Grade 3 is the most affected by these proposals however the impact is spread across a range of grades.</p>							
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?				What do you still need to find out? Include in actions (last page)	We need to consider how the savings proposals may impact upon this profile, once further detail is known.		

Other					
please feel free to consider the potential impact on people in any other contexts					
Positive impact	n/a	Negative impact	n/a	Unequal impact	n/a
Please evidence the data and		No other impacts are anticipated.			

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

information you used to support this assessment			
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?		What do you still need to find out? Include in actions (last page)	

What are the findings of any consultation with:

Staff?	Each restructure proposal will be subject to consultation with staff and Trade Unions in accordance with statutory requirements	Residents?	N/A
Voluntary & community sector?	N/A	Partners?	N/A
Other stakeholders?	N/A		

Overall conclusion & future activity

Explain the overall findings of the assessment and reasons for outcome (please choose one) :		
1. No inequality, inclusion issues or opportunities to further improve have been identified		
Negative / unequal impact, barriers to inclusion or improvement opportunities identified	2a. Adjustments made	
	2b. Continue as planned	We will continue to adhere to Redundancy and Redeployment policies to ensure consistency, fairness & transparency, and work with partners to ensure reasonable adjustments for disabled employees.
	2c. Stop and remove	

Detail the actions that are needed as a result of this assessment and how they will help to remove discrimination & harassment, promote equal opportunities and / or encourage good relations :				
Action	Will this help to remove, promote and / or encourage?	Responsible officer	Deadline	How will this be embedded as business as usual?
On-going review as further detail becomes available during consultation periods, considering in detail each of the areas.	All		On-going	Will be built into consultation process
Explore opportunities to work with other organisations and charities to assist in identifying and implementing reasonable adjustments for disabled staff	Remove and promote		On-going	Will form part of individual consultation meeting discussions
Consider whether any of the proposed redundancies include staff affected by pregnancy or maternity leave	Remove and promote		On-going	Will form part of individual consultation meeting discussions
Encourage staff to self-declare their personal	Remove and promote		On-going	Continue to encourage people to declare personal

All figures quoted are rounded to two decimal places

characteristics				characteristics as part of the recruitment process.
Continue to monitor the profile of the workforce through the quarterly workforce information provided to SMT, as part of routine workforce reporting arrangements	Remove and promote	Christina Hefferon/SMT	On-going (next annual report due April 2015)	As part of routine workforce profile reporting arrangements

Approved by Strategic Director:
Date: