

Title of proposed EIA	New Ways Of Working
Reference No	EQUA674
EA is in support of	Amended Policy
Review Frequency	Quarterly
Date of first review	21/06/2021
Directorate	Digital and Customer Services
Division	
Service Area	New Ways of Working Programme
Responsible Officer(s)	 Robin Burton
Quality Control Officer(s)	 Tracy Kirton
Accountable Officer(s)	 Peter Bishop
Purpose of proposal	Lancaster Circus declared surplus and Margaret Street no longer a CAB
Data sources	Statistical Database (please specify); relevant research
Please include any other sources of data	SAP HR data for the provision of protected characteristics where recorded. Data for the 3 main buildings of Woodcock Street, Lancaster Circus and Margaret Street annex at the point of this assessment is indicative data whereby we have verified occupants from property and IT databases and managed to cross referene them to HR records. There is a gap in this data as new starters or those moving to the building over the last 12-18 months do not appear on our location information. We aim to capture more robust data as part of our programme.
ASSESS THE IMPACT AGAINST THE PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS	
Protected characteristic: Age	Employees
Age details:	Age analysis of all City Council employees shows that of the 10,595 staff in SAP HR at the time of completing this EIA the % split is as below: Not available - 0.37% Under 20 - 0.35%

20-29 - 6.01%

30-39 - 13.66%

40-49 - 23.15%

50-59 - 40.54%

60-69 - 14.66%

70plus - 1.26%

When looking at all 3 buildings that are affected at this point in the programme it changes slightly to:

Not available - 0.10%, down by 0.27%

Under 20 - 0.26%, down by 0.09%

20-29 - 6.17%, up by 0.16%

30-39 - 16.92%, up by 3.26%

40-49 - 28.76%, up by 5.61%

50-59 - 38.89%, down by 1.65%

60-69 - 8.80%, down by 5.86%

70plus - 0.10%, down by 1.16%

Whilst in both the council wide and those that affected by this programme the figures show that on those aged 20-29 (0.16% increase) are affected minimally and those aged 30-39 (3.26% increase) and 40-49 (5.61%) are impacted slightly.

However as the support available during the relocation of staff is open to all staff through a variety of delivery methods, we do not feel there is any direct impact on any specific age group

Protected characteristic: Disability

Disability details:

Employees

Employees with access to work equipment in Lancaster Circus and Margaret Street will have a formal review of their working requirements to ascertain their needs moving forward.

These will need to be reviewed regardless following over 12 months of work from home for many during the pandemic lockdown restrictions.

Any equipment currently supplied under Access to Work will either be relocated to Woodcock Street, or should the employee choose to continue to work from home then their equipment will be supplied to their home address.

Where a workers role is agreed with them as being "remote" then they will be assessed individually for their requirements at home and at Woodcock Street.

The new proposals are likely to have a more positive impact as each employee will have the autonomy to choose the most relevant location. The programme also seeks to enable employees to have more autonomy and choice, wherever possible in terms of the working hours to enable the to work at times that meet their health needs.

Protected characteristic: Sex

Gender details:

Employees

In terms of gender, our initial analysis of Lancaster and Margaret Street shows more male (67.27%) than female (32.73%) employees. This is based on property occupation data being cross referenced to HR/SAP data. However the property data cannot be relied on as accurate as it is 12months out of date. This suggests that more males will be affected by the closure than females.

However, as the closure will also impact on Woodcock Street employees who will need to "share" space it is felt that the total demographic is to be used for the EIA purpose. This demonstrates an almost equal impact with 48.03% male and 51.96% female being affected by these proposals.

As every employee will be supported individually by the NWOW team it is not felt that any further mitigation is required.

Protected characteristics: Gender Reassignment

Gender reassignment details:

Employees

Unfortunately we do not have at this stage any details of employees for this characteristic.

The closure of the buildings will not directly impact should there be as welfare facilities in all 3 buildings are the same.

Should Woodcock Street require additional welfare facilities moving forward then our staff groups will be involved in any decisions regarding their designs.

