

Equality Impact Assessment – Staff

Name of Initiative, Policy or Project	Hampshire Museums & Arts Service reorganisation – Phase 2
Department	Culture, Communities and Business Services
Names of people completing assessment	Jan Mein and Jo Bailey
Date	5 th October 2011.
<i>A front line or direct service is highly likely to have an impact on different communities. An infrastructure service may have an indirect impact. You need to use your professional knowledge to decide if you know enough about the different customer or staff groups which might be affected. These prompts will assist you to decide if you need to do an impact assessment.</i>	
Describe main purpose of Initiative, Policy, Project	Reorganisation and restructuring of the Arts and Museums Service to address the significant financial risk associated with the reduction in local authority funding subsequent to the CSR in October 2010.
What are the main activities?	<p>Staff restructuring;</p> <p>The proposals outlined in section 7, 8 and 9 of Creating Hampshire, the Draft Strategic Plan for Arts and Museums 2012-2016 and proposals sent out for consultation to staff and unions on 30th September identify that the strategic and fundamental reorganisation of the service would impact significantly on the staffing structure and imply change in a large proportion of roles.</p> <p>Proposals that will have a direct impact on staff:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. review of the arts and museum venue portfolio and identifying alternative options for service delivery 2. increase efficiency in managing arts and museum venues and greater integration of facilities management <p>Reduction of the budget resource by 16% Museums (2011/12 and 12/13) and 8% arts (2012/13)</p> <p>The existing Community Museums, Museums Resources, Learning & Access, Milestones and Basing House and Arts teams are remodelled as an integrated service organised into 5 functional areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Learning and Community Engagement – Visitor Services – Exhibitions – Collections

Equality Impact Assessment – Staff

	<p style="text-align: center;">– Partnerships and Planning</p> <p>Overall Summary</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Grade</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Remove fte</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Reduce fte</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Create fte</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Net Change</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>J</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>I</td><td>2</td><td></td><td>2</td><td>(-2)</td></tr> <tr><td>H</td><td>2</td><td></td><td>2</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>G</td><td>3</td><td></td><td>1</td><td>(-2)</td></tr> <tr><td>F</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>E</td><td>3.49</td><td>1.75</td><td>0</td><td>(-5.24)</td></tr> <tr><td>D</td><td>2</td><td>0.4</td><td>1.65</td><td>(-0.75)</td></tr> <tr><td>C</td><td></td><td>2.29</td><td>5.33</td><td>3.04</td></tr> <tr><td>B</td><td>5.52</td><td>0.99</td><td>3.15</td><td>(-3.36)</td></tr> <tr><td>A</td><td></td><td></td><td>1.1</td><td>1.1</td></tr> <tr><td>Summary</td><td>(-20.01)</td><td>(-5.43)</td><td>16.25</td><td>(-9.21)</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In addition to voluntary redundancy other voluntary measures are being investigated such as reductions in working hours</p>	Grade	Remove fte	Reduce fte	Create fte	Net Change	J	1		1		I	2		2	(-2)	H	2		2		G	3		1	(-2)	F	1		1		E	3.49	1.75	0	(-5.24)	D	2	0.4	1.65	(-0.75)	C		2.29	5.33	3.04	B	5.52	0.99	3.15	(-3.36)	A			1.1	1.1	Summary	(-20.01)	(-5.43)	16.25	(-9.21)
Grade	Remove fte	Reduce fte	Create fte	Net Change																																																									
J	1		1																																																										
I	2		2	(-2)																																																									
H	2		2																																																										
G	3		1	(-2)																																																									
F	1		1																																																										
E	3.49	1.75	0	(-5.24)																																																									
D	2	0.4	1.65	(-0.75)																																																									
C		2.29	5.33	3.04																																																									
B	5.52	0.99	3.15	(-3.36)																																																									
A			1.1	1.1																																																									
Summary	(-20.01)	(-5.43)	16.25	(-9.21)																																																									
Who is intended to benefit?	Hampshire residents and visitors to Hampshire by retaining their arts and museums services in a form that is sustainable beyond March 2012 and in a strong position to benefit from future funding and partnership opportunities.																																																												
<p>Based on existing knowledge and information use the following checklist to decide what the impact might be on different groups. Identify and summarise the data from the sources listed in the grid below.</p> <p>Further guidance on 1. equality groups 2. data sources</p>																																																													

