

#	Equality Analysis - Questions to Consider	Comments
Data		
Q.1	Are there any gaps in the available data which may adversely affect the accuracy of the impact assessment on any protected group? <i>e.g. high non disclosure rates, comparator data is as at 31st March etc.</i>	Currently staff within Tiers 1 - 3 have moderate levels of non-disclosure. The lowest level of non disclosure is ethnicity (27%) and the highest level is gender re-assignment (51%). All non-disclosure rates for the staff in scope are lower than the council's workforce non-disclosure rates but given that several non-disclosure rates for the group in scope are over 30% (including disability, religion, sexual orientation) - there may be less reliability for any conclusions drawn from equality analysis.
Q.2	If limited data is available, have steps been considered to fill the information gaps via additional data gathering exercises <i>e.g. conducting targeted surveys with the affected staff group</i> .	Currently communication has been done via the intranet about the importance of sharing data including linking this to equality analysis and restructures. Targeted communication is also being made to departments where equality data is particularly low such as Children's, Families and Education.
Q.3	Does the proposed change relate to a service area where there are known or potential equality issues?	As this restructure covers the top 3 tiers of the council it is apparent that the levels of BAME representation for this group is lower for this group (20%) than corporately (32%). Also the level of women within scope (59%) is also lower than corporate representation.
Q.4	Does the proposed change relate to a service area where there are already local or national equality indicators?	Similarly to other councils leadership teams the staff in scope comprise of a majority of white groups (53%) and the majority of staff aged over 45 (75%)
Q.5	Is any particular group over-represented and if so is there a context or specific reasons for this ? <i>e.g. a National trend for the occupational group.</i>	As above with trends.
Q.6	Are there any measures that could be undertaken to mitigate the change disproportionately affecting specific groups? <i>e.g. entirely amending the group affected, changing the selection process.</i>	The process of meaningful consultation, which may alter proposals in some way and recording and mapping changes to the resource plans will assist.
PESTLE		
Q.7	Are there any political, economic, sociological, technological, legal or environmental (PESTLE) factors that might shape the EIA outcomes and which may need to be considered?	Yes - UK economy significantly affected post COVID-19. Significant economic decline and potential for recession will impact on job market and potential reticence to take VR; Ongoing pandemic and current 3rd lockdown in London with high covid 19 infection rates; Disproportionate impact on BAME people being adversely affected by COVID-19. The Black Lives Matter campaign has raised the profile of disproportionality and fairness and makes us more resolute to drive and accelerate the action outlined in our workforce and equalities strategy. Also the council's financial situation and issuing of Section 114 letter as the council is unable to balance its budget is a significant motivator for our Croydon Renewal Plan.
Public Sector Equality Duty		
Q.8	Is the proposed change likely to help or hinder the Council in advancing equality of opportunity between people who belong to protected characteristic groups?	The identification of savings sought in the Croydon Renewal Plan in response to the council's issuing of Section 114 notification and the inability to balance the council budget has been a driving force. The planned comprehensive and meaningful consultation process will reflect fully the views of our workforce and will shape final proposals.

Q.9	Is the proposed change likely to help or hinder the Council in eliminating unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation?	See above
Q.10	Is the proposed change likely to help or hinder the Council in fostering good relations between people who belong to protected characteristic groups?	See above
Alternative Proposals		
Q.11	If it is assessed that it is likely that the proposal will have a highly adverse impact on a particular group and actions cannot be identified which would mitigate or reduce the impact, has an alternative way of delivering the change (which has less of an adverse impact) been considered?	This is the purpose of the consultation process which may alter proposals in some way and recording and mapping changes to the resource plans will assist.
Q.12	Are alternative proposals evidenced in the business case/consultation paper?	This is the purpose of the consultation process which may alter proposals in some way and recording and mapping changes to the resource plans will assist.
Q.13	If an alternative proposal is not viable, has the rationale for this been explained in the business case/consultation paper?	N/A
Consultation Process		
Q.14	Is the timing of the selection process likely to be difficult for some employees? <i>e.g. during Ramadan for Muslim staff, during the school summer holidays.</i>	Yes - as Christmas Holiday was included but consultation process has been extended longer to take this into account so will run from 9th December - 29th January 2021 and may be extended further.
Q.15	Has a process been put in place to consider any reasonable adjustments to the selection process, if necessary?	Yes - there is a potential to extend the consultation period if required.