Equality Impact Assessment for Reorganisations

This part of the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is triggered by an Organisational Change Assessment report. If you require support completing this form, please speak to your HR Relationship Manager or call Smart HR on extension 1000 and select option 4.

INITIAL SCREENING:

1. Service Details

Department	ELRS
Division	Leisure & Parks – Cemeteries
Policy, proposal, strategy or function being assessed	Varying the current grounds maintenance contract with Quadron Services Limited (QSL) to include the management of Cemeteries function
Lead officer carrying out EIA Name, title and telephone number	Ullash Karia, Head of Leisure & Parks
Other officers involved in EIA (include HR Relationship Managers)	Ullash Karia, Head of Leisure & Parks
Date of Assessment	15.01.13

2. Proposal Details

Policy Aims, Objectives and Projected Outcomes	What are the main aims, purpose and outcomes of the proposed reorganisation as detailed in the organisation change assessment.	
	 In your response please consider: What is the purpose of the policy? What outcomes are expected? Does the policy have any specially designed measures to promote equality of opportunity? 	

Further to the Cabinet Members approval back in September 2012 to vary the current grounds maintenance contract with Quadron Services Limited (QSL) to include the management and client function of the Cemeteries. Cabinet approval is now sought to make this a more permanent arrangement.

It is proposed that the management function for Cemeteries be outsourced to Quadron Services Ltd (QSL), the current Grounds Maintenance provider, with the one existing staff member being seconded to QSL on existing pay, terms and conditions. This will enable better co-ordination of service delivery as QSL already maintain the cemeteries and carry out the grave digging and back fill operations. RBKC have already approved the outsourcing of the Cemeteries functions to QSL and bi-borough working has created an opportunity to look at smart ways of working to improve service delivery and to generate a small amount of savings to both authorities.

QSL would be responsible for filling the vacant posts in line with the council's Equal Opportunities Policy.

Intended Beneficiaries	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to this policy
	 In your response, please consider: Who will be affected by this change Who does the policy intend to benefit

The current LBHF cemeteries service has a manager and two assistants. The Senior Cemeteries & Facilities Officer and the Cemetery Manager both retired on 31 August 2012, last year.

- The Bi-borough initiative provided the opportunity to re-assess the staffing of the service across both Authorities and a number of options were considered. QSL already permanently manage the client management function in the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea and since September 2012 have been doing the same in Hammersmith & Fulham. This includes a Manager across both Boroughs.
- 2. The arrangement has proven to be successful, there has not been a dip in quality of provision and because QSL already look after the grounds maintenance element there have been benefits in joining up both elements. In particular there have been notable synergies in booking and managing grave plots with the wider grounds maintenance of the cemeteries.
- Currently there is only one member of staff who is employed by LBHF, Bereavement services Officer it is proposed that she would TUPE across to QSL, who are also an equal opportunities employer with a very good track record.

3. Relevance/Proportion

J. I (CIC Valio	en reportion			
Will the reorganisation proposal require an increase or decrease (change) in staff numbers?				
Is it likely to	NO			
Do you feel of the prote	NO			
 Age Disability Race Gender reassignment Marriage and Civil Partnership Sex Sexual Orientation 				
•	f you have answered YES to any these questions, what is the proposed Impact Assessment level of the proposal, plan or function?			
Low	Addition/Deletion of posts, no change to job descriptions and/or terms and conditions.			
Medium Addition/Deletion of posts, change to job descriptions, learning and development opportunities but no change to terms and conditions.				
High Addition/Deletion of posts and entire teams, learning and development opportunities, changes to job descriptions and terms and conditions including grade/pay, flexible working, allowances, overtime pay etc.				
Go to full E	EIA below if MEDIUM or HIGH.			

If you have answered **NO** to all of these questions and the assessment is **LOW**, list the evidence considered below and include the following statement in the Organisational Change Assessment report. Please ensure that this is signed off by the Head of Service.

"This proposal was screened for impact on equalities on (insert date). The following evidence (insert evidence) has been considered. As a result of this screening, it has been decided that a full equality impact assessment is not required."

"This proposal was screened for impact on equalities on 03.01.13. The following evidence has been considered: A full and detailed evaluation of all options has been prepared (please see imbedded document) and considered by the Head of Service and consulted on with Senior Managers within ELRS. As a result of this screening, it has been decided that a full equality impact assessment is not required."

Service Head	Ullash Karia, Head of Leisure & Parks
Signature	
Date	

FULL IMPACT ASSESSMENT:

4. Data & Evidence

Review of relevant data

List all examples of quantitative and qualitative data available that will enable the impact assessment to be undertaken. Try to use various data sources. The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) and Government Equalities Office (GEO) publishes many research reports on equalities.

