

Full Equality Impact Assessment- Appendix H

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

What is being assessed?		Proposed forthcoming staff related savings over the next 3 years (2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17)		
Lead Assessor	Clare Davies, HR Manager (Business Partnering and Policy Development)		Assessment team Christina Hefferon Richard Protheroe Emma Barron	
Start date	28 October 2013	End date		2017
When will the EqIA be reviewed?		Ongoing reviews over the next 3 years and specifically as consultation in each SDU commences.		

Who may be affected by it?	<p>Early indications from the proposals are that there may be in the region of 20 redundancies in year one. The proposals for years two and three require further investigation and will consider the impact on the equality profile of and diversity within the workforce.</p>
What are the key aims of it?	<p>Stevenage Borough Council is required to make significant savings of £3million over the next 3 years. 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 new 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 3 years savings proposals • Impact of the proposed savings on the workforce profile. <p>This is intended to guide decision making in considering the savings proposals over the next 2-3 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 services to our equally diverse community.</p>

Appendix H

	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 (PPC) and Outplacement support for those staff impacted by redundancy.
--	--

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

What sources of data / information are you using to inform your assessment?	<p>Workforce profile data (correct as at 19 September 2013), 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 year one, as at 31 December 2013.</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?	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.
--	--

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 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. Local Community Data from Census 2011					
		Change from 2010 to 2012	2012 profile	2013 profile	Potential staff affected out of total age range	% of Stevenage Community
	Under 25 (16-24)	- 1.7%	3.8% (27)	4.20% (31)	Nil	11.8%
	25-29	+ 0.6%	9.3% (65)	18.02% (133)	7.52% (10)	7.3%
	30-34	+ 0.5%	8.5% (60)			
	35-39	- 2.2%	6.8% (48)	19.24% (142)	11.97% (17)	21.2%
	40-44	+ 0.6%	14.8% (104)			
	45-49	+ 0.2%	15.7% (110)	33.06% (244)	2.87% (7)	20.3%
	50-54	- 0.4%	15.4% (108)			
	55-59	+ 1.6%	16.0% (112)	23.98% (177)	6.78% (12)	4.9%
	60-64	+ 1.1%	8.7% (61)			
	65 and over	- 0.2%	1.0%	1.49%	18.18%	14.1%

Appendix H

		(7)	(11)	(2)	
Total	-		100.00% (738)	(48)	

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

The table reflects that Stevenage Borough Council has a higher representation in the age range 45-64 when compared with the local community.

As demonstrated in the table, the indications are that the proposals may have a higher impact on staff in the age ranges 35-44 and 65+.

With regards to the age range 35-44, our workforce profile would remain largely reflective of the local community profile for this age range.

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).

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	Negative impact		Unequal impact	

Appendix H

	available suitable alternative employment opportunities																												
Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment	<p>Stevenage Borough Council workforce data as at 19/9/2013. Local Community Data from Census 2011</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="488 408 1256 703"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>SBC Headcount</th> <th>SBC Percentage</th> <th>Potentially at risk employees as %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>619</td> <td>83.88%</td> <td>6.78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not stated</td> <td>65</td> <td>8.81%</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prefer not to say</td> <td>13</td> <td>1.76%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>41</td> <td>5.56%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>738</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>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 selected the “Prefer not to state” option, it is not possible to know if any of these employees have a disability.</p> <p>In comparison with the local community, which have 7.5% of residents (aged 16-64) having declared themselves as having a disability, 5.56% of employees have declared themselves as having a disability. It should also be highlighted that 10.6% 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 they have disability or not.</p>						SBC Headcount	SBC Percentage	Potentially at risk employees as %	No	619	83.88%	6.78%	Not stated	65	8.81%	3%	Prefer not to say	13	1.76%	15%	Yes	41	5.56%	5%	Total	738	100.00%	
	SBC Headcount	SBC Percentage	Potentially at risk employees as %																										
No	619	83.88%	6.78%																										
Not stated	65	8.81%	3%																										
Prefer not to say	13	1.76%	15%																										
Yes	41	5.56%	5%																										
Total	738	100.00%																											
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?	It may be possible to work with 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>Ask all staff to review and update their personal records, including to declare their disability status.</p>																										

Appendix H

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	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 marriage and civil partnership 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)	

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		From the information of employees potentially impacted by the year 1 proposals, we are not aware (as at 31 st December 2013) of any employee who may potentially be either being pregnant or on maternity leave during the time of the proposals.			
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.	

