

APPENDIX 3

Haringey Council

Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) for Organisational Restructures

Date: 21/04/2011
Department and service under review: Children & Young People's Service – Restructure of Youth, Connexions & Participation Services
Lead Officer/s and contact details: Jan Doust – 020 8489 3150 – jan.doust@haringey.gov.uk
Contact Officer/s (Responsible for actions): As above
Summary of Assessment (completed at conclusion of assessment to be used as equalities comments on council reports) This assessment considers the impact on staff of the restructuring of Youth, Connexions & Participation Services, in relation to the protected equalities groups of ethnicity, gender, age, disability, and pregnancy and maternity. It does not consider issues relating to sexual orientation, gender reassignment, and religion or belief, as the relevant data is not available for these groups. Note that an overarching EqIA is also being carried out to consider the combined impact of all of the staffing changes within the Children & Young People's Service resulting from the 2011/12 budget-setting process. The posts considered here will also be considered as part of that EqIA. Ethnicity – The proportion of BME staff affected is in line with the overall council profile (57.1% compared to 54.0%). The ethnicity profile of staff in each ring fence is for the most part in line with the profile of the affected staff group however there is an overrepresentation of BME staff in the group of displaced staff who do not have a position for which they are able to apply in the new structure. Gender – The proportion of males and females is broadly in line with the council profile (females comprise 62% of affected staff compared to 67% in

council overall). The gender profile of staff in each ring fence is for the most part in line with the profile of the affected staff group however there is an overrepresentation of females in the ring fences for the Team Leader, Admin & Data Lead, and Administrator posts.

Age - Compared to the overall council profile there are more staff drawn from the lower age bands and fewer from the higher age bands. 44% of affected staff are under 35 compared to 21% across the council. There is an overrepresentation of younger staff in the group of staff who are not eligible to apply for any of the posts in the new structure.

Disability – There is an overrepresentation of staff with a disability in the affected group. 12 staff have a disability, this constitutes 11.4% of the group, compared to 7.2% in the council overall.

Pregnancy and Maternity - Three of the affected staff are pregnant or on maternity leave.

The Equalities Impact Assessment for service restructures should assess the likely impact of restructuring on protected equalities groups of employees by: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (gender), sexual orientation.

The assessment is to be completed by the business unit manager with advice from HR. It is to be undertaken by an assessment of the basic employment profile data and then answering a number of questions outlined below.

PART 1
TO BE COMPLETED DURING THE EARLY STAGES OF CONSULTATION
WITH STAFF/ UNIONS ON THE STRUCTURE

Step 1 – Aims and Objectives

1. Purpose – What is the main aim of the proposed/new or change to the existing service?

The proposal is to reorganise the council's Youth Service, Connexions, and Children, Young People, Parent & Community Participation Service into a revised structure that will:

- Deliver the statutory responsibilities of the Local Authority
- Prioritise provision for at risk and vulnerable groups
- Meet the needs of the community and the aspirations of young people

The name of the proposed new service is Youth, Participation & Community.

The proposal involves a 75% saving to the Youth Service and Connexions budgets. In order to achieve this level of saving, a reduced service based around 3 key service areas is proposed:

- A. Service Delivery
- B. Quality Assurance
- C. Citizenship/Involvement of young people

105 staff are affected by this review, this equates to 85.9 FTE. In addition to this the review involves the deletion of 44 (30.9 FTE) vacant posts. In the proposed new structure there are 42 posts; 22 of these are part-time so the proposed structure equates to 28 FTE. Note that these figures do not include the Head of Service post as this is being addressed as part of the 'Rethinking Haringey' restructure (and EqIA).

The table below sets out the status of the 105 affected staff.

