

Equality Analysis	For each of the protected characteristics, please explain the effect the proposal would have on different groups given the equality data of staff in scope, by:	
	a)	Explaining the findings of the data analysis and the evidence used to support the conclusion of b).
	b)	Stating whether the proposed change will have a disproportionate/adverse impact on any particular group and to what degree (severity) given the evidence?
EXAMPLE	a)	73% of staff in the structure are female and of those 'at risk' 80% are female however this is within with the wider workforce profile of HWA where 71.71% of staff were female, as of 31st March 2020. Corporately, 66.21% of the Council workforce were female as of 31st March 2020.
	b)	Whilst it may initially appear disproportionate that 80% of staff 'at risk' are female, this is within the context of the wider workforce profile where the female population significantly exceeds males at a corporate (66.21% : 33.79%) and departmental level (71.71% : 28.29%).
Gender	a)	59.18% of staff in scope are female and 40.82% are male. Corporately 66.91% of staff in the council are female and 33.09% are male as at 30/11/20.
	b)	Whilst it the rate of female staff in scope is higher than male staff, this is within the context of the wider workforce profile where female staff numbers exceeds male staff (66.91% v 33.09%). The level of male staff in scope (40.82%) is higher than the workforce representation (33.09%) which means the proposed change could have a slight adverse impact for male staff.
Age	a)	42.86% of staff in scope are in the age range of 45 -54 -this is the largest group. 31.63% of staff in scope are in the 55 - 64 age group and 23.47% of staff in scope are in the 35-44 age group.
	b)	The 45 -54 age group comprises 27.46% of the council workforce. This means that the this age group is disproportionately over-represented for staff in scope (42.86%) which may have a severe adverse impact on this age group. The 55 - 64 age group comprises 25.57% of staff in the workforce. Although this group is scope is still over-represented (31.63%) there may be less of an adverse impact. The 35 -44 age group comprised 24.54% of the workforce which is similar to the proportion that they make up of the group in scope (23.47%) - therefore no adverse impact can be inferred.
Disability	a)	8.16% of staff in scope have declared a disability. 57.14% of staff in scope have declared that they are not disabled. The level of non-disclosures for staff in scope for disability is 32.65%.
	b)	The level of declared disability within the council workforce is 6.32%. This means that as the level of declared disability for staff in scope is higher (8.16%) and it could be inferred that there may be some adverse impact for disabled staff in scope. The levels of non-disclosure are similar for staff in scope compared to the council workforce (32.65% v 32.78%). However as non-disclosure is over 30% the reliability of figures may be queried which may make it difficult to draw firm adverse impact conclusions.
Race	a)	20.41% if staff in scope are declared BAME. Of these Mixed - White/Asian; Mixed- White/Black Caribbean and Mixed - White/Black African groups each comprise 2.04%. Within the Croydon council workforce, BAME comprises 32% and mixed groups comprise 0.77%; 0.29% and 1.39% respectively. White groups comprise 53.06% of staff in scope compared to 36% of white groups in the council workforce. Non-disclosure rates for staff in scope is 26.55% compared 32% for the council workforce.
	b)	The level of white group in scope (53%) is considerably higher than their council workforce representation (36%). This means that this group may be adversely impacted by this change. Mixed race groups are also more highly represented within staff in scope (2.04%) compared to their workforce profile (0.77%;0.29%;1.39%) so they may also be adversely impacted. Asian British /Bangladeshi are also more impacted within staff in scope (2.04%) compared to their workforce profile (0.46%) so may also be impacted adversely. The levels of non-disclosure for the group in scope (26.55%) is lower than the council workforce (32%)
Religion or Belief	a)	36.73% of staff in scope have declared they are Christian - this is the largest group. 21.43% of staff have declared they have no religion which is the second largest group in scope. This compares to the Croydon workforce profile in which Christians are also the largest group (34.01%) with the second largest group being 'no religion' - 16.33%. Non-disclosure rates for staff in scope is 30.61% which is lower than the council workforce (34.21%).
	b)	The representation of Christians in scope (36.73%) is slightly higher than their workforce representation (34.01%). Staff who have declared 'no religion' comprise 21.43% of staff in scope which is also higher than their workforce representation (16.33%). This means there may be adverse impact for these religious groups. However the non-disclosure rates for staff in scope (30.61%) and the council workforce (34.21%) are moderately high which may make these figures unreliable and difficult to judge impact.
Sexual Orientation	a)	1.02% of staff in scope have declared they are LGBT. 59.18% of staff have declared they are heterosexual/straight. This compares to 4% of staff in the council workforce who have declared they are LGBT and 52.52% of staff who have declared they are heterosexual/straight. The level of non-disclosure for sexual orientation is 31.63% for staff in scope compared to 34.90% for staff in the council workforce
	b)	As the level of LGBT staff in scope is very low, there is no adverse impact on this group from the change. Heterosexual staff representation in scope is higher (59.18%) compared to the council workforce (52.52%). However levels of non-disclosure are over 30% for staff in scope as well as in the council workforce so it may be difficult to draw any adverse conclusions.
Marriage or Civil Partnership	a)	40.82% of staff in scope have declared that they are married which compares to 20.08% of staff within the council workforce. This is the largest group within this category. 'Never married' comprises the second largest group in scope which is 7.14% compared to the council representation of 12.16%. However non-disclosure is 46.94% for staff in scope and 61.18% for staff within the council workforce.
	b)	As levels of non-disclosure for marital status is very high for staff in scope (46.94%) and also for the council workforce (61.18%), it is difficult to draw any adverse conclusion for these figures.
Gender Reassignment	a)	46.94% of staff in scope have declared that their gender is the same as was assigned at birth. This compares to 41.56% of staff within the council workforce. No staff in scope have declared their gender is not the same as assigned at birth. Non -disclosure rates are very high for this category - 51.02% for staff in scope and 57.38% for staff within the council.
	b)	As levels of non-disclosure for gender re-assignment is very high for staff in scope (51.02%) and also for the council workforce (57.38%), it is difficult to draw any adverse conclusion for these figures.
Pregnancy and Maternity	a)	No staff in scope are on maternity leave.
	b)	No adverse impact can be inferred as no staff are on maternity leave.

