

Appendix J – Equality Impact Assessments

Initial assessment – Implementation of pay scales
(Assimilate first rather than Increment first or Increment first then Assimilate option)
(Include new points excluding new point 13 & 16)

What are the proposed outcomes of the policy?

EIA definition from the Green Book: An EIA is an analysis of a proposed change to an organisational policy **to determine whether it has a disparate impact on groups with relevant protected characteristics** as identified in the Equality Act 2010. It applies both to external policies (i.e. those having an impact on customers or clients of an organisation) and to internal policies (i.e. those affecting the organisation's employees). This is an internal EIA but the pay scales changes may be taken up by external bodies.

Peterborough City Council apply the pay scales and pay awards negotiated by The National Joint Council (NJC) for Local Government Services. The last time the council determined how the pay points would be grouped into grades was as part of the single status negotiations. These grades were implemented wef 1st April 2007. The NJC pay agreement for 2018-20 included the introduction of a new pay spine on 1 April 2019 that was based on the following:-

- A bottom rate of £17364 per annum on SCP 1 (equivalent to the old SCPs 6 & 7)
- Pairing off of old SCPs 6-17 inclusive to create new SCPs 1-6 inclusive
- Equal steps of 2% between each new SCP 1-22 (equivalent to old SCPs 6-28)
- New SCPs 10, 13, 16, 18, and 21 to enable the equal steps to be achieved
- 2% flat increase on SCPs 23 and above (old SCPs 29 and above).

The council has no choice in respect of whether or not to implement the new pay scales. The scales have to be implemented on 1st April 2019. However, there is discretion in respect of how the scales are implemented. Therefore this assessment is considering if there is any negative impact on any group as a result of how we choose to undertake the implementation.

This proposal is as a result of very detailed work that has been undertaken by the Senior Reward Advisor, Reward Advisor, Financial Accountant and regional and local members of the GMB, Unison and Unite unions since July 2018. The group have looked at various potential ways of reaching an agreed set of pay scales, using actual gender data of staff in post when the data was cut in July 2018. This assessment includes more up to date information as it has been carried out on actual numbers of staff in post on 19/11/18.

The final two favoured approaches are:-

1. Include all new SCP's excepting 13 and 16 - Increment first then Assimilate (known as Approach E)
2. Include all new SCP's excepting 13 and 16 - Assimilate first then Increment (known as Approach F)

The project group decided from the outset that this review should not look to change any of the principles of the Job Evaluation system and process which works effectively and ensures consistent and fairness in respect of the points score of each evaluated role. The aim was to 'lift and shift' the new scales into the PCC existing scales. The proposals adhere to this. There is no proposal to change the single status agreement in respect of starting salaries, pay progression, performance related increments or market factors. The overall aim is to continue to achieve equal treatment of all groups in respect of pay.

The comments inserted on the proposal documents shared with the trade unions as part of the working group papers also provide additional information about the impact on each pay point (this is in addition to the information detailed in this EIA).

By undertaking a 'lift and shift' exercise as simply as we have this does mean that the lower grades see a reduction in the number of points within each grade. Grade One will only have one point (was two), grade two and three will have two points (was three), grade four will have three points (was four), and grade five will have three points (was five). The overlaps in the grades will remain.

Factors or forces which could contribute to or detract from delivery of the outcomes and success measures: Incorrect data extracted from the HR/Payroll system.

Which groups will be affected by this proposal?

All staff employed and paid on the NJC pay scales will be affected. This assessment is carried out on the 1036 staff who were directly employed by the council on 19/11/18.

As it is likely that some of the council's schools may wish to use the same grades going forward we have also undertaken a further gender breakdown analysis of staff employed in two primary schools on 26/11/18.

Having assessed the two favoured options already employees on existing SCP 12 of Grade 4, and existing points 14 and 16 of Grade 5 would be better off under Approach F and worse off under Approach E. However, employees on existing point 20 of Grade 6, existing SCP 25 of Grade 7 and existing SCP 27 of Grade 8 would be better off under Approach E and worse off under Approach F. However, all staff in all grades will be in receipt of a pay increase regardless. There is no difference to staff on all other grades in respect of the approach and therefore this assessment will focus particularly on Grades 4,5,6,7,and 8. Data has been provided however for all grades.

Now consider whether any of the following groups will be disproportionately affected:

Equality Group	Note any positive or negative effects
Disabled people	<p>The % of disabled staff in the total workforce is 2.1%. The % of non-disabled staff is 56.7%.</p> <p>A very high 41.2% have not stated.</p> <p>1.6% of the G4&G5 staff and 0.7% of the G6&G7&G8 staff state that they are disabled. Therefore it is clear that a very small % of disabled employees in both groups would be affected, and in both cases the % is below the rate for disabled employees in the total population. It is worth noting that the high % of staff in all grades who do not state whether they are disabled or not does mean that it is difficult to accurately assess the impact. It is of course the employee's choice as to whether they inform their employer. We are hoping that when the new HR system is introduced we will have more up to date data but these figures are representative of the records currently.</p>
Married couples or those entered into a civil partnership	<p>The procedure focuses on consistent and fair treatment irrespective of status. We are not currently collecting data on civil partnership but may extend our monitoring to this group at a later date.</p>
Pregnant women or women on maternity leave	<p>Data not available and therefore the assessment cannot discount the fact that there may have been women in these grades who are pregnant currently or on maternity leave. Women on maternity leave will be treated in accordance with the NJC maternity scheme in respect of pay if they are on maternity leave on 1st April 2019.</p>
Particular ethnic groups	<p>The HR Resource Link system is used to monitor and identify where any such trends may be occurring.</p> <p>The % of staff who have declared that they are from a mixed or minority ethnic origin in the total workforce is 15.3%.</p> <p>The % of staff who have stated that they are not from a mixed or minority ethnic origin in the total workforce is 7.14%.</p> <p>An exceptionally high 77.5% have not stated.</p> <p>The % of staff from a mixed or minority ethnic origin in G4&G5 is 29.5% and in G6&G7&G8 is 17.5%.</p> <p>The % of staff not from a mixed or minority ethnic origin in G4&G5 is 27.9% and in G6&G7&G8 is 7.4%.</p> <p>A very high % in both grade sets have not stated their ethnic origin (42.6% in G4&G5) and 75.1% in G6&G7&G8.</p> <p>This means that in G4&G5 there is a much higher % of staff against the overall workforce and a marginally higher % in G6&G7&G8. Therefore potentially there is an impact in G4&G5 unless we proceed with Approach F.</p>
Those of a particular religion or who hold a particular belief	<p>We are not currently collecting data on religion or belief. When a decision is taken regarding the HR system going forward then the council will work with its equalities groups to decide whether to extend our monitoring to this group.</p>
Male/Female	<p>The data from July 2018 that formed the basis of the detailed proposal documents included gender breakdown data as this was an important consideration for the project group from the outset.</p> <p>The gender data for this equality impact assessment has been refreshed during November 2018 to bring it right up to date and this EIA reviews the refreshed data in depth.</p> <p>The current system only allows for M or F to be recorded and therefore there is no 'not stated'.</p>

The % of male staff in the total workforce is 29%.
The % of female staff in the total workforce is 71%.

The % of male staff in G4&G5 is 31.1%
The % of male staff in G6&G7&G8 is 22.2%

The % of female staff in G4&G5 is 68.9%
The % of female staff in G6&G7&G8 is 77.8%.

These results do show that there would be a slightly higher number of males that would benefit if we decided to implement approach F as there is a higher than the population average of males in G4&G5 (29% in the total workforce - 31% in G4/5). Conversely there is a slightly higher number of females in G6/7&8 than the overall population. However, the figures are not significantly above the averages (77.8% / 71%). In our view this is not significant enough to require further investigation or to evidence that we should take one approach over the other. Reviewing the data further at G6 current SCP 20 there are equal numbers of men and women in the affected points. In G7 current SCP 25 there are 50% more women than men - under Approach E they would receive a total increase of 7.3% and under Approach F it would be 5.2%. In G8 current SCP 27 where there are 75% more women than men - under Approach E they would receive a total increase of 6.73% and under Approach F it would be 4.64%.

Another important factor to consider is that our proposed new G7 includes most of the new SCPs. However, as we will not be using SCP 13 and 16 staff in G7 will move from bottom point 12 to point 14 (i.e. a double increase of 4% between points) and the same will occur for those on point 15 of G7 who will move to point 17 so receiving a 'double' increase. The main reason that we made this decision not to include all the new points was to ensure that there was no age bias in our grades as explained in the column below.

As there is actually no effect at all for employees on G9 and above it was decided that we should also consider the gender impact based on Grades 1 to 5 against Grades 6 to 8 rather than (as above) Grades 1 to 15. The results were as follows:-

The % of male staff in G1-G8 only is 25%.
The % of female staff in G1-G8 only is 75%.

The % of male staff in G4&G5 is 31.1%
The % of male staff in G6&G7&G8 is 22.2%

The % of female staff in G4&G5 is 68.9%
The % of female staff in G6&G7&G8 is 77.8%.

Again these results do show that there would be a very slightly higher number of males that would benefit if we decided to implement approach F as there is still a higher than the population average in G4&G5. Conversely there is a slightly higher number of females in G6/7&8 than the overall population. However, the figures are even closer than the figures above (77.8% / 75%). In our view this reinforces the opinion that the difference is not significant enough to require further investigation or to evidence that we should take one approach over the other.

In terms of actual staff numbers there are only 61 staff in total in G4&G5 which equates to 42 F and 19 M.

G4 roles are largely Domestic roles in residential homes, Drivers in passenger transport, and staff employed in the Tourist Information Centre. G5 roles are very varied but include 'Assistant' roles in HR, and other teams, technical roles in Growth & Regeneration, Chapel & Crematorium technician roles, and Reablement Workers.

	<p>Currently there is no one in post on existing G4 SCP12 and therefore no one ever would be affected as all staff in G4 are on existing SCP 13 and 14.</p> <p>G6, G7, and G8 roles are very diverse ranging from Bereavement Officers (G6) to Assistant Caseworkers (G7) to PES Officers (G8). There are a large number of Residential Workers at G7&G8.</p> <p>Also, as we are not the employer and do not have the data we are unable to fully assess how data from the school workforce may or may not vary these results.</p>																												
Particular age groups	<p>One of the main decisions the project group took from the outset was to only have grades that were six SCP's or less. The reason for this was twofold (1) we did not want grades that would appear to discriminate against younger staff and the view nationally is that no grade should be more than six points. Taking five years to reach the top of the scale is considered to avoid any disparate impact on younger staff, and (2) no role on these scales should need someone to be in the role for more than five years before they were fully competent in the role.</p> <p>The HR Resource Link system is used to monitor and identify relevant data.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age</th> <th>G4&5</th> <th>G6&7&8</th> <th>Total workforce</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>16-24</td> <td>6.5%</td> <td>4.19%</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25-34</td> <td>19.7%</td> <td>17.77%</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>35-44</td> <td>24.7%</td> <td>25.18%</td> <td>28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>45-54</td> <td>26.2%</td> <td>30.88%</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>55-64</td> <td>22.9%</td> <td>20.5%</td> <td>20.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>65+</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1.48%</td> <td>1.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There are very slight differences in each age range – for both bandings. Some are slightly less and others slightly more representative of the age band. The biggest variance is in the 16-24 age range where there are 3.5% more staff than the total workforce in G4&5 and also 1.19% more in G6/7/8 but neither of these are significant. This doesn't actually represent many individuals. There would be no justification for determining the scheme for the whole workforce based on the age of a very small section of the workforce. However, by opting for Approach F it would be favouring the younger workers in this pay group (in the same way as the older workers in the grades). Both schemes will be applied consistently irrespective of age.</p>	Age	G4&5	G6&7&8	Total workforce	16-24	6.5%	4.19%	3%	25-34	19.7%	17.77%	17%	35-44	24.7%	25.18%	28%	45-54	26.2%	30.88%	30%	55-64	22.9%	20.5%	20.5%	65+	0%	1.48%	1.5%
Age	G4&5	G6&7&8	Total workforce																										
16-24	6.5%	4.19%	3%																										
25-34	19.7%	17.77%	17%																										
35-44	24.7%	25.18%	28%																										
45-54	26.2%	30.88%	30%																										
55-64	22.9%	20.5%	20.5%																										
65+	0%	1.48%	1.5%																										
Those proposing to undergo, currently undergoing or who have undergone gender reassignment	The council does not currently collect data on gender reassignment but is considering whether to extend our monitoring to this group at a later date.																												
Sexual orientation	The council does not currently collect data on sexual orientation but is considering whether to extend our monitoring to this group at a later date.																												

What impact would the two approaches have on community schools?

The council still provides payroll services to some of its community schools which has meant that a gender assessment can be made on spot schools. Two primary schools were chosen randomly from the payroll records.

Schools use the council job evaluation scheme and grading system. We understand that various academy trusts also still use the PCC systems to evaluate and pay roles within their schools. Due to this the trade unions asked that we consider the impact of approach E and F on schools by using a sample of the schools data that is available to us.

School One

Total support workforce - 95.2% F 4.8%M

G4&5 - 100% F

G6&7&8 - 86% F 14% M

In actual numbers there are 60 F and 3 M in this workforce - all three of the M are in G6,7,&8. There are more F in the lower grades than there are overall and therefore in this school approach F would favour the Female dominated workforce.

School Two

Total support workforce - 97.4% F 2.6%M

G4&5 - 100% F

G6&7&8 - 93% F 7% M

In actual numbers there are 38 F and 1 M in this workforce - the one male is in G6, 7, &8 (G8). There are more F in the lower grades than there are overall, but in this school there are also 14 F in G6, 7, &8 but obviously the average is below the school overall average. Due to the fact that there is only 1 male in this school it is less relevant to draw conclusions from this example. Based on numbers of staff alone, rather than percentages, in this school approach E would favour the Female dominated workforce.

What information is available to help you understand the effect this will have on the Groups identified above?

The data used was taken from the HR Resource Link system. It includes the details of the actual staff in post on a given day in November. If we undertook the same assessments in another month's time the data could have changed as staff join, leave or receive a pay change. Many of these staff will move to a higher increment in April or later in 2019 but this is the most accurate set of data that we consider appropriate to use. From an equal pay perspective and to operate fair practices it is very important that wherever possible there is equity across the pay scales. The council has always opted to protect its lowest paid staff and this applies in respect of various elements of local terms and conditions.

Who will be the beneficiaries of the policy?

All of the NJC paid workforce will benefit. Our decision is in respect of implementation and deciding whether there is any detrimental impact on any group by how we apply the new scales. Costings have been considered throughout and no approach has been discarded on the basis of cost. However, cost is a very important factor due to the budget reductions that the council has to manage over the next three years. Therefore we are constantly reviewing what impact on budgets each approach will have.

Has the policy been explained to those it might affect directly or indirectly?

The initial discussions are being held with the trade unions and decisions have so far been made jointly. Employees were informed that this was a two year pay deal that would result in some changes to pay scales in the second year of the deal. Employees will be informed when an approach has been decided.

Can any differences be justified as appropriate or necessary?

Yes - gender difference can be justified as these staff are in higher paid groups and the council and it's trade unions always seek to protect the lower paid.

Yes - the data shows that although the number of male staff who would benefit more from Approach F is above the percentage of males in the workforce the % is very minimal. As the council can evidence an unbiased approach to job evaluation, recruitment, and opportunities for training this means that both males and females have equal access to all roles.

Yes - the difference with the **overall population** is minimal. We usually only investigate gaps of 5+%. Our gender pay gap results were higher than this (9%).

Yes - all staff are receiving pay increases of at least 2% (incremental) and 2% (pay award). This means that **all staff** will benefit from the revised pay scales. It is only how we carry out the implementation that impacts on staff on six specific SCPs.

Yes - the cost will have an **impact on the council's budget** especially because there are so many more staff employed in G6,7,and 8 rather than G4&5.

Are any remedial actions required?

No. Because under the proposed new grades all staff will benefit - this assessment looks to assess which grades should benefit more than other grades. Progression to a Full Equality Impact Assessment is not required.

Once implemented, how will you monitor the actual impact?

Monitoring will take place through the HR Resource Link System and through feedback from employees, trade unions and senior managers across the organisation plus HR team members.

Policy review date	1.4.2020.
Assessment completed by	Karen Craig
Date Initial EqIA completed	28/11/2018
Signed by Head of Service	

This page is intentionally left blank