Appendix H

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 Local community data, Census 2011																													
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Headcount</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Potentially at risk employees as %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BME</td> <td>41</td> <td>5.56%</td> <td>14.63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not stated</td> <td>70</td> <td>9.49%</td> <td>4.29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Background</td> <td>25</td> <td>3.39%</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prefer not to say</td> <td>4</td> <td>0.54%</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White - British</td> <td>598</td> <td>81.03%</td> <td>6.19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>738</td> <td>100.00%</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As demonstrated in the table, there is potentially a disproportionate impact on BME employees. Stevenage Borough Council has a combined representation of people from a BME or other background of 8.95%, which is significantly lower than the representation among the population of Stevenage at 16.9% (according to Census 2011).</p> <p>There is also potentially a significant impact on employees who have chosen the option "Prefer not to state". However, due to this nature of the statement, it is not possible to identify if this has a disproportionate impact on any particular groups.</p>				Headcount	Percentage	Potentially at risk employees as %	BME	41	5.56%	14.63%	Not stated	70	9.49%	4.29%	Other Background	25	3.39%	4%	Prefer not to say	4	0.54%	25%	White - British	598	81.03%	6.19%	Total	738	100.00%
	Headcount	Percentage	Potentially at risk employees as %																											
BME	41	5.56%	14.63%																											
Not stated	70	9.49%	4.29%																											
Other Background	25	3.39%	4%																											
Prefer not to say	4	0.54%	25%																											
White - British	598	81.03%	6.19%																											
Total	738	100.00%																												
What opportunities are there to promote equality and inclusion?	A new Recruitment and Selection Policy was implemented in October 2014, 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

Appendix H

Positive impact	Negative impact	Unequal impact																																																																				
<p>Please evidence the data and information you used to support this assessment</p>	<table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;"></th> <th style="width: 15%;">SBC Headcount</th> <th style="width: 15%;">SBC Percentage</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Potentially at risk employees as %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Buddhist</td><td style="text-align: center;">4</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.54%</td><td style="text-align: center;">25%</td></tr> <tr><td>Christian</td><td style="text-align: center;">365</td><td style="text-align: center;">49.46%</td><td style="text-align: center;">5.75%</td></tr> <tr><td>Hindu</td><td style="text-align: center;">3</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.41%</td><td style="text-align: center;">-</td></tr> <tr><td>Jewish</td><td style="text-align: center;">1</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.14%</td><td style="text-align: center;">100%</td></tr> <tr><td>Muslim</td><td style="text-align: center;">6</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.81%</td><td style="text-align: center;">-</td></tr> <tr><td>No Religion</td><td style="text-align: center;">213</td><td style="text-align: center;">28.86%</td><td style="text-align: center;">6.57%</td></tr> <tr><td>Not stated</td><td style="text-align: center;">89</td><td style="text-align: center;">12.06%</td><td style="text-align: center;">4.49%</td></tr> <tr><td>Other</td><td style="text-align: center;">2</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.27%</td><td style="text-align: center;">-</td></tr> <tr><td>Prefer not to say</td><td style="text-align: center;">50</td><td style="text-align: center;">6.78%</td><td style="text-align: center;">10%</td></tr> <tr><td>Sikh</td><td style="text-align: center;">5</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.68%</td><td style="text-align: center;">-</td></tr> <tr><td>Total</td><td style="text-align: center;">738</td><td style="text-align: center;">100.00%</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="margin-top: 10px;">As demonstrated in the table above, the proposals potentially have a significant impact on employees of Jewish and Buddhist religions. These two religions have low representation within the Stevenage local community, as demonstrated in the table below and the workforce profile largely correlates with the local community profile</p> <table border="1" style="margin-top: 10px; margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 70%;">Religion</th> <th style="width: 30%;">% of Stevenage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Christian</td><td style="text-align: center;">54.4</td></tr> <tr><td>Buddist</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.5</td></tr> <tr><td>Hindu</td><td style="text-align: center;">1.2</td></tr> <tr><td>Jewish</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.2</td></tr> <tr><td>Muslim</td><td style="text-align: center;">2.0</td></tr> <tr><td>Sikh</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.4</td></tr> <tr><td>Other</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.5</td></tr> <tr><td>No religion</td><td style="text-align: center;">34.1</td></tr> <tr><td>Not stated</td><td style="text-align: center;">6.7</td></tr> </tbody> </table>			SBC Headcount	SBC Percentage	Potentially at risk employees as %	Buddhist	4	0.54%	25%	Christian	365	49.46%	5.75%	Hindu	3	0.41%	-	Jewish	1	0.14%	100%	Muslim	6	0.81%	-	No Religion	213	28.86%	6.57%	Not stated	89	12.06%	4.49%	Other	2	0.27%	-	Prefer not to say	50	6.78%	10%	Sikh	5	0.68%	-	Total	738	100.00%		Religion	% of Stevenage	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
	SBC Headcount	SBC Percentage	Potentially at risk employees as %																																																																			
Buddhist	4	0.54%	25%																																																																			
Christian	365	49.46%	5.75%																																																																			
Hindu	3	0.41%	-																																																																			
Jewish	1	0.14%	100%																																																																			
Muslim	6	0.81%	-																																																																			
No Religion	213	28.86%	6.57%																																																																			
Not stated	89	12.06%	4.49%																																																																			
Other	2	0.27%	-																																																																			
Prefer not to say	50	6.78%	10%																																																																			
Sikh	5	0.68%	-																																																																			
Total	738	100.00%																																																																				
Religion	% of Stevenage																																																																					
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																																																																					

