Equality Impact Assessment

REDEPLOYMENT PROCEDURE

Impact Assessor: Kirsten Burnett, HR Development Officer
Assisted by Redeployment Panel – Alan Leigh / Wendy England / Tania Blench

1. Defining the Aims of the Procedure

- To ensure, where possible, that employment status is protected when someone cannot continue to work in their substantive post – for reasons of redundancy, health, capability, conduct or other;
- To retain valued staff and utilise their skills;
- To be a good employer;
- To reduce Employment Tribunal claims and, where these occur, defend them successfully.
- To support the Council’s Redundancy and Absence Management Procedures;
- To assist staff who become ill or have a disability – or to prevent conditions worsening because of work-related factors – thereby seeking to increase equality of opportunity for people with disabilities;
- To find work at the appropriate level for staff whose pay is protected;
- In capability situations, to recognise that staff have a positive contribution to make in the right job;
- To provide work in a different area, where appropriate, following investigations into bullying or harassment.
- To seek more flexible work for staff with caring responsibilities, where this cannot be accommodated in their substantive post.

The Procedure is defined by Corporate HR team. It is managed by a Redeployment Panel, comprising HR Policy Officer and staff from departmental HR teams.

The desired outcome for staff placed on the Redeployment List is to find a suitable alternative post, equivalent in grade to their substantive post, for which they meet the essential criteria. Ideally, the post will be in an area of work they are interested in and view as a positive career move.

The stakeholders are: HR, all employees, all managers and the Trade Unions. Sometimes other agencies are involved – for instance Access to Work or the Disability Employment Advisor from JobCentrePlus. However, contact is minimal and usually reactive rather than pro-active.

What might hinder the Procedure?

- Managers sometimes feel disappointed that they are not able to “choose the best candidate” and may be suspicious that there are problems with redeployees. In 2000, when the procedure was introduced, there were a number of redundancies and there was view that poor performing or “problem” staff were being passed on. Although this should have lessened occasional examples suggest the view perpetuates in some areas. There are many positive examples of successful redeployments but these are not “advertised”.
- Some redeployees do not possess the basic skills – usually in relation to IT – to be considered for the kind of posts that might otherwise be suitable. A typical example might be a care assistant who has developed back problems, making his or her substantive role unsuitable. The obvious solution is to find an office-based administrative role, which does not require any manual handling. However, even the lower-grade administrative roles usually have IT skills as essential.
- It is recognised that being at risk of losing employment is difficult for staff. The panel find in some cases that several jobs, which seem suitable, are offered, but immediately rejected by redeployees, who do not then provide full reasons when requested.
• Increasingly, staff who were employed on temporary or fixed-term contract, are coming on to the list because they have gained employment rights.
• Clear time limits for remaining on the list are not always agreed at the outset, leading to inconsistency in the way redeployees are treated – such as the length of time before they are given notice for dismissal on the grounds of ill health capability.
• The current procedure does not specify the level of jobs which should be consider, except to specify that employees should not be promoted. Ground rules have been developed since the procedure was introduced, in 2000 but the panel would welcome clarity.

2. Available data and Research

• Have taken the last 50 staff who have come off the redeployment list – either because found new post, they have been able to continue in their substantive post or have resigned / been dismissed or retired. Analysed whether positive or negative outcomes – identified BME staff and looked at gender and disability.

Of the 50 redeployees, 47 were white, 2 were from BME groups and 1 refused to give this information. There were twice as many females as males. 9 staff declared themselves as disabled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
<th>No. with +ve outcomes</th>
<th>% +ve outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused details</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
<th>No. with +ve outcomes</th>
<th>% +ve outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-disabled / did not declare</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
<th>No. with +ve outcomes</th>
<th>% +ve outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 (36% of total)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32 (64% of total)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
<th>No. with +ve outcomes</th>
<th>% +ve outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Services / Regeneration and Corporate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Children’s / Leisure and Cultural</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services and Housing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent review of procedure has included consultation with managers and staff and will shortly be consulted on with Trade Unions.

Personal Profile Forms.

3. **Assessment of Impacts**

Although it is acknowledged that the data is limited, there seem to be no significant or discernable differences in the outcomes based on gender, disability or race.

Significantly more female staff were included in the 50 staff looked at.

The outcomes for Social Services staff seem to be much better than for staff in other departments. Significantly more staff from this department have been on the redeployment list.

4. **Possible Measures to Mitigate Impact / Promote Equality of Opportunity**

- IT / other training – perhaps though TU Learning Representative, when postholder is appointed. Consider offering psychometric tests – for instance testing literacy and numeracy skills, particularly for staff who do not possess formal GCSE level qualifications.
- Consider using a skills checklist as part of the Personal Profile Form.
- Standardise letters.
- Produce simple factsheets for redeployees and manager, explaining / selling the process.
- Consider advertising some success stories.
- Develop and send out a questionnaire to redeployees asking about how the process could be improved or what information / training etc they would find useful.
- Amend procedure to give clear guidelines as to the amount of pay which can be protected, to provide consistency.
- Amend procedure to give clear guidelines as to the time limits for staff to remain on the list, recognising that there should be scope for discretion based on individual circumstances. Monitor the time staff are allowed to remain on the list.
- Agree a system for future monitoring of information on ethnicity, gender and disability. Consider monitoring other equalities data.
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