Example

- Workforce Report
- Department Demographic data
- Staff Survey
- Published workforce research
- Equality and Human Rights Commission Reports

The workforce report is a published report that can be found on the internet. This is published annually usually around June/July after the end of the financial year.

The department's demographic data can be obtained from Trent HR.

Please note that if the reorganisation is for a small team, use division/department data. This is to ensure protection of personal data where individuals could be easily identifiable.

Summarise the key information from the data/evidence and how it relates to the public sector duties (PSD)

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- advance equality of opportunity between different groups; and
- foster good relations between different groups.

5. Findings

Assessment of impact	<u>Employment</u>
	Use the data to complete appendix 1 to identify the effect of the policy
	on different groups.
	From demographic data, look at the percentages of 'at risk' in relation to

the department/division and general workforce. 'At risk' percentages above the department and general workforce population are considered negative impact. 'At risk percentages at or below the department and council workforce population are considered neutral or positive impact. Concentrate on at risk percentages with a variance over 10%.

Complete the table below by noting what the data is telling you about each group.

In your response please consider:

- How does the data identify potential or known positive impacts?
 What are the reasons?
- How does the data identify any potential or known adverse impacts? What are the reasons?
- Percentages can be deceiving so where numbers involved are small, make sure you note where this is the case.

Remember each reorganisation is unique. In some cases, comparing the grades will also be important as well as the main protected characteristics especially as we know that women and BME are underrepresented at SMG grade in the organisation.

Where you do not have sufficient data, make it explicit for example 'We currently do not have any data to make an objective assessment on this and there is limited research to inform our thinking'

Appendix 1 and 2



EIA - Reorg Impact Analysis v2.xls

Group	Impact (Positive Negative Neutral)	Comments/Reasoning
Age		
Disability		
Gender		
Race		

Sexual Orientation		
Religion/belief (including non-belief)		

6. Consultation

This section is to be completed after you have consulted.
Briefly describe who you consulted, when and the outcome. Please outline a brief summary of the responses gained and links to relevant documents, as well as any actions.
This information is highly relevant for medium to high Impact EIAs.
Remember to update the findings (section 5) after you have completed this section.

Consultation group	Date completed	Findings	Recommendations and Action

7. Mitigation

Measures to mitigate adverse impact	From the data and consultation, have you identified any adverse impact? If so, are there changes that you could introduce which would make the proposal work better for this group of people? Is further research or consultation required?
	From Appendix 1, consider mitigating measures for at risk variances and especially those above 30%. Please consider:

- Practical actions to reduce, justify or remove any adverse/negative impact?
- Are there learning and development opportunities?
- How the policy can be revised, or additional measures taken, in order for the policy to achieve its aims without risking adverse impact?
- Legal responsibilities under Disability requiring treating disabled people more favourably where necessary?
- Have the plans been revised in light of the consultation results, to enhance positive impact or reduce/eliminate negative impact?

8. Conclusions

Outcome of Assessment

Summarise your findings and give an overview of whether the proposed reorganisation will meet the Council's responsibilities in relation to equality. Pay particular attention to where differential adverse negative impact is identified taking into account mitigating measures.

If the proposal is likely to have an adverse impact on any equality group how this can be justified? Make sure you outline the Economical/Technical/Organisation (ETO) reasons where applicable.

It is also important to note where the analysis on staff at risk shows disproportionate negative impact and the expectation is that a large number of staff will secure roles in the new structure.

Conclusions can be:

- 1 Proceed with the proposal *as is* either because there is no evidence to show adverse impact or there is justification to do so. Remember weighty reasons will be needed. It is important to underline that there is no justification for direct discrimination and that indirect discrimination will need to be justified.
- 2- Adjust the proposal to remove any barriers and better promote equality which will include putting in place the mitigating measures or making changes to the proposal itself.
- 3 Abandon the policy if the risks of going ahead are high.

9. Action Plan

Action Plan	Any actions that arise as a result of the impact assessment should be noted here. Please include responsibility and target date.
	Example Complete a further EIA at the end of the restructure when the impact on the workforce is clearer.

Action	Responsibility	Date

10. Monitoring and Review

Post-Reorganisation	A review will be required once the proposal has been put in place to
Assessment	check what the actual impact was.
Outcome of Implementation	Using Appendix 2, complete the details of the remaining staff. Look at the percentages of remaining staff compared to the 'at risk', department and council workforce population. Using the principles set out above, note your analysis.
	Note that where 'remaining staff' percentages are higher than the 'at risk, then there was in fact a positive impact and this should be highlighted.
	Remember, percentages can be misleading so where numbers involved are small, make sure you note where it is the case.

Reorganisation EIA v3.4

Date of Post –	
Reorganisation	
Assessment.	
Authorisation	
Service Head	
Signature	
Date	
Date sent for publication	

Once you have filled in this document please send a copy to Employment Equalities Lead.