Status	No. of staff
No suitable position in new structure for postholder	21
Postholder has been accepted for Voluntary Redundancy	21
Postholder has resigned	1
Postholder in ring fence for position in new structure	55
Postholder to be assimilated into position elsewhere in C&YPS	1
Postholder to be assimilated into position in new structure	2
Post to remain unchanged in new structure; postholder to remain in post	4

Grand Total	105
--------------------	------------

The table shows that 21 staff will be displaced because there is no position in the new structure which they can be matched to. Of the 42 posts in the new structure, 4 are remaining unchanged and 2 are assimilations. This leaves 55 staff (49.1 FTE) in ring fences for 36 posts (22 FTE). As the FTE figures show, the proposed structure has a higher proportion of part-time posts than the current one, and this makes it difficult to say how many staff will be displaced by the recruitment exercise.

Some staff are ring-fenced against more than one post. In particular, there is a large degree of overlap in the ring fences for the Young People's Involvement Officer, Quality Assurance Officers and Frontline Worker roles. The table below sets out details of the posts in the proposed new structure and the number of staff ring fenced against them.

Job title	No. of posts (FTE in brackets)	Grade	Selection Method	No. of staff ringfenced (FTE in brackets)
Youth Support Services Manager	1 (1)	SM1	Assimilation	1 (1)
Team Leaders	2 (2)	PO4	Closed ring fence	4 (4)
Young People's Involvement Officer x 1; Quality Assurance Officers x 2	3 (3)	PO2	Open ring fence	32 (31.3)
Front line workers	29 (15)	PO1	Open ring fence	42 (37.4)
Admin & data lead	1 (1)	PO1	Closed ring fence	2 (1.7)
Website developer	1 (1)	SO1	Assimilation	1 (1)
Administrator	1 (1)	Sc6	Closed ring fence	7 (6)

The posts remaining in the new structure are as follows:

- Community Participation Officer
- Participation Strategy Officer
- Tracking Assistants x2

2. What are the main benefits and outcomes you hope to achieve?

See 1. above.

3. How will you ensure that the benefits/ outcomes are achieved?

Successfully establishing the new structure will deliver the savings benefit. The emphasis on Quality Assurance and Involvement of Young People noted above indicates a strong commitment to ensuring that the new service meets the needs of young people.

Step 2 – Current Workforce Information & Likely Impact of your proposals

1. Are you closing a unit?

- If No, go to question 3.

No.

2. Can any staff be accommodated elsewhere within the service, business unit or directorate?

N/A

Race

3. Provide a breakdown of the current service by Grade Group and Racial Group following the format below.

Grade Group	Total Staff	White		White Other		Not declared		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other		BME subtotal		BME % Council
		No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	
MANUAL	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	4%
Sc1-5	28	4	14.3%	3	10.7%	2	7.1%	1	3.6%	16	57.1%	2	7.1%	0	0.0%	19	67.9%	6%
Sc6-SO2	53	13	24.5%	6	11.3%	6	11.3%	1	1.9%	23	43.4%	4	7.5%	0	0.0%	28	52.8%	5%
PO1-3	11	3	27.3%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	7	63.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	63.6%	4%
PO4-7	11	3	27.3%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	5	45.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	54.5%	3%
PO8+	2	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1%
TOTAL	105	24	22.9%	11	10.5%	10	9.5%	3	2.9%	51	48.6%	6	5.7%	0	0.0%	60	57.1%	5%

Grade Group	Total Staff	% Grade Group	% in Council
MANUAL	0	0.0%	2.4%
Sc1-5	28	26.7%	37.1%
Sc6-SO2	53	50.5%	26.2%
PO1-3	11	10.5%	14.7%

PO4-7	11	10.5%	13.9%
PO8+	2	1.9%	5.9%
TOTAL	105	100.0%	100.0%

4. Highlight any grade groups that are very under represented (10% or more difference) compared with the council profile and where relevant the borough profile.

Overall, the staff affected by these proposals are at lower grades than the typical council distribution – 22.9% of affected staff are at the equivalent of PO1 or above, compared to 34.4% of staff across the council. The grade group Sc6-SO2 accounts for over half of affected staff – SO2 is the normal grade for Connexions Personal Advisers, and many Youth Workers are at Scale 6.