Appendix H

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.

Sex					
Positive impact	One instance of existing informal part time working arrangements made permanent by mutual agreement form part of the savings proposals and this supports flexible working arrangements.	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 Local community data, Census 2011				
		Headcount	Percentage	Potentially at risk employees as %	
	Female	364	49.32%	9.07%	
	Male	374	50.68%	4.01%	
	Total	738	100.00%		
	<p>As demonstrated in the table, there is potentially a slightly more significant impact upon female employees. Stevenage Borough Council currently have a larger percentage of male employees and it should be noted that the Stevenage local community profile is 49.4% of residents were male and 50.6% of residents were female.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that a number of the savings proposals include the formalisation of part time</p>				

Appendix H

working arrangements, by mutual agreement, which predominantly relate to female employees.

	SBC Headcount	SBC Percentage	% of community aged 16- 24 (Census 2011)
Female Full Time	252	34.15%	27.2%
Male Full Time	359	48.64%	46%
Total Full Time	611	82.79%	73.2%
Female Part Time	112	15.18%	19.9%
Male Part Time	15	2.03%	6.9%
Total Part Time	127	17.21%	26.8%
Total	738	100.00%	

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. 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.

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

Stevenage Borough Council workforce data

	Headcount	Percentage	Potentially at risk

Appendix H

used to support this assessment				employees as %
	Bisexual	3	0.41%	-
	Gay Man	1	0.14%	-
	Heterosexual	618	83.74%	6.80%
	Lesbian	2	0.27%	-
	Not Stated	78	10.57%	2.57%
	Prefer not to say	36	4.88%	11.1%
	Total	738	100.00%	
<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 communities’ 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		Negative impact	Reduction of approximately 10 agency/seasonal employment opportunities proposed.	Unequal impact
Please evidence the data and information you used to support	Stevenage Borough Council workforce data as at 19/9/2013			
		Headcount	Percentage	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.

Appendix H

this assessment				employees as %	
	Chief Officers	15	2.03%	-	
	Scale 1 - 4	290	39.30%	7.93%	
	Scale 5 - 6	106	14.36%	2.83%	
	SO1 -SO2	71	9.62%	2.82%	
	PO1 - PO4	78	10.57%	14.1%	
	PO5 - PO11	59	7.99%	15.25%	
	Other*	119	16.12%	-	
Total	738	100.00%			
<p>As demonstrated in the table, there is a disproportionate impact upon the PO grades. The profile of the organisation broken down by grade remains largely the same as it was in October 2012.</p> <p>In addition, since April 2013 Stevenage Borough Council has on average hired 80 agency workers each month.</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 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?		Residents?	
Voluntary &		Partners?	

Appendix H

community sector?			
Other stakeholders?			

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	Introduced new Redundancy and Redeployment Policies to ensure fair consultation and selection process and the identification of suitable alternative employment wherever possible. Working with partners to ensure reasonable adjustments for disabled employees
	2b. Continue as planned	
	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.		Clare Davies	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	Support disabled employees with both selection and appointment to possible redeployment opportunities	Clare Davies	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	Clare Davies	On-going	Will form part of individual consultation meeting discussions

Appendix H

Encourage staff to self-declare their personal characteristics	Remove and promote	Clare Davies	On-going	Will form part of review of HR system and employee self-service facilities
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/SMB	On-going (next quarterly report due April 2014)	As part of routine workforce profile reporting arrangements
Develop and implement a People Strategy to encourage a diverse workforce	Encourage and promote	Christina Hefferon/Clare Davies and SMB	Implement 5 year strategy from 1 April 2014	There will be a Council wide People Strategy and each SDU will develop, implement and monitor annual People Plans.

Approved by Strategic Director:
Date: