

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)



You will need to produce an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) if:

- You are developing a new policy, strategy, or service
- You are making changes that will affect front-line services
- You are reducing budgets, which may affect front-line services
- You are changing the way services are funded and this may impact the quality of the service and who can access it
- You are making a decision that could have a different impact on different groups of people
- You are making staff redundant or changing their roles

Guidance notes on how to complete an EqIA and sign off process are available on the Hub under Equality and Diversity. You must read the [guidance notes](#) and ensure you have followed all stages of the EqIA approval process (outlined in appendix 1). Section 2 of the template requires you to undertake an assessment of the impact of your proposals on groups with protected characteristics. Equalities and borough profile data, as well as other sources of statistical information can be found on the Harrow hub, within the section entitled: [Equality Impact Assessment](#) - sources of statistical information.

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

Type of Decision:	<input type="radio"/> Cabinet <input checked="" type="radio"/> Portfolio holder <input type="radio"/> Other (state)	
Title of Proposal	Divisional Directorates Restructure Environment & Culture and Commissioning & Commercial Services	Date EqIA created 30 November 2020
Name and job title of completing/lead Officer	Michael Butler Interim Director of Environmental Services	
Directorate/ Service responsible	Resources	
Organisational approval		
EqIA approved by Directorate Equalities Lead	Name: Paul Walker	Signature <input type="checkbox"/> Tick this box to indicate that you have approved this EqIA Date of approval

1. Summary of proposal, impact on groups with protected characteristics and mitigating actions
(to be completed after you have completed sections 2 - 5)

a) Management Proposal

The two existing Divisions have been without Directors for some time now. An Interim Director has been in post since October 2019 to ensure suitable leadership is provided to staff in both Divisional Directorates. During this time temporary changes to the structure and reporting lines have been implemented in order to ensure that the services continued to be delivered.

In addition, a financial review has been undertaken of both Directorates which has been in line with overall Council objectives to reduce net spending. This review now seeks to address the finances and structures of both Divisions in line with Council's overall service development, delivery and financial requirements.

Phased Implementation of the Proposed Restructure

The proposal is that the restructure will be managed across separate phases covering all grades of employees from the management team (Heads of Service) downwards and across operational teams within Environmental Services. Details of affected employees and operational teams will be revealed at the formal consultation processes as each Phase is formally launched.

Reduction in Roles

This EqIA is completed for Phase 1 of the proposed restructure which affects five Head of Service employees within the senior management team. There are currently seven Head of Service roles and the proposal is to reduce that to six Head of Service roles and to delete all current vacant posts within the senior management team. There are five new roles proposed within the new structure four of which are Heads of Service roles.

b) Summarise the impact of your proposal on groups with protected characteristics

No negative impact has been identified for affected employees in the age, gender, ethnicity origin and disability, protected characteristics as detailed in C below. All five affected employees have an equal opportunity and accessibility to the new posts in the proposed new structure and all have been ringfenced for interviews to appropriate and relevant opportunities in the new structure.

c) Summarise any potential negative impact(s) identified and mitigating actions

No negative impact has been identified for affected employees in the age, gender, ethnicity origin and disability, protected characteristics as detailed in C below. All five affected employees have an equal opportunity and accessibility to the new posts in the proposed new structure and all have been ringfenced for interviews to appropriate and relevant opportunities in the new structure.

2. Assessing impact																													
You are required to undertake a detailed analysis of the impact of your proposals on groups with protected characteristics. You should refer to borough profile data , equalities data , service user information, consultation responses and any other relevant data/evidence to help you assess and explain what impact (if any) your proposal(s) will have on each group. Where there are gaps in data, you should state this in the boxes below and what action (if any), you will take to address this in the future.		What does the evidence tell you about the impact your proposal may have on groups with protected characteristics? Click the relevant box to indicate whether your proposal will have a positive impact, negative (minor, major), or no impact																											
Protected characteristic	For each protected characteristic, explain in detail what the evidence is suggesting and the impact of your proposal (if any). Click the appropriate box on the right to indicate the outcome of your analysis.	Positive impact	Negative impact		No impact																								
			Minor	Major																									
Age	<p>The age profile of five staff affected at Phase 1 of the proposed management restructure</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>AGE RANGE</th> <th>TOTAL</th> <th>PERCENTAGE %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>20-29</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>30-39</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: yellow;"> <td>40-49</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50-59</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60-69</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70-79</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>GRAND TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The highest percentage within the affected staff is within the 40 - 49 age bracket. This is comparable to the breakdown of the highest group within the overall profile of MG grades within the Community Directorate which is within the 50 – 59 age range.</p> <p>Given these are higher graded posts the highest percentage age range within this group is not surprising. There is no impact.</p>	AGE RANGE	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE %	20-29			30-39	1	20%	40-49	2	40%	50-59	1	20%	60-69	1	20%	70-79			GRAND TOTAL	5	100%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
AGE RANGE	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE %																											
20-29																													
30-39	1	20%																											
40-49	2	40%																											
50-59	1	20%																											
60-69	1	20%																											
70-79																													
GRAND TOTAL	5	100%																											