The proportion of staff affected by these proposals who are of Black or Minority Ethnic origin is in line with the overall council profile – 57.1% compared to 54.0%. At Sc1-Sc5 and Sc6-SO2 BME representation is in line with the council profile. At PO1-PO3 and PO4-PO7 the proportion of BME staff exceeds the council profile. At PO8+ there is no BME representation, however it should be noted that there are only 2 staff in this category.

5. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on staff from one ethnic minority group (white, white other, asian, black, mixed race) or Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) staff only?

- *If No, go to question 8.*

Staff remaining in post or being assimilated – of the 6 staff in this category, 50% are White UK and 50% are BME. This does not indicate a disproportionate impact.

Staff displaced due to no position in new structure – 66.6% of staff in this category are of BME backgrounds, compared to 57.1% of affected staff.

Team Leaders – 1 of the 4 staff is BME, this is an underrepresentation.

Young People's Involvement Officer x 1; Quality Assurance Officers x 2 – 59.3% of staff in this ring fence are BME, this is in line with the staff group overall.

Front line workers – 57.1% of staff in this ring fence are BME, this is in line with the staff group overall.

Admin and data lead – Only two staff are in this ring fence and ethnicity is not recorded for one of them

Administrator – 5 out of the 7 staff in this ring fence are BME, this is an overrepresentation.

6. By how much does these staff change the % (percentage) of BME staff in the structure? Show start and end %.

The percentage change will depend on which staff are appointed to posts. Based on the proposed ring fence arrangements, the percentage of BME staff in the proposed new structure could be anywhere between 39.4% and 73.6%.

7. Can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.?

- If Yes, how many and what effect do they have on the BME %? Show start and end %.

Affected staff will be considered for any suitable alternative opportunities within CYPS during the consultation period. The formal redeployment period runs concurrently with an employee's notice period, during which the Council is committed to trying to redeploy staff facing redundancy into suitable alternative posts, however in the current financial situation, opportunities are likely to be limited.

Gender

8. Provide a breakdown of the current organisation by Grade Group and Gender breakdown following the format below

Grade Group	TOTAL STAFF	Male		Female			
		No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	% Females in Council	% Females in Borough
MANUAL	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	49%	
Sc1-5	28	15	53.6%	13	46.4%	68%	
Sc6-SO2	53	20	37.7%	33	62.3%	74%	
PO1-3	11	3	27.3%	8	72.7%	62%	
PO4-7	11	2	18.2%	9	81.8%	64%	
PO8+	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	52%	
TOTAL	105	40	38.1%	65	61.9%	67%	49.80%

9. Highlight any grade groups that are very under represented (10% or more difference) compared to the % of females/males in the council.

The overall proportion of males and females in the affected staff group is broadly in line with the council profile. At PO4 and above males are very underrepresented.

10. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on female or male staff?

- *If No, go to question 13.*

Staff remaining in post or being assimilated – of the 6 staff in this category 50% are male and 50% are female. This does not indicate a disproportionate impact.

Staff displaced due to no position in new structure – of the 21 staff in this category, 11 are male and 10 are female. This does not indicate a disproportionate impact.

Team Leaders – all 4 staff in this ring fence are female, this is an overrepresentation.

Young People's Involvement Officer x 1; Quality Assurance Officers x 2 – 59.3% of staff in this ring fence are female, this is in line with the overall staff group.

Front line workers– 61.9% of staff in this ring fence are female, this is in line with the overall staff group.

Admin and data lead – both staff in this ring fence are female, this is an overrepresentation.

Administrator – 6 out of the 7 staff in this ring fence are female, this is an overrepresentation.

11. By how much do these staff change the % (percentage) of female/male staff in the whole structure? Show start and end %.

The percentage change will depend on which staff are appointed to posts. Based on the proposed ring fence arrangements, the percentage of males in the proposed new structure could be anywhere between 18.4% and 47.3%.