Action Plan	Mitigating Action	Action Owner	Indicative Completion Date
	A further equality analysis should be done to assess the impact on staff who may be at risk of compulsory redundancy	Maxine Benjamin	At end of further consultation after redeployment (July/Aug 2021)
	Disabled staff should be offered any reasonable adjustments that are necessary for the consultation process and also assistance with any selection or redeployment opportunities	HR Consultancy	February - July 2021

<p><b>Based on the analysis above, please detail the key actions which can be taken to remove or mitigate any adverse impact.</b></p>	<p>A disproportionate impact may be seen on male staff; staff in the 45 - 54 age group and 55- 64 age group; disabled staff; white groups; mixed race groups; Asian Bangladeshi group; This will be monitored once equality analysis has been re-run to better assess impact</p>	<p>Maxine Benjamin</p>	<p>Jul-21</p>
	<p>A key enhancement in the structure has been to create a division of Service Quality, Improvement and Inclusion as it was recognised that there needed to be more focus on equality and inclusion, as not enough progress is being made. Discussions with key external advisers on race and equality led to the design of this function. This division will own the council's equality policy and strategy and will also be charged with refreshing the council's vision and values through a wide ranging staff engagement process.</p>	<p>Katherine Kerswell</p>	<p>Jun-21</p>

<b>Future Review &amp; Monitoring</b>
---------------------------------------

Please outline when the impact of the change will be reviewed and monitored, post its implementation.

Another equality analysis will be done in March to assess the impact of voluntary redundancies an compulsory redundancy planning.

<b>EA Conclusion</b>
----------------------

Based on the equality analysis outlined above, select the relevant decision statement in line with the definition and the Equality Act 2010 Public Sector duty .

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Decision	Definition
<input type="checkbox"/>	No major change	We will not make any major amendments to the proposed change because it already includes all appropriate actions i.e. the assessment shows that there is no potential for discrimination, harassment or victimisation and that the proposed change includes all appropriate actions to advance equality and foster good relations between protected groups.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adjust the proposed change	We will adjust the proposed change because we have identified opportunities to lessen the impact of discrimination, harassment or victimisation; better advance equality and foster good relations between protected groups through the proposed change. We are going to take actions to make sure these opportunities are realised.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Continue the proposed change	We will continue with the proposed change, despite potential for adverse impact or opportunities to lessen the impact of discrimination, harassment or victimisation; better advance equality and foster good relations between protected groups through the change. <u>However</u> we are not planning to implement them as we are satisfied that the proposal will not lead to unlawful discrimination and there are justifiable reasons to continue as planned.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Stop or significantly amend the proposed change	The proposed change will be stopped or significantly amended because going ahead with the proposal would have adverse effects on one or more protected groups, which could lead to unlawful discrimination. There are no justifiable reasons to proceed and the adverse impact cannot be mitigated.

<b>Authorisation</b>
----------------------

	Name	Job Title	Date
<b>HR Lead:</b>	Maxine Benjamin	HR Policy and Equality Manager	03/02/21
<b>Director [Department]:</b>	Sue Moorman	HR Director	16/06/21
<b>Equalities Lead:</b>	Yvonne Okiyo	Equalities Manager	04/02/21