	<p>The age breakdown of the overall profile of MG grades within the Community Directorate.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="654 293 1408 528"> <thead> <tr> <th>AGE RANGE</th> <th>TOTAL</th> <th>PERCENTAGE %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>20 - 29</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>30 - 39</td> <td>3</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>40 - 49</td> <td>12</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50 - 59</td> <td>28</td> <td>55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60 - 69</td> <td>8</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70 - 79</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>GRAND TOTAL</td> <td>51</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AGE RANGE	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE %	20 - 29			30 - 39	3	6%	40 - 49	12	23%	50 - 59	28	55%	60 - 69	8	16%	70 - 79			GRAND TOTAL	51	100%				
AGE RANGE	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE %																											
20 - 29																													
30 - 39	3	6%																											
40 - 49	12	23%																											
50 - 59	28	55%																											
60 - 69	8	16%																											
70 - 79																													
GRAND TOTAL	51	100%																											
<p>Disability</p>	<p>The disability breakdown profile of the five affected staff at Phase 1 by the proposed management restructure.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="734 630 1328 746"> <thead> <tr> <th>DISABILITY Y OR N</th> <th>PERCENTAGE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>N</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>None of the affected staff are disabled. There is no impact.</p> <p>The disability breakdown of the overall profile of MG grades within the Community Directorate.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="741 849 1323 1082"> <thead> <tr> <th>DISABILITY DESCRIPTION</th> <th>TOTALS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prefer not to say</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(blank)</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>51</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DISABILITY Y OR N	PERCENTAGE	N	100%	Grand Total	100%	DISABILITY DESCRIPTION	TOTALS	No	28	Prefer not to say		Yes	4	(blank)	19	Grand Total	51	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
DISABILITY Y OR N	PERCENTAGE																												
N	100%																												
Grand Total	100%																												
DISABILITY DESCRIPTION	TOTALS																												
No	28																												
Prefer not to say																													
Yes	4																												
(blank)	19																												
Grand Total	51																												
<p>Gender reassignment</p>	<p>The Gender reassignment profile of staff affected by the proposed management restructure:</p> <p>None of the affected staff indicated that their gender identity was different to that assigned at birth. There is no impact.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="752 1222 1312 1372"> <thead> <tr> <th>GENDER REASSIGNMENT Y or N</th> <th>PERCENTAGE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>N</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	GENDER REASSIGNMENT Y or N	PERCENTAGE	N	100%	Grand Total	100%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																		
GENDER REASSIGNMENT Y or N	PERCENTAGE																												
N	100%																												
Grand Total	100%																												

Marriage and Civil Partnership

The Marriage and Civil Partnership profile of the five staff affected by the proposed management restructure.

MARITAL STATUS	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES
Sep.	1	20%
CivPar		
Div.		
Marr.	4	80%
Single		
Unknwn		
Wid.		
(blank)		
Grand Total	5	100%

The overall profile for MG grades in the Community Directorate

Marital Status	Total	%
Separated	1	2%
Civil Partnership		
Divorced.	1	2%
Married	32	63%
Single	9	18%
Not Specified	8	15%
Grand Total	51	100.00%

The highest percentage within the affected staff group is within the married bracket which compares to the highest group within the overall profile for MG grades within the Community Directorate.

Given these are higher graded posts the highest percentage within this group is not surprising. There is no impact.

Pregnancy and Maternity	From the current profile data for staff affected by the proposed management restructure there are no staff who are either pregnant or on maternity leave at the moment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**Race/
Ethnicity**

The Race / Ethnicity profile of the five affected staff of the proposed management restructure

All Ethnicities	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES
Asian - Bangladeshi	1	20%
White - English	3	60%
Unknown	1	20%
Grand Total	5	100%

The overall profile of MG grades within the Community Directorate

Ethnic origin	Number	Percentage
White - English	27	52%
Asian - Indian	7	14%
Unknown	1	2%
Asian - Sri Lankan		
Mixed - Other		
White - Other	6	12%
Asian - Afghani		
Asian - Bangladeshi	1	2%
Asian - Pakistani		
Black - African	1	2%
White - Irish	3	6%
Asian - Chinese		
Black - Other		
Black - Somali		
Black - Black Caribbean	4	8%
Mixed - Black and White Caribbean		
Other - any other ethnic group		
White - Polish		
White - Romanian		
White - Scottish		
White - Welsh	1	2%
Total (All Groups)	51	100.00%



The highest percentage within the affected staff is White English which compares to the highest group in the overall MG grade in the Community Directorate. There is no impact.

Religion or belief

The Religious / Belief group profile of the five staff affected by the proposed management restructure.

Religion	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES
Christianity	3	60%
Islam	1	20%
No Religion/Atheist	1	20%
Grand Total	5	100%

The overall Harrow Council staff Religious / Belief group profiles:

RELIGION	Total	%
Buddhism		
Christianity	24	47%
Hinduism	2	4%
Islam	1	2%
Jainism		
Judaism	2	4%
No Religion/Atheist	2	4%
Other		
Sikh	1	2%
Zoroastrian		
(blank)	19	37%
Grand Total	51	100%

The highest percentage within the affected staff is Christianity which compares to the highest declared group in the overall MG grade in the Community Directorate. There is no impact.

Some general indicators worth noting:

- GLA's Religious Diversity Indices show that Harrow is London's second more religiously



	<p>diverse borough after Redbridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Census 2011 – Religious affiliation is very high in Harrow with Harrow having the second lowest number of residents who stated that they have no religion after Newham. • Christianity identified as Harrow’s most common religion with 37.3% followers. 25.3% of Harrow’s residents 																												
Sex	<p>The Gender group profile of the five staff affected by the proposed management restructure.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 464 1061 663"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>TOTALS</th> <th>PERCENTAGES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>2</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>3</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>5</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The highest percentage within the affected staff is male at 60% to 40% female. This compares to 59% males and 41% female gender split within the overall MG grade in the Community Directorate. There is no impact.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 836 1061 1035"> <thead> <tr> <th>Gender</th> <th>TOTALS</th> <th>PERCENTAGES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>21</td> <td>41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>30</td> <td>59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>51</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Gender	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES	Female	2	40%	Male	3	60%	Grand Total	5	100%	Gender	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES	Female	21	41%	Male	30	59%	Grand Total	51	100%	□	□	□	☒
Gender	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES																											
Female	2	40%																											
Male	3	60%																											
Grand Total	5	100%																											
Gender	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES																											
Female	21	41%																											
Male	30	59%																											
Grand Total	51	100%																											

Sexual Orientation

The Sexual Orientation group profile of five staff affected by the proposed management restructure

Sexual Orientation	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES
Bisexual		
Gay/Lesbian		
Hetrosexual / Straight	4	80%
Other		
Prefer not to say	1	20%
(blank)		
Grand Total	5	100%

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The profile data relating to sexual orientation groups for MG grades within the Community Directorate are:

SEXUAL ORIENTATION	TOTAL	%
Bisexual		
Gay/Lesbian	1	2%
Hetrosexual/Straight	25	49%
Other		
Prefer not to say	2	4%
Blank	23	45%
Grand Total	51	100.00 %

The highest percentage within the affected staff is Hetrosexual/Straight which compares to the highest group in the overall MG grade within the Community Directorate. There is no impact.

2.1 Cumulative impact – considering what else is happening within the Council and Harrow as a whole, could your proposals have a cumulative impact on groups with protected characteristics?

Yes No

If you clicked the Yes box, which groups with protected characteristics could be affected and what is the potential impact? Include details in the space below

2.2 Any other impact - considering what else is happening nationally/locally (national/local/regional policies, socio-economic factors etc), could your proposals have an impact on individuals/service users, or other groups?

Yes No

If you clicked the Yes box, Include details in the space below

3. Actions to mitigate/remove negative impact

Only complete this section if your assessment (in section 2) suggests that your proposals may have a negative impact on groups with protected characteristics. If you have not identified any negative impacts, please complete sections 4 and 5.

In the table below, please state what these potential negative impact (s) are, mitigating actions and steps taken to ensure that these measures will address and remove any negative impacts identified and by when. Please also state how you will monitor the impact of your proposal once implemented.

State what the negative impact(s) are for each group, identified in section 2. In addition, you should also consider and state potential risks associated with your proposal.	Measures to mitigate negative impact (provide details, including details of and additional consultation undertaken/to be carried out in the future). If you are unable to identify measures to mitigate impact, please state so and provide a brief explanation.	What action (s) will you take to assess whether these measures have addressed and removed any negative impacts identified in your analysis? Please provide details. If you have previously stated that you are unable to identify measures to mitigate impact please state below.	Deadline date	Lead Officer
N/A				

4. Public Sector Equality Duty

How does your proposal meet the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) to:

1. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
2. Advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups
3. Foster good relations between people from different groups

Include details in the space below

5. Outcome of the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) click the box that applies

Outcome 1

No change required: the EqIA has not identified any potential for unlawful conduct or disproportionate impact and all opportunities to advance equality of opportunity are being addressed

Outcome 2

Adjustments to remove/mitigate negative impacts identified by the assessment, or to better advance equality, as stated in section 3&4

Outcome 3

This EqIA has identified discrimination and/ or missed opportunities to advance equality and/or foster good relations. However, it is still reasonable to continue with the activity. Outline the reasons for this and the information used to reach this decision in the space below.

Include details here