**University of Stirling Equality Impact Assessment**

# Equality Impact Relevance

# 

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of policy, practice, activity or proposed decision | Information Services Restructure |
| Purpose/aim of above | To reshape Information Services under a new target operating model and team structure, in order to deliver £700k in annual savings whilst ensuring the department is optimally shaped and skilled to set against a challenging context of hybrid digital and physical working, and to provide an underpinning structure for a successful future. |
| Faculty or Professional Services area responsible | Information Services |
| Will the policy/practice/activity/proposal impact on people? | Yes – an EIA is required. Proceed to section 2. |

1. **Identifying** **and mitigating risks of disadvantage and discrimination**

Will any aspect of the policy/practice/activity/proposal be likely to result in a differential impact for people sharing a particular characteristic, and, if so, could this result in disadvantage, discrimination, harassment, victimsation or any other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act (2010)[[1]](#footnote-2)? In answering these questions, please summarise the evidence you have considered and the issues you have identified.

*Note: 9 of the characteristics listed are protected in law under the Equality Act 2010. These are denoted below by (PC). The other characteristics are those which the University has identified should be considered as part of its work to achieve its published equality outcomes.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **Is there potential for a differential impact between people who share a characteristic and those who do not? (YES/NO/UNKNOWN)** | **If yes, is there potential for that differential outcome to result in disadvantage/ discrimination? (YES/NO/UNKNOWN)** | **If disadvantage was identified, is this lawful, justifiable and proportionate[[2]](#footnote-3)?**  **(YES/NO/ UNKNOWN)** | **Summarise the reasoning behind your findings, and any evidence you have drawn upon in coming to that conclusion.**  **If the answer to any of the 3 questions is “unknown”, note what steps will be taken to investigate further.** |
| Age (PC) | Yes | Yes | Yes | See appendix |
| Caring responsibilities | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Disability (PC) | No |  |  |  |
| Gender identity | No |  |  |  |
| Gender Re‐assignment (PC) | No |  |  |  |
| Marriage and civil partnership (PC) | No |  |  |  |
| Mental health and wellbeing[[3]](#footnote-4) | No |  |  |  |
| Pregnancy and Maternity (PC) | No |  |  |  |
| Race (including ethnicity, nationality & skin colour) (PC) | No |  |  |  |
| Religion or belief (PC) | No |  |  |  |
| Sex (PC) | Yes | Yes | Yes | See attached appendix. |
| Sexual orientation (PC) | No | No | No |  |
| Socio-economic status | No | No | No |  |
| Experience of the care system (“care  experienced”) | No | No | No |  |

# Promotion of equality and good relations

Does this policy/practice/activity/proposal help the University fulfil its [statutory duties to promote equity and good relations](https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/essential-guide-public-sector-equality-duty-scotland.pdf) between people who share a characteristic and those who do not?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **YES/NO/ UNKNOWN** | **Summarise the reasoning behind your findings, and any evidence you have drawn upon in coming to that conclusion.**  **If the answer is “unknown”, note what steps will be taken to investigate further.** |
| Age (PC) | NO |  |
| Caring responsibilities | NO |  |
| Disability (PC) | NO |  |
| Gender identity | NO |  |
| Gender Re‐assignment (PC) | NO |  |
| Marriage and civil partnership (PC) | NO |  |
| Mental health and wellbeing[[4]](#footnote-5) | NO |  |
| Pregnancy and Maternity (PC) | NO |  |
| Race (including ethnicity, nationality and skin colour) (PC) | NO |  |
| Religion or belief (PC) | NO |  |
| Sex (PC) | NO |  |
| Sexual orientation (PC) | NO |  |
| Socio-economic status | NO |  |
| Experience of the care system (“care experienced”) | NO |  |

