

Before carrying out EIA, you should familiarise yourself with the University’s Equality and Diversity Policy and undertake our online training on Equality and Diversity and unconscious bias. These, along with further information and resources, are available on the Equality and Diversity Pages on the intranet.

EIA covers policies, provisions, criteria, functions, practices, and activities, including decisions and the delivery of services, but will be referred to as ‘policy/practice’ hereinafter.

A. Policy/Practice (name or brief description):	Proposed Restructure – September 2020 baseline
--	--

B. Reason for Equality Impact Assessment (delete as applicable):
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other (please state): Restructure

C. Person responsible for the policy area or practice:	
Name:	
Job title:	
School/service/unit:	UEL Overview

D. An Impact Assessment should be carried out if any of the following apply to the policy/practice, if it:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> affects primary or high-level functions of the University is relevant to the promotion of equality (in terms of the Public Sector Equality Duty ‘needs’ as set out in the Policy and Guidance)? It is one which interested parties could reasonably expect the University to have carried out an EIA? <p>All of the above</p>

E. Equality Groups

To which equality groups is the policy/practice relevant and why?

- A reduction in headcount is an inevitable outcome of the restructure process. Understanding the potential for adverse and/or disproportionate impact from the point of view of a number of protected characteristics – specifically but not restricted to gender, ethnicity, age, and disability – is a fundamental responsibility arising from the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) to which UEL is subject. In line with the PSED, UEL has attempted to mitigate against the impact of the restructure by considering alternative business cases as well as engaging in an effective student recruitment strategy.

Add notes against the following statements where applicable/relevant:

- **On any available information about the needs of relevant equality groups:**
UEL employs a highly diverse staff team by comparison with many HE institutions, with 39% of staff from a BAME background compared with 54% identifying as White. Gender distribution is split 54% to 46% female to male. 5% of staff have shared information on their disability; 11% fall within the 18-29 age bracket; 48% are 30-49 and 41% are aged 50 or over.
- **Any gaps in evidence/insufficient information to properly assess the process, and how this be will be addressed:**
Staff profile data is available for the protected characteristics of gender, ethnicity, age, and disability. Information on religion/belief, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy & maternity, and marriage & civil partnership is inconsistent, sufficient to warrant exclusion from this analysis.

A series of tables showing the staff data analysed are included in this report. A number of summary conclusions are offered, based on comparing the percentage of staff 'in scope' (at risk of redundancy) with the overall staff population, and using the four protected characteristics mentioned above as points of reference. A previous analysis conducted in June 2020 provides a useful baseline for this report, and will be referenced where necessary.

Summary conclusions

- The overall pattern of impact suggested in the previous analysis – that is, with men and White staff carrying a greater burden of adverse exposure to risk of redundancy – remains present through the subsequent reduction of the numbers of staff in scope. Initially, larger number of women than men were at risk. This position is reversed (albeit marginally) in the current analysis (Table 1) showing a total of 142 staff in scope compared with 450 in the June analysis.
- Tables 2 and 3 give some insight into the gender distribution between academic and Professional Services staff, and within each of the six Schools. Professional Services shows a greater reduction of the number of staff in scope compared to academics (53%). As noted, male staff carry a heavier burden of risk of redundancy; in four Schools, there is a difference of four percentage points or less, and in one School the burden is equally shared.
- With ethnicity (Tables 4-7), the established trend continues to the effect of the overall balance of risk of redundancy falling more heavily on White staff compared with BAME staff – a difference of five percentage points. More BAME staff than White appear to have been taken out of scope in the most recent proposals, with Black staff showing the highest percentage reduction. Amongst academics, the adverse impact on White staff remains greater with twice the percentage at risk compared with BAME staff.
- Looking at the age profile (Table 8), the analysis presented here shows that younger staff (18-29yrs) have been taken out of scope at a notably higher rate than older staff groups, though the overall number of staff in this group is smaller.
- On disability (Table 9), non-disabled staff continue to carry a greater burden of risk compared with their disabled colleagues, No information is available on the nature of impairments that disabled staff live with, so this needs to be an area of continued vigilance even in the absence of specific data.
- Whilst previous analyses explored the profiles staff who applied for, and either accepted or were rejected for voluntary severance, no data was available to support such an analysis on this occasion.
- The question of the impact on HPLs was raised after the first EIA. It has been clarified that only one permanent HPL had been put at risk and that this individual was being treated in accordance with the same provisions as all other permanent staff. Issues relating to non-permanent HPLs have been dealt with extensively in other, separate, correspondence.
- Further analysis is contained in an appendix to this report, showing comparative profiles of at-risk staff in June and at present. Some

commentary is provided in the appendix; the overall trend is a slight but definite reduction in the burden of risk of redundancy carried by female and BAME staff at present compared with the starting position in June.