Equality Impact Assessment – Staff

These different staff groups are more likely to be excluded.	What do you know about the breakdown of staff within your services?	<i>What are the possible negative impacts?</i>	<i>What are the potential positive Impacts?</i>																								
<p>Age</p> <p><i>Children, young people, young parents, older or retired people</i></p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Section</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Staff (FTE)</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Under 55</th> <th style="text-align: center;">% under 55</th> <th style="text-align: center;">55+</th> <th style="text-align: center;">% 55+</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Arts</td> <td style="text-align: right;">23.57</td> <td style="text-align: right;">19.83</td> <td style="text-align: right;">84%</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3.74</td> <td style="text-align: right;">16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Museums</td> <td style="text-align: right;">82.86</td> <td style="text-align: right;">66.77</td> <td style="text-align: right;">81%</td> <td style="text-align: right;">16.09</td> <td style="text-align: right;">19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">106.43</td> <td style="text-align: right;">86.6</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">19.83</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>18.6% of the people working in the 2 teams are over 55</p>	Section	Staff (FTE)	Under 55	% under 55	55+	% 55+	Arts	23.57	19.83	84%	3.74	16%	Museums	82.86	66.77	81%	16.09	19%	Total	106.43	86.6		19.83		<p>18.6% (fte) of staff are over 55. It is more likely that staff over 55 express an interest in taking voluntary redundancy.</p> <p>A skills loss to the service from people over 55.</p>	<p>The Service will be seeking to use voluntary measures to achieve the necessary reductions to reduce the need for compulsory redundancy where possible. Staff accepting voluntary redundancy will receive full redundancy payments. Staff aged 55+ accepting voluntary redundancy are also entitled to access their pension. More opportunities for those under 55 remaining within the service.</p>
Section	Staff (FTE)	Under 55	% under 55	55+	% 55+																						
Arts	23.57	19.83	84%	3.74	16%																						
Museums	82.86	66.77	81%	16.09	19%																						
Total	106.43	86.6		19.83																							
<p>Disabled People</p> <p><i>Mobility, sight, hearing, speech &</i></p>	<p>There is one declared disabled person in the service (0.9% of staff cohort)</p>	<p>There is a very small percentage of staff with a declared disability. It is not expected</p>	<p>In the case of an individual who has agreed reasonable adjustments within their current working</p>																								

Equality Impact Assessment – Staff

These different staff groups are more likely to be excluded.	What do you know about the breakdown of staff within your services?	What are the possible negative impacts?	What are the potential positive Impacts?																				
<i>language disability or difficulty, mental health/distress</i>		that there will be any negative impact of the proposals.	arrangements, these would continue under a new structure.																				
Faith <i>Communities or individuals with different religions or beliefs</i>	No data is collected on faith of HCC staff	No negative impact perceived.																					
Gender <i>Women, Men, boys, girls, carers (of children, disabled or older people)</i>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Gender by Grade</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">J</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">I - E</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">D-B</th> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">A</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male FTE</td> <td></td> <td>15.57</td> <td>14.64</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female FTE</td> <td>1</td> <td>37.92</td> <td>36.28</td> <td>1.12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total 106.43</td> <td>1</td> <td>53.94</td> <td>50.92</td> <td>1.12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Overall there is currently a larger % of female staff in the service –The table below demonstrates that the gender split is approximately balanced. The proposed new structure demonstrates no significant changes in balance across the service.</p>	Gender by Grade	J	I - E	D-B	A	Male FTE		15.57	14.64		Female FTE	1	37.92	36.28	1.12	Total 106.43	1	53.94	50.92	1.12	See further analysis by grade in the second table: Neutral impact - Both I to E grades and D to B grades are likely to be reduced by similar proportions, so there will not be a disproportionate impact on either men or women.	The restructure is based on a new model to support the future delivery of the museums service. Gender is not a factor in this model, and the review of grades and posts in the structure.
Gender by Grade	J	I - E	D-B	A																			
Male FTE		15.57	14.64																				
Female FTE	1	37.92	36.28	1.12																			
Total 106.43	1	53.94	50.92	1.12																			
Gender/Grade																							