1. As a result of the thought and engagement process in steps 2 and 3, if you have identified (a) risks of disadvantage, discrimination, harassment or victimisation; or (b) opportunities to help better promote equity and good relations between people who share a characteristic and those who do not, summarise below **what steps need to be taken/adjustments need to be made to** the policy/practice/activity/proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **Steps/adjustments required to mitigate risks of disadvantage/discrimination or promote equity and good relations** |
| Age (PC) | See appendix |
| Caring responsibilities | See appendix |
| Disability (PC) |  |
| Gender identity |  |
| Gender Re‐assignment (PC) |  |
| Marriage and civil partnership (PC) |  |
| Mental health and wellbeing[[5]](#footnote-6) |  |
| Pregnancy and Maternity (PC) |  |
| Race (including ethnicity, nationality and skin colour) (PC) |  |
| Religion or belief (PC) |  |
| Sex (PC) | See appendix |
| Sexual orientation (PC) |  |
| Socio-economic status |  |
| Experience of the care system (“care experienced”) |  |

1. **Action Plan**

Summarise any actions required as a result of the EIA

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action/change required** | **Responsibility** | **Timescale** | **Resources required** | **Who else needs to be involved in approval of**  **actions/resources?** |
| Outplacement Support including CV writing and interview skills | HR/OD | Available following consultation period | HR/OD, perhaps external provider depending on budget and availability | HR/OD |
| Development plan for those securing new or different roles | IS & HR | Available following implementation period | HR/OD and IS perhaps external provider depending on budget and availability | HR/OD and IS |
| Encourage feedback from staff and trade unions regarding proposed structural changes | IS & HR | Ongoing - consultation period ends on 12th October | Restructure Paperwork | HR and IS |
| Highlight support mechanisms available to all staff | HR | Available 24/7 | N/A | HR |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Equality Impact Assessment completed by[[6]](#footnote-7)** | David Telford, Richard Aird, James Blair and Lesley Graham | Date 25/09/2020 |

Once the EIA has been completed and signed off, please submit to [equality@stir.ac.uk](mailto:equality@stir.ac.uk)

Findings of the EIA including the action plan will be published, in line with the University’s statutory duties.

IS Restructuring EIA Appendix

**Identifying and mitigating risks of disadvantage and discrimination**

**Age**

The age range within IS is diverse, with the majority of staff sitting within the 41 - 50 age bracket.

The majority of those at risk following on from this review process are detailed below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age Group | Overall Number | At risk number | % of overall at risk |
| 18 - 30 | 5 | 2 | 6.9 |
| 31 - 40 | 9 | 5 | 17.24 |
| 41 - 50 | 34 | 8 | 27.59 |
| 51 - 60 | 28 | 9 | 31.03 |
| 61+ | 10 | 5 | 17.24 |
| Total | 86 | 29 | 33.7 |

We recognised that those in the age groups 41 – 50 and 51 – 60 were proportionately impacted more than other age groups, mainly due to changes to the service delivery within the library focuses on removing some of the lower graded roles and replacing these with higher graded roles to allow for better career development and opportunities. Typically, the lower graded roles are filled by those in the 41 + age group.

One of the first things we did was to compare the newly proposed job descriptions with the current responsibilities of the staff to see if there were similarities which is turn would determine whether or not someone would be placed at risk. This process avoided discrimination as only the contents of the job descriptions were reviewed against the new business needs and not the individuals involved.

For the newly proposed roles available for employees to apply for, we will conduct interviews which will be based on the candidates experience and skills set. We will have consistent panels which aim to be gender balanced, scoring sheets which are based on the published criteria with interview focusing on experience and skill set. Applicants will have sufficient time to prepare prior to the interview (dates and presentations titles (if applicable) will be available at least two weeks prior to the interview. Applicants will encouraged to access the outplacement support developed specifically for IS staff.

For those who are successful following interview, there will be a development plan introduced to ensure any training needs are identified and addressed.

We feel this approach along with the above support will minimise any differential impact felt.

**Caring Responsibilities**

This is difficult to report on due to the lack of data but there is no evidence to suggest that those with caring responsibilities would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

IS has 26 employees on part time contracts varying from 0.87FTE to 0.17FTE, the majority of those in part time roles are in based in the library service delivery teams. The proposed structure continues to offer part time roles but also provides an opportunity to increase their hours. Once the employees are in place, a rota will be developed with the aims of matching desired working patterns with the business needs. We feel this approach will minimise any differential impact felt.