12. Can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.?

Affected staff will be considered for any suitable alternative opportunities within CYPs during the consultation period. The formal redeployment period runs concurrently with an employee's notice period, during which the Council is committed to trying to redeploy staff facing redundancy into suitable alternative posts, however in the current financial situation, opportunities are likely to be limited.

Age

13. Provide a breakdown of the current organisation by Grade Group and Age breakdown following the format below

	16-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+		TOTAL
Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	No. Staff	% of Grade Group	STAFF
MANUAL	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	
Sc1-5	12	42.9%	6	21.4%	3	10.7%	5	17.9%	2	7.1%	0	0.0%	
Sc6 - SO2	2	3.8%	21	39.6%	12	22.6%	15	28.3%	3	5.7%	0	0.0%	
PO1-3	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	2	18.2%	4	36.4%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	
PO4-7	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
PO8+	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	
TOTAL	14	13.3%	32	30.5%	17	16.2%	33	31.4%	9	8.6%	0	0.0%	1
Council Profile	3%		18%		25%		35%		18%		1%		
Borough Profile	14%		27%		23%		16%		10%		1%		

14. Highlight any grade groups with a high level of staff from a particular age group compared to the council profile.

The affected staff group has a younger age profile than the council overall. 43.8% of staff affected are under 35 compared to 21% across the council.

15. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on staff from one age group only?

- If No, go to question 18.

Staff remaining in post or being assimilated – 4 of the 6 staff in this category are in the age group 25-34, this is an overrepresentation.

Staff displaced due to no position in new structure – There is an overrepresentation of younger staff in this category – 71.4% of staff with no suitable position in the new structure are under 35 compared to 43.8% of the staff group overall.

Team Leaders – three staff are aged 45-54; one is aged 25-34, this is an overrepresentation for the 45-54 age group.

Young People's Involvement Officer x 1; Quality Assurance Officers x 2 – all staff in this ring fence are aged between 25 and 54. 41% are aged 25-34, 28% are aged 35-44, staff in these age groups are overrepresented. 31% are aged 45-54.

Front line workers – All age groups represented in the overall staff group are in this ring fence. 31% of staff in this ring fence are aged 35-44 compared to 16% of the overall staff group.

Admin and data lead – both staff in this ring fence are aged 35-44 and this age group is therefore over represented.

Administrator – there is an overrepresentation of younger staff in this ring fence – 6 out of the 7 are under 35.

16. Does the displacement of these staff result in no representation of staff from a particular age group within the structure as a whole?

There is already no representation of staff aged 65+. Depending on the outcome of the recruitment exercise, it is possible that there will be no representation from staff aged 16-24 or 55-64. It is very unlikely that any of the other age bands will not be represented.

17. If Yes, can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.?

Affected staff will be considered for any suitable alternative opportunities within CYPS during the consultation period. The formal redeployment period runs concurrently with an employee's notice period, during which the Council is committed to trying to redeploy staff facing redundancy into suitable alternative posts, however in the current financial situation, opportunities are likely to be limited.

Disability

18. Identify the total number of disabled staff in the service following the format below:

Grade Group	TOTAL STAFF	No. declared disabled Staff	No. staff declared not disabled	No. staff disability not stated	% of Service declared disabled	Council profile
MANUAL	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.8%
Sc1-5	28	3	12	13	10.7%	6.9%
Sc6 - SO2	53	6	17	30	11.3%	6.8%
PO1-3	11	1	2	8	9.1%	2.6%
PO4-7	11	2	3	6	18.2%	6.9%
PO8+	2	0	1	1	0.0%	9.5%
TOTAL	105	12	35	58	11.4%	7.2%
Borough Profile						7.6%

There is an overrepresentation of staff with a disability in the affected group. 12 staff have a disability, this constitutes 11.4% of the group, compared to 7.2% in the council overall.

19. Do any ring fences disproportionately impact on disabled staff?

Staff remaining in post or being assimilated – none of these staff have declared a disability

Staff displaced due to no position in new structure – one staff member in this category is disabled, this is not disproportionately high.