Equality Impact Assessment – Staff

These different staff groups are more likely to be excluded.	What do you know about the breakdown of staff within your services?	What are the possible negative impacts?	What are the potential positive Impacts?																																					
<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; margin-right: 20px; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"> <th style="text-align: left;">Gender by Grade current</th> <th style="text-align: center;">J</th> <th style="text-align: center;">I - E</th> <th style="text-align: center;">D-B</th> <th style="text-align: center;">A</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male FTE</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">15,57</td> <td style="text-align: right;">14.64</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female FTE</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: right;">37.92</td> <td style="text-align: right;">36.28</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1.12</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"> <td>Total 106.43</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: right;">53.94</td> <td style="text-align: right;">50.92</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1.12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.93</td> <td style="text-align: right;">49.8</td> <td style="text-align: right;">47.8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"> <th style="text-align: left;">Grades in proposed structure</th> <th style="text-align: center;">% Staff</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>J</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I - E</td> <td style="text-align: right;">46.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D - B</td> <td style="text-align: right;">49.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"> <td>Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Gender by Grade current	J	I - E	D-B	A	Male FTE		15,57	14.64		Female FTE	1	37.92	36.28	1.12	Total 106.43	1	53.94	50.92	1.12	%	0.93	49.8	47.8	1	Grades in proposed structure	% Staff	J	1.1	I - E	46.2	D - B	49.7	A	3	Total	100
Gender by Grade current	J	I - E	D-B	A																																				
Male FTE		15,57	14.64																																					
Female FTE	1	37.92	36.28	1.12																																				
Total 106.43	1	53.94	50.92	1.12																																				
%	0.93	49.8	47.8	1																																				
Grades in proposed structure	% Staff																																							
J	1.1																																							
I - E	46.2																																							
D - B	49.7																																							
A	3																																							
Total	100																																							
Transgender <i>(those who have changed gender or are in the process of change)</i>	No data is collected of HCC staff	No negative impact perceived.																																						
Race	Only 0.49% of staff have not declared ethnicity and 98% are White-British. Declared B-black – is grade C. 3 staff not obtained/refused – Grades B/C	No negative impact perceived.																																						
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual	No data is collected of HCC staff	No negative impact perceived.																																						

Equality Impact Assessment – Staff

These different staff groups are more likely to be excluded.	What do you know about the breakdown of staff within your services?	<i>What are the possible negative impacts?</i>	<i>What are the potential positive Impacts?</i>
<p>Low or no Income (analysis of pay grade for staff)</p>	<p>Overall Summary of proposals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See table above <p>Grade B-D: There is an increase of 1.07fte</p> <p>Grade A There is an increase of 1.1fte</p>	<p>There is a small increase in the number of posts graded below band D</p>	<p>The impact of the new grade structure has been spread across the higher grades.</p>
<p>People disadvantaged by background or other factors</p> <p><i>Includes-, where they live, socio-economic status, location(rural/urban), educational achievement</i></p>	<p>Staffing levels and grades are proposed to suit the business need.</p>	<p>Some staff may be affected by a change in working location, additional travel costs and a lower grade position in frontline service because of the reduction in E,D & B posts.</p>	<p>The reduction in posts is compensated by an increase in C posts.</p>

Equality Impact Assessment – Staff

The potential impact and further action sections below must be completed

1. What conclusions have you reached about the potential impact ?

Possible Impact	Group/s Affected	Evidence
Uncertainty and anxiety for staff during the period of consultation and implementation.	All staff in the Arts and Museum service	Staff briefings, consultation and reaction
May be unable to grant voluntary redundancy to all staff expressing an interest	All staff in the Arts and Museum service – particularly those aged over 55.	

IMPORTANT

If you have identified that any groups are disadvantaged, is this likely to be unlawful? Yes/No

This relates purely to any potential breach of legislation – in most cases the answer will be No.

Equality Impact Assessment – Staff

2. Further action (please specify – actions to mitigate any identified negative impacts)

Impact identified	Actions to be taken	Responsibility	Timescale	Expected Outcomes	Review date
Anxiety and uncertainty Acceptance/refusal of redundancy	<p>Consultation with staff, unions and external stakeholders on the proposals</p> <p>Dialogue with staff on the proposed direction of the service – detail of proposed reorganisation published for staff</p> <p>Communications plan to ensure effective consultation, HR support and regular dialogue with the unions</p> <p>Slotting in arrangements where there is 70% match to existing role and no requirement to reduce number of staff in the role. Ring fencing also applies.</p>	Assistant Director/ Head of Service	Oct 2011 – Jan 2012	May- June 2012	September 2012

Agreed by: Jan Mein and Jo Bailey

Date of completion of this Impact Assessment: 07 October 2011

Summary published on web: Yes

Date published: 10 October 2011