Data tables

Table 1: Gender	Female		Male	
	n	%	n	%
In Scope (n=142)	70	49%	72	51%
Population (n=1516)	716	54%	637	46%
For Demographic	10%		11%	

Table 2: Gender by Role		Female		Male	
		n	%	n	%
Academics	In Scope (n=100)	51	51%	49	49%
	Population (n=713)	371	52%	342	48%
	For Demographic	7%		14%	
PSS	In Scope (n=42)	19	45%	23	55%
	Population (n=800)	438	55%	362	45%
	For Demographic	4%		6%	

Table 3: Gender by School		Female		Male	
		n	%	n	%
CASS	In Scope (n=8)	4	50%	4	50%
	Population (n=126)	81	64%	45	36%
	For Demographic	5%		9%	
ACE	In Scope (n=56)	27	48%	29	52%
	Population (n=154)	56	36%	98	64%
	For Demographic	17%		30%	
ACI	In Scope (n=10)	5	50%	5	50%
	Population (n=97)	50	52%	47	48%
	For Demographic	10%		11%	
B&L	In Scope (n=5)	2	40%	3	60%
	Population (n=93)	46	49%	47	51%
	For Demographic	4%		6%	
HSB	In Scope (n=2)	1	50%	1	50%
	Population (n=126)	81	64%	45	36%
	For Demographic	1%		2%	
Psychology	In Scope (n=19)	12	63%	7	37%
	Population (n=127)	79	63%	47	37%
	For Demographic	15%		15%	

Table 4: Ethnicity	BAME		White		Not Known	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
In Scope (n=142)	35	25%	101	71%	6	4%
Population (n=1516)	588	39%	843	56%	85	5%
For Demographic	6%		11%		7%	

Table 5: Ethnicity Breakdown	Asian		Black		White	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
In Scope (n=127)	17	19%	9	12%	101	59%
Population (n=1516)	273	18%	219	14%	843	56%
For Demographic	6%		4%		12%	

Table 6: Ethnicity by Role		BAME		White		Not Known	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Academics	In Scope (n=100)	18	18%	78	78%	4	4%
	Population (n=714)	226	32%	449	63%	39	5%
	For Demographic	8%		16%		10%	
PSS	In Scope (n=42)	17	40%	23	55%	2	5%
	Population (n=802)	362	45%	394	49%	46	6%
	For Demographic	5%		6%		4%	

Table 7: Ethnicity by School		BAME		White		Not Known	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
CASS	In Scope (n=8)	1	29%	7	71%	0	
	Population (n=126)	33	26%	90	71%	3	2%
	For Demographic	3%		7%		0%	
ACE	In Scope (n=56)	11	20%	42	75%	3	5%
	Population (n=154)	62	40%	83	54%	9	6%
	For Demographic	17%		51%		33%	
ACI	In Scope (n=10)	0	0%	10	100%	0	0%
	Population (n=97)	20	21%	74	76%	3	3%
	For Demographic	0%		14%		0%	
B&L	In Scope (n=5)	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%
	Population (n=93)	44	47%	41	44%	8	9%
	For Demographic	5%		7%		0%	
HSB	In Scope (n=2)	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
	Population (n=117)	39	33%	67	57%	11	9%
	For Demographic	0%		3%		0%	
Psychology	In Scope (n=19)	4	21%	14	74%	1	5%
	Population (n=127)	28	22%	94	74%	5	4%
	For Demographic	14%		15%		20%	

Table 8: Age	18-29	30-49	50+
--------------	-------	-------	-----

	n	%	n	%	n	%
In Scope (n=452)	50	11%	215	48%	187	41%
Population (n=1516)	263	16%	857	52%	541	33%
For Demographic	28%		28%		12%	

Table 9: Disability	Yes		No		Not Known	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
In Scope (n=142)	3	2%	131	92%	8	6%
Population (n=1516)	76	5%	1348	90%	92	5%
For Demographic	4%		10%		9%	

- **If application of this policy/practice leads to discrimination (direct or indirect), harassment, victimisation, less favourable treatment for specific equality groups:**

The view offered in the June 2020 EIA – that the restructure should not lead to direct discrimination as the make-up of those affected is diverse and consistent with overall demographics – is considered to remain valid following the analysis presented here. There is no risk of indirect discrimination either. This is an important point to highlight given the significance of the Public Sector Equality Duty in that HEIs have a responsibility to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation under the Equality Act 2010. Although figures show that men are more affected overall despite their lower percentage in overall demographics, this discrepancy can be explained by the very high percentage of male staff within the security function (80%) who are all at risk.

There are, however, some important contextual factors that should perhaps be kept in mind as they will likely affect how staff may receive the occurrence of the restructure irrespective of the ‘facts’.

During the height of the COVID pandemic in March and April 2020, the London Borough of Newham (home to all three UEL campuses) had the highest rate of Covid-19 deaths in the United Kingdom. Newham had an age-standardised mortality rate of 144.3 Covid-19 related deaths per 100,000. Newham is the most racially diverse borough in London with over 70% of its residents identifying as Black, Asian, or Minority Ethnic and also one of the most deprived.