Team Leaders – 1 of the 4 staff is disabled, this is an overrepresentation.

Young People's Involvement Officer x 1; Quality Assurance Officers x 2 – 2 of the 32 staff in this ring fence are disabled, this is not disproportionately high.

Front line workers – 4 of the 42 staff are disabled, this is a slight overrepresentation.

Admin and data lead – 1 of the 2 staff is disabled, this is an overrepresentation.

Administrator - 2 of the 7 staff are disabled, this is an overrepresentation.

20. Can any of these staff be accommodated elsewhere within the proposed new structure or can you amend the structure to

accommodate them e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc.?

Affected staff will be considered for any suitable alternative opportunities within CYPS during the consultation period. The formal redeployment period runs concurrently with an employee's notice period, during which the Council is committed to trying to redeploy staff facing redundancy into suitable alternative posts, however in the current financial situation, opportunities are likely to be limited.

21. In addition to the above analysis of race, sex, age and disability you will need to consider the impact on groups with the following characteristics: gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, sexual orientation. Please ask HR for help with the data on:

- Gender Reassignment
- Religion/ Belief
- Sexual Orientation
- Maternity & Pregnancy

Three of the affected staff are on maternity leave. One is in the ring fence for the front line worker positions and the other is in the ring fence for the administrator positions.

In line with Haringey Council's Restructure Policy, employees who have already commenced a period of statutory maternity or family leave and who have received their letter of dismissal due to redundancy will be offered suitable alternative employment¹ in preference to any other employee who is similarly affected by redundancy.

The relevant data on gender reassignment, religion/belief, and sexual orientation is not available.

22. If you provide services to residents please also identify the potential impact/ issues relating to the change in service delivery as a result of your proposals.

These issues will be addressed in the 'service delivery' EqIA.

Date Part 1 completed - 12/04/2011

¹ Suitable alternative employment means the work to be done is suitable in relation to the employee and appropriate for her to do in the circumstances, and the provisions of the contract as to the capacity and place in which she is to be employed and the other terms and conditions are not substantially less favourable than they would have been if the employee had continued to be employed under the previous contract. *Haringey Council Restructure Policy*

PART 2
**TO BE COMPLETED AT THE END OF CONSULTATION WITH STAFF/
UNIONS ON THE STRUCTURE**

Step 3 – Consultation

Formal consultation with staff and unions on the restructuring of Youth, Connexions and Participation Services commenced on 11th February 2011 and was completed on 20th April 2011. A number of issues were raised and are detailed alongside the management response in Appendix 5 of the report to the General Purposes Committee meeting of 4th May 2011.

Step 4 – Address the Impact

1. Are you in a position to make changes to the proposals to reduce the impact on the protected groups e.g. consideration of flexible working or reduced hours including flexible retirement, voluntary reduction of grades, etc. – please specify?

All requests for flexible working are considered on a case by case basis.

2. What changes or benefits for staff have been proposed as a result of your consultation?

As a result of the consultation, the following changes have been made to the proposed structure:

- The Youth Support Services Manager post has been removed from the proposed structure and instead there will be an additional Team Leader post at PO4. This is in response to comments that the proposed structure was too ‘top-heavy’ and that the team leaders would be required to manage and supervise too many staff.
- Three Senior Practitioner posts at PO2 have been created, one of which will have responsibility for completing S139a assessments for young people with learning difficulties and disabilities (this is a statutory duty). All staff ring fenced to the QA and Young People’s Involvement posts will be eligible to apply for these roles.
- The Site Manager post has been retained.
- The remit of the Quality Assurance officers has been extended to include responsibility for building links with voluntary and community organisations that work with young people. The job

title for these posts is now Community Development and Quality Assurance Officer.