Protected characteristics: Marriage and Civil Partnership

Marriage and civil partnership details:

Employees

We have not analysed our data for this characteristic as our data set needs to be refined as we engage with every team affected.

We will review this as part of our systematic review

However every employee will be enabled to access all support available throughout the programme.

Protected characteristics: Pregnancy and Maternity

Pregnancy and maternity details:

Employees

We have not analysed our data for this characteristic as our data set needs to be refined as we engage with every team affected.

We will review this as part of our systematic review

However every employee will be enabled to access all support available throughout the programme.

Protected characteristics: Race

Race details:

Employees

Ethnicity information for Lancaster and Margaret Street shows there are 56.50% white employees compared to 43.50% BME, suggesting that the move would mean slightly more impact on our white staff.

However we also need to consider the Woodcock population as these staff

will also be affected by the proposals. When including 54.1% white and 45.9% BME for Woodcock the overall effect is only slightly changed at 54.5% white employees and 45.5% BME.

A slightly different way of analysing the impact on this protected characteristic has also been to look at lower paid staff in terms of any affect. With this in mind we have also analysed our GR1-GR4 grades for all 3 buildings. In this scenario we see that the figures change slightly and show that there is a potential to impact slightly more on our BME staff as the figures change to 49.82% white and 50.18% BME. However this difference is so minor it is not considered any mitigation is required at this stage as all staff can accept all the support on offer.

Protected characteristics: Religion or Beliefs

Religion or beliefs details:

Employees

Unfortunately we do not have at this stage any details of employees for this characteristic.

The closure of the buildings will not directly impact should there be as welfare facilities in all 3 buildings are the same.

Should Woodcock Street require additional welfare facilities moving forward then our staff groups will be involved in any decisions regarding the designs.

Protected characteristics: Sexual Orientation

Sexual orientation details:

Employees

Unfortunately we do not have at this stage any details of employees for this characteristic.

The closure of the buildings will not directly impact should there be as welfare facilities in all 3 buildings are the same.

Should Woodcock Street require additional welfare facilities moving forward then our staff groups will be

	involved in any decisions regarding their designs.
Socio-economic impacts	Not applicable
Please indicate any actions arising from completing this screening exercise.	<p>The only characteristic at this stage of the programme that would require mitigation is our employees with a disability. In term of this our NWOW are engaging with all employees with access to work equipment and requirements in Lancaster Circus and Margaret Street and support them in their move to Woodcock Street or home depending on their personal choice and job role.</p> <p>The programme is likely to expand as we hope to provide more locality based working, it is therefore important to keep this EIA under review as we consider any other options</p>
Please indicate whether a full impact assessment is recommended	NO
What data has been collected to facilitate the assessment of this policy/proposal?	
Consultation analysis	
Adverse impact on any people with protected characteristics.	
Could the policy/proposal be modified to reduce or eliminate any adverse impact?	
How will the effect(s) of this policy/proposal on equality be monitored?	
What data is required in the future?	
Are there any adverse impacts on any particular group(s)	No
If yes, please explain your reasons for going ahead.	
Initial equality impact assessment of your proposal	
Consulted People or Groups	
Informed People or Groups	
Summary and evidence of findings from your EIA	<p>The data collected on the 3 main buildings detailed in this proposal do not suggest a full equality impact assessment is required at this stage.</p> <p>As data is captured through more detailed conversations with relevant teams a review of this screening will be required and any mitigations identified agreed.</p>

QUALITY CONTORL SECTION

Submit to the Quality Control Officer for reviewing?

Yes

Quality Control Officer comments

I have amended this screening in parts to provide our most recent data and would suggest as we proceed with the programme we revisit this screening in 3 months time

Decision by Quality Control Officer

Proceed for final approval

Submit draft to Accountable Officer?

Yes

Decision by Accountable Officer

Date approved / rejected by the Accountable Officer

Reasons for approval or rejection

Please print and save a PDF copy for your records

No

Julie Bach

Person or Group

Content Type: Item

Version: 40.0

Created at 09/04/2021 04:16 PM by  Robin BurtonLast modified at 14/05/2021 09:21 AM by Workflow on behalf of  Tracy Kirton[Close](#)