**Disability**

This is difficult to report on due to the lack of data but there is no evidence to suggest that those with a disability would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

It is clear in the FAQs available to employees, that should they need adjustments, to let us know.

**Gender Identity**

This is difficult to report on due to the lack of data but there is no evidence to suggest that those would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

**Gender Re-Assignment**

This is difficult to report on due to the lack of data but there is no evidence to suggest that those would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

**Marriage and civil partnership**

This is difficult to report on due to the lack of data but there is no evidence to suggest that those would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

**Mental health and wellbeing**

This is difficult to report on due to the lack of data but there is no evidence to suggest that those would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

**Pregnancy and Maternity (PC)**

There are no individuals currently pregnant or currently on maternity leave however, there is no evidence to suggest that those would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

**Race (including ethnicity, nationality & skin colour) (PC)**

There is high representation of British nationality within IS (94%) but there is no evidence to suggest that this protected characteristic would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

**Religion or belief (PC)**

This is difficult to report on due to the lack of data but there is no evidence to suggest that this protected characteristic would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

**Sex (PC)**

Overall IS has a ratio of 42 males to 44 females. The majority of females (35) work in service delivery roles within the Library and as such proportionately 19 women are at risk compared with 9 males at risk. This is due to the restructuring of the library service delivery teams, the majority of which are currently held by women.

The gender split for grades 5 and up, shows that there are more males in higher graded roles.

It is recognised that the G4 library assistants within the service delivery side of IS (92% of these roles are held by women), have traditionally had few, or even no options for career progression – usually posts are at G7/8 above this with the exception of a tiny number of specialist roles at G5 (2) or supervisory at G6 (1).  The proposal sees added value activity being added to the new role profile, which commands a G5 salary instead of a G4 – allowing for progression from Information Support at G3 to Senior Information Support at G5.  The experience at G5 is far more likely to give relevant experience for career progression into G6/7 roles than the current G4 posts.  We’re also introducing new roles at G6 and G7.

Part of the purpose for the proposed restructuring is to ensure the right skills are in place for the future. This in turn affords developmental opportunities for a variety of staff including the group noted above. There will be outplacement support available to those who are impacted by the proposed changes which will help those at risk, ensure they maximise their ability to articulate their potential and how they may fit into one the new roles. For those securing new or different roles, there will be a development plan in place to ensure staff are given every opportunity to maximise their potential in these roles. The plan will include a variety of activities depending on the role and needs but will include activities such as mentoring, courses, on the job coaching, skills focused activities. We hope that these steps will minimise the impact on all staff but specifically those identified above. Support mechanisms have been shared with staff and we have made ourselves available for questions and discussions.

For the newly proposed roles available for employees to apply for, we will conduct interviews which will be based on the candidates experience and skills set. We will have consistent panels which aim to be gender balanced, scoring sheets which are based on the published criteria with interview focusing on experience and skill set. Applicants will have sufficient time to prepare prior to the interview (dates and presentations titles (if applicable) will be available at least two weeks prior to the interview.

We feel this approach along with the above support will minimise any differential impact felt.

**Sexual orientation (PC)**

There is no evidence to suggest that this protected characteristic would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

**Socio-economic status and Experience of the care system (“care experienced”)**

We do not currently hold this data but there is no evidence to suggest that this group would be affected differently by the proposed new structure.

Overall, we feel we have mitigated any potential differential impacts to the groups identified above. Whilst we recognise that a number of employees will be at risk, our aim was to ensure the IS service is fit for purpose and the number of redundancies is kept to a minimum. The net reduction in posts is 1.33FTE across the full restructure.

1. See appendix 2 of the full guidance on conducting an EIA <https://stir.app.box.com/file/676999536175> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Consider the definitions of discrimination in the Equality Act (2010) – refer to guidance. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Note people with mental health conditions are protected under the disability elements of the Equality Act 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Note people with mental health conditions are protected under the disability elements of the Equality Act 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Note people with mental health conditions are protected under the disability elements of the Equality Act 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Note that an EIA should be carried out by at least two people responsible for the policy, activity, practice or proposal. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)