- Some changes have been made to the line management arrangements – please see the structure chart at Appendix 5 of the report to the General Purposes Committee meeting of 4th May 2011.
- The Front Line Worker role is now termed Young People's Practitioner. There are now 8.5 FTE posts rather than 15. This is partially due to the creation of the Senior Practitioner posts, but also results from further consideration of the overall service budget, including premises, activity and other running costs.
- The 8.5 FTE Young People's Practitioners will include a minimum of 3 full-time staff with experience of delivering IAG and 3 full-time staff with experience of delivering positive activities for young people in either a targeted or universal setting. The remaining 2.5 FTE will consist of a mix of part-time and full-time staff with a range of relevant skills and experience.
- The new proposed structure contains a greater proportion of full-time to part-time posts. Taking the Team Leader and Front Line Worker roles, there were previously 9 full-time and 22 part-time positions (=17 FTE). There are now 12 full-time roles and 2.5 FTE roles which can be allocated to a mix of part-time and full-time staff (making 14.5 FTE).

Overall the proposed new structure consists of 25.5 FTE posts, compared to 28 in the initial proposal, so more staff will be displaced. The changes to the proposed structure do not significantly affect the ring fence arrangements – that is, staff are essentially in the same ring fences for slightly fewer posts. With the introduction of the Senior Practitioner roles, there are now more posts at PO2 and fewer at PO1. However, as most of the staff ringfenced for the PO1 positions are also ringfenced for the PO2 positions, the equalities impacts of the proposal discussed in part one of this assessment are likely to remain unchanged.

3. If you are not able to make changes – why not and what actions can you take?

N/A

4. Do the ringfence and selection methods you have chosen to implement your restructure follow council policy and guidance?

Yes

5. Will the changes result in a positive/ negative impact for service delivery/ community groups – please explain how?

Please see service delivery EqIA.

6. How can you mitigate any negative impact for service users?

Please see service delivery EqIA.

Date Steps 3 & 4 completed – 21/04/11

Step 5 – Implementation and Review

- 1. Following the selection processes and appointment to your new structure are there any adverse impacts on any of the protected groups (the eight equalities characteristics). Please identify these.**

To be completed following completion of recruitment process.

- 2. If there are adverse impacts how will you aim to address these in the future?**

It is proposed that affected staff will be considered for any suitable alternative opportunities within CYPS during the consultation period. The formal redeployment period runs concurrently with an employee's notice period, during which the Council is committed to trying to redeploy staff facing redundancy into suitable alternative posts, however in the current financial situation, opportunities are likely to be limited.

- 3. Identify actions and timescales for implementation and go live of your new service offer.**

It is intended that the interviews of existing staff will be completed by June 2011, however the new structure may not be fully implemented until September 2011.

- 4. If you are not in a position to go ahead on elements of your action plan – why not and what actions are you going to take?**

To be completed following General Purposes Committee decision on the proposal.

- 5. Identify the timescale and actions for review of the restructure to ensure it achieved the expected benefits/ outcomes.**

The Head of Youth, Participation & Community will ensure that processes for monitoring the work of the service and evaluating impact are in place. A review will be undertaken after the first 18 months of operation.

Step 6 – Sign off and publication

There is a legal duty to publish the results of impact assessments. The reason is not simply to comply with the law but to make the whole process and its outcome transparent and have a wider community ownership. You should summarise the results of the assessment and intended actions and publish them.

COMPLETED BY (Contact Officer Responsible for undertaking this EqlA)

NAME: Jan Doust

DESIGNATION: Deputy Director, Early Intervention & Prevention

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

QUALITY CHECKED BY (Equalities,)

NAME: Helena Pugh

DESIGNATION: Policy, Equalities & Partnerships Manager

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

SIGNED OFF BY Director/ Assistant Director

NAME:

DESIGNATION:

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

SIGNED OFF BY Chair Directorate Equalities Forum

NAME: Ian Bailey

DESIGNATION: Deputy Director, Business Support & Development

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

Note - Send an electronic copy of the EqlA to equalities@haringey.gov.uk; it will then be published on the council website