Data indicating Covid-19 deaths by ethnicity revealed that although Black people account for 13% of the London population, they account for 16% of Covid-19 deaths. This is a higher rate of mortality compared to their White, Asian and Mixed heritage counterparts. The national lockdown commenced on the 23rd March and has now been eased, although there have been local lockdowns in various UK regions where spikes have occurred. It is important to note that at the time of writing this EIA, the Prime Minister has confirmed that we have entered a second wave of the pandemic. The COVID-19 risk in London is increasing and Newham Council has increased the risk from ‘low’ to ‘medium’. This means that the cases of COVID in the local area are no longer stable but are increasing. Furthermore, the government recently introduced new restrictions in England in an attempt to control outbreaks and reduce cases.

It is important to provide this information as a backdrop to the restructure because the student demographic at UEL is predominately Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (over 70%). In addition, the academic staffing demographic is 24% BAME and PSS demographic is 41% BAME. It is not difficult to see how this background would accentuate a perception of risk amongst Black staff specifically and BAME staff

generally, and whilst it might not change the outcome some cognizance of this context would be appropriate in how the process is handled.

- **If the policy/practice contributes to advancing equality of opportunity¹**

- Given the nature of restructurings, some groups are bound to be more affected than others, even if by slight margins. The consultation period and process should provide a transparent and open procedure with clear rationale for the restructure. Where staff have the opportunity to apply for new roles within the new structure, all efforts will be made to make sure that the process is inclusive and does not favour any particular group disproportionately.

- **If there is an opportunity in applying this policy/practice to foster good relations:**

- The restructure should not affect relations between different groups and will provide a transparent and clear rationale for why this is taking place.

- **If the policy/practice create any barriers for any other groups?**

- Provision of various support will be presented to all staff that in scope of the restructuring throughout the process.

- **How the communication of the policy/practice is made accessible to all groups, if relevant?**

- Due to the current restriction to physical gatherings by the pandemic, the Vice Chancellor (or appointed person) has held virtual briefing sessions to communicate the rationale and reasoning for the proposed restructures. A formal period of consultation took place with affected staff, trade union representatives, other staff, and stakeholder in addition to letters being sent to the home addresses of affected staff.

- **How equality groups or communities are involved in the development, review and/or monitoring of the policy or practice?**

¹ This question does not apply to the protected characteristic of marriage or civil partnership

- A formal consultation process took place with the affected staff and trade union representatives.
- EIA carried out and quality assured by the Office for Institutional Equity (OIE).

• **Any potential or actual impact of applying the policy or practice, with regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality and promote good relations:**

- While there is potential for staff with different protected characteristics being affected, this is inevitable due to the diversity of UEL staff. All efforts will be made to undertake an inclusive approach to all restructures and support provided to staff through existing mechanisms.

F. Equality Impact Assessment Outcome

Select one of the four options below to indicate how the development/review of the policy/practice will be progressed and state the rationale for the decision. (Delete the options that do not apply):

Option 1: No change required – the assessment is that the process is robust.

According to information seen in the data provided, there is a fairly consistent approach to the process. The groups affected reflect the diversity of the university’s staff demographics. Although those in the age bracket of 30-49 seem to be most affected as well as staff that have shared information on their disability, the impact on the overall demographic across the protected characteristics should be minimal. Nonetheless, it is recommended that more support be provided to staff that have shared information on their disability.

G. Action and Monitoring

1. Specify the actions required for implementing findings of this EIA and how the policy or practice will be monitored in relation to its equality impact (or note where this is specified above).

- Make it clear what opportunities there are for staff to continue to work part time or possible request part time / flexible hours / job share as part of the consultation process.
- A follow up EIA review should be conducted after the completion of

	<p>the restructuring process before implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The student experience will need to be monitored in affected departments in Schools. SSRs will need to be monitored along with the student experience in the services. Although UEL has a higher proportion of BAME academic staff (24%) compared to the sector average (9%), the loss of BAME staff presents significant issues such as decreased levels of representation, role models, and potentially a positive student experience especially for BAME students. - The impact of Dual Delivery will have to be monitored. As UEL enters a new phase in its style of academic delivery, the impact of delivering across different platforms and modes will need to be assessed when implemented. This is clearly of more relevance to staff that remain following the restructure, and there is a considerable amount of evidence pointing to the need to attend to the emotional and psychological wellbeing of staff who 'survive' a restructure.
2. When will the policy/practice next be reviewed?	- At the end of the formal consultation process.

H. Publication of EIA		
Can this EIA be published in full, now?	Yes	No

If No – please specify when it may be published or indicate restrictions that apply:	The EIA will need to be consulted on by the Trade Union members.
--	--

I. Sign-off	
EIA undertaken by (name(s) and job title(s)):	Fitzroy Andrew, Senior Institutional Equity Officer
Accepted by (name): [This will normally be the person responsible for the policy/practice named above. If not, specify job-title/role.]	
Date:	25 th September 2020

Retain a copy of this form for your own records and send a copy to equality.diversity@uel.ac.uk