

Appendix 5 x Full Equality Assessment (EA).

Section 1: General Information

1a) Area of reorganisation

Integrated Commissioning – Health Adults and Communities

1b) Service area

The Ageing Well service and the Cross Cutting service

1c) Service Head

Warwick Tomsett – Divisional Director
Darren Ingram – Service Manager
Rahima Miah – Service Manager

1d) Name and role of the officer/s completing the EA

Darren Ingram – Service Manager

Section 2: Information about changes

2a) In brief please explain the reorganisation and the reasons for this change

This restructure is driven by the integration of the Council and CCG commissioning functions into an integrated division and the need to invest in appropriate levels of strategic staff to deliver on the vision of the Tower Hamlets together partnership. The Council and CCG, through the Tower Hamlets Together partnership have a shared vision, ambition and drive to become one of the best interconnected commissioners of provision for residents in the borough, supporting the delivery of joint planning and joint commissioning in order to ensure the best possible outcomes and maximum value for a collective investment.

The reorganisation deletes a number of defunct posts – the Service Manager, Access to Resources which is no longer required due to the Brokerage and Brokerage Finance teams transferring to other parts of the Council; the Transactional Commissioning Manager due to contract management now being integrated within the commissioning services; the Market Infrastructure Officer in recognition that many of the functions will now be integrated into the commissioning manager roles within the new structure.

The commissioning officer posts and monitoring officer posts will be merged in the proposed structure to reflect the need to approach commissioning and contract management differently and there is a reduction in posts (13 to 6) to reflect the shift in requirements towards more strategic roles that can deliver on the vision for integrated commissioning.

There is a reduction in the number of quality monitoring officers within the proposed structure and this reflects a need to align this resource more closely with the locality based commissioning approach for domiciliary care and for the resources to reflect the levels of monitoring required going forward.

The proposed structure introduces the role of Senior Commissioning Manager. These posts will play a key role in delivering the ambition for joint commissioning and will have a lead role for the commissioning of a broad portfolio area within a service, working with a broad spectrum of partners to deliver key priorities for the Council, CCG and the wider THT partnership.

2b) What are the equality implications of your proposal?

At the start of this consultation a review of the equality profile for the function has taken place and will be kept under review throughout the restructuring process. At present no adverse implications have been identified. The data is summarised below:

- There are 29 staff impacted by the restructure currently employed in Integrated Commissioning .

A total of 35 posts will be deleted and 25 posts will be created. The number of staff impacted by this restructure is 29 and the FTW equivalent is 27.83.

There is also one vacancy (included in the above figures) within the Mental Health and Joint Commissioning team that is being ring-fenced for staff in scope for this restructure.

- 20 are female and 10 are male. Of these 3 are listed as having a disability, 24 did not and 3 either have missing data or preferred not to say.
- There are 10 officers who classify themselves as White, 12 as Bangladeshi, 4 as Black and 4 as Asian. The remaining age classifications had fewer than 5.
- There are 3 officers aged 25-34, 1 listed as 35-44, 2 listed as 45-49, 7 listed as 50-54 The remaining age classifications had fewer than 5.
- There are 25 officers listed as heterosexual, 4 either have no data or prefer not to say. 2 officers listed as bi-sexual or gay.
- There are 11 officers listed as Muslim, 7 listed as Christian, 6 as no religion and 0 listed as Hindu and 2 listed as other religion. 3 officers are listed as either no data or declined to say.

Staff will have access to opportunities to secure new posts in the new service and/or express an interest in ER/VR, and redeployment to council wide positions. All staff at risk of being displaced will be offered relevant support to broaden their skills and knowledge including interview / CV writing skills.

Recommendation

To proceed with the reorganisation, keeping the impact on staff under review throughout and putting in place relevant mitigation should any impact emerge.

2c) What is the cumulative equality impact of your proposal?

The new service model has 25 posts. As a result of performing the analysis no specific equality impact is anticipated.

Any staff displaced by the reorganisation will have access to redeployment opportunities and the impact of the restructure kept under review so that consideration can be given to any relevant changes

Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

With reference to the analysis above, for each of the equality strands in the table below please record and evidence your conclusions around equality impact in relation to the savings proposal.

Note that the Guidance states:

No specific data should be quoted if individual staff can be identified. No data should be quoted unless there are 5 or more employees as part of the larger group being compared to e.g. there are 2 disabled employees, both of whom are amongst the 14 staff that have a direct assimilation claim. In circumstances when the group being compared against is 4 or less, there must be a standard comment of “HR have reviewed the data and have not identified any adverse impact. Specific figures cannot be disclosed due to the risk of individual employees being identified from the statistics”.

Race

Identify the effect of the restructure on different racial groups.

Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on specific ethnic groups?

Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.

Potentially there could be changes in the ethnicity profile of the division but at this stage it is difficult to determine the impact. This will be kept under review at different stages of the restructure.

Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.

The current workforce profile is as follows:

All racial groups are potentially adversely impacted by the restructure. However, the data does not indicate any group with greater risk of an adverse impact at present.

| Race | Staff in scope |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Asian | 4 |
| Bangladeshi | 12 |
| Black | 4 |
| White | 10 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Employees in scope | 29 |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Disability</p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the restructure on different disability groups</i></p> | <p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on disabled people?</p> <p>Potentially there could be changes in the disability profile of the division but at this stage it is difficult to determine the impact. This will be kept under review at different stages of the restructure.</p> <p>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>Most staff registered as not having a disability. Where staff have registered a disability, relevant reasonable adjustments will be considered at different stages of the process and kept under review throughout the process.</p> |
|---|--|

Gender

Identify the effect of the restructure on different gender groups (inc Trans) groups

Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on men or women?

Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion. Include in the analysis, the effects on pregnant women and women on maternity leave.

Potentially there could be changes in the gender profile of the division but at this stage it is difficult to determine the impact. This will be kept under review at different stages of the restructure.

Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion. Include in the analysis, the effects on pregnant women and women on maternity leave.

The current workforce profile and analysis of job matching claims based on job descriptions is as follows:

All genders are potentially adversely impacted by the restructure. At present the data does suggests women may be at risk of greater adversity than any other, but this will continue to be reviewed throughout the process. Those staff who are pregnant or on maternity leave will be considered in line with the council's policy.

| Gender | Staff in scope |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Female | 20 |
| Male | 10 |
| Employees in scope | 29 |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Sexual Orientation</p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the restructure on members of the LGB community</i></p> | <p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on lesbian, gay or bisexual people?</p> <p>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>There could be changes in the LGBT profile of the division but at this stage it is difficult to determine the impact. It will be kept under review at different stages of the restructure. The number of staff who have self -identified as LGBT is less than 3.</p> |
|---|---|

Religion and Belief

Identify the effect of the restructure on different religious and faith groups

Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on people who practice a religion or belief?

Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.

There could be changes in the religious profile of the division but at this stage it is difficult to determine the impact. This will be kept under review throughout the different stages of the restructure.

Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.

The current workforce profile and analysis of job matching claims based on job descriptions is as follows:

All religions and faith groups are potentially adversely impacted by the restructure. At present the data does not suggest any religion or faith group has greater adversity than any other, but this will continue to be reviewed throughout the process.

| Religion | Staff in scope |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Christian | 7 |
| Muslim | 12 |
| Buddhist | 1 |
| No religion | 5 |
| Other | 1 |
| Sikh | 1 |
| Missing / Decline | 3 |
| Employees in scope | 29 |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Age</p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the restructure on different age groups using the prompts above</i></p> | <p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on specific age groups?</p> <p>There could be changes in the age profile of the division, but at this stage it is difficult to determine the impact. This will be kept under review throughout the different stages of the restructure.</p> <p>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>Some officers are nearing retirement age and may decide to take ER/VR and vacant posts could potentially offer an opportunity to recruit officers that are underrepresented. This will continue to be reviewed throughout the process.</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Salary</p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the restructure on different groups at particular salary levels using the prompts above</i></p> | <p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on specific groups at particular salary levels?</p> <p>There could be changes in the salary profile of the division but at this stage it is difficult to determine the impact. This will be kept under review throughout the different stages of the restructure.</p> <p>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>A comparison has been undertaken across the old structure, grades of staff currently in post and grades of posts in the proposed structure. Across the grading profile in the proposed structure there is a mixture of assimilation and ring- fenced opportunities. The only area where there are substantially less posts is PO2 and below.</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Socio-economic</p> <p><i>Identify the effect of the restructure in relation to socio-economic inequalities</i></p> | <p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on people with low incomes?</p> <p>No</p> <p>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>There could be changes in the salary profile of the division but at this stage it is difficult to determine the impact. This will be kept under review throughout the different stages of the restructure.</p> |
| <p>Other</p> <p><i>Identify if there are groups, other than those already considered, that may be adversely affected by the restructure?</i></p> | <p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on any other people (e.g. carers, staff who are absent because of long term sickness)?</p> <p>No</p> <p>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion.</p> <p>The restructure will not impact on any other people.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Staff <i>Identify if there are any staff groups that may be adversely affected by the policy?</i> | <p>Will the change in your policy/service have an adverse impact on staff?</p> <p>See sections above. The restructure reduces the number of posts from xx to xx. There are currently xx Tower Hamlets staff employed in .</p> |
|---|--|

Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Please list in the table below any adverse impact identified and, where appropriate, steps that could be taken to mitigate this impact.

If you consider it likely that your proposal will have an adverse impact on a particular group (s) and you cannot identify steps which would mitigate or reduce this impact, you will need to demonstrate that you have considered **at least one alternative** way of delivering the change which has less of an adverse impact.

| Adverse impact | Please describe the actions that will be taken to mitigate this impact |
|----------------|--|
| | N/A at this stage – will be continually reviewed |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

If an adverse impact cannot be mitigated please describe an alternative option, its costs and the equality impact.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Alternative option | |
|---------------------------|--|

Section 5: Future Review and Monitoring

| |
|--|
| <p>Please explain how and when the actual equality impact of these changes will be reviewed and monitored. The equalities profile of the team will be monitored periodically e.g. when agreeing ER/VR and after different rounds of recruitment with a review at post reorganisation</p> |
|--|

APPENDIX A: Equality Impact Assessment Test of Relevance

| TRIGGER QUESTIONS | YES / NO | IF YES PLEASE BRIEFLY EXPLAIN |
|---|----------|-------------------------------|
| Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality? | NO | |
| | | |

| CHANGES TO A SERVICE | | |
|---|------------|---|
| Does the change alter access to the service? | No | |
| Does the change involve revenue raising? | NO | |
| Does the change alter who is eligible for the service? | NO | |
| Does the change involve a reduction or removal of income transfers to service users? | NO | |
| Does the change involve a contracting out of a service currently provided in house? | NO | |
| CHANGES TO STAFFING | | |
| Does the change involve a reduction in staff? | Yes | See above. The budget for the function has been reduced |
| Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff? | Yes | See above. The current structure is being deleted and the functions being substantially reorganized to drive improvement. The proposed structure has fewer layers of |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | management and small teams and broader based jobs. |
|--|--|--|