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

B. Reason for Equality Impact Asessment (delete as applicable):

- 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 if the following apply to the policy/practice, if it:

- 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?

   All of the above

E. Equality Groups
To which equality groups is the policy/practice relevant and why?
Potentially staff from these highlighted groups may be directly affected • Gender • Race • Disability • Age
Add notes against the following statements where applicable/relevant:
• **On any available information about the needs of relevant equality groups:** UEL staff ethnic demographics is diverse with 39% of staff from a BAME background and 54% identifying as White. Gender distribution is split as 54% female and 46% male. 5% of staff have shared information on their disability and 52% of our staff population fall within the 30-49 age bracket and 33% at 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. There are a large proportion of unknowns for religion/belief, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy & maternity, and marriage & civil partnership and so these data have been excluded. Also, they do not offer much relevance to the assessment of this process.
 	
The following is a summary:
Across UEL (Schools and Services affected) comparing the percentage of those in scope with the entire staff population for context:
    o Although the number of women in scope is slightly higher than that of men, men are slightly more affected over all (49% of those in scope in comparison to 46% of the staff population (see Table 1).
    o When broken down to Academic/PSS split, more women in Academics are affected than men, that is, 31% of the female academic population compared to 29% of the male academic population. However, more men in PSS are affected than women, that is, 30% of

the male professional staff compared with 21% of the female professional staff are in scope (see Table 2).

o When looking at Schools specifically, female staff at ACE are more affected as 54% of their female population are in scope compared with 30% of its male population whereas male staff are more affected in Business and Law, where 45% of their male staff population are in scope compared with 35% of their female staff population (see Table 3).

o By ethnicity, the difference between those in scope and the staff population is wholly consistent (see Table 4). However, when ethnicity is further broken down, staff that identify as Asians are most affected, as 34% of their population are in scope compared with 26% for Blacks and 28% for Whites, despite the higher number of Whites in scope (see Table 5).

o When ethnicity is broken down into Academics and PSS, White academic staff are adversely more affected than BAME identifying staff, 34% of the White staff population are in scope compared to 24% of the BAME identifying staff (see Table 6). On the other hand, BAME identifying staff are more affected than White staff in PSS roles. 30% of the staff population identifying as BAME are affected compared with 23% of White staff population in PSS (see Table 6).

o Breaking down ethnicity by Schools, there is consistent spread factoring in the proportion of staff in scope with the staff population for each ethnic group. However, in Psychology, BAME identifying staff are more affected than White staff, 31% of the BAME identifying staff population at the school are in scope, compared with 25% for White staff. Especially when considering the BAME identifying staff in Psychology only make up 22% of the school's staff population (see Table 7).

o By age group, staff that fall within the 18-29 bracket are most affected. They make up only 16% of the staff population, yet 28% of them are in scope, compared with 28% of the 30-49 bracket that make up 52% of the population and 12% of the 50+ group that make up 33% of the staff population (see Table 8).

o By disability, staff that shared information about their disability are most affected. Although only 3% of those in scope shared information on their disability, that number makes up 19% of the population of staff that shared information on their disability compared with 32% that did not but make up 82% of the staff population (see Table 9).

Table 1: Gender	Female	Male

	Female		Male	
	n	%	n	%
In Scope	229	51%	221	49%
Population	901	54%	760	46%
For Demographic	25%		29%	

Table 2: Gender by Role		Female		Male	
		n	%	n	%
Academics	In Scope	114	54%	99	46%
	Population	365	51%	347	49%
	For Demographic	31%		29%	
PSS	In Scope	115	49%	122	51%
	Population	536	56%	413	44%
	For Demographic	21%		30%	

Table 3: Gender by School		Female		Male	
		n	%	n	%
CASS	In Scope	20	67%	10	33%
	Population	87	66%	45	34%
	For Demographic	23%		22%	
ACE	In Scope	32	51%	31	49%
	Population	59	37%	102	63%

		BAME		White	
	For Demographic	**54%**		**30%**	
ACI	In Scope	6	46%	7	54%
	Population	54	52%	49	48%
	For Demographic	**11%**		**14%**	
B&L	In Scope	14	42%	19	58%
	Population	40	49%	42	51%
	For Demographic	**35%**		**45%**	
HSB	In Scope	21	54%	18	46%
	Population	62	51%	59	49%
	For Demographic	**34%**		**31%**	
Psychology	In Scope	21	60%	14	40%
	Population	82	63%	48	37%
	For Demographic	**26%**		**29%**	

Table 4: Ethnicity	BAME		White		Not Known	
	n	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
In Scope	179	40%	257	57%	14	3%
Population	645	39%	903	54%	113	7%
For Demographic	**28%**		**28%**		**12%**	

Table 5: Ethnicity Breakdown	Asian		Black		White	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
In Scope	93	22%	67	16%	257	62%
Population	276	17%	262	16%	903	54%
For Demographic	34%		26%		28%	

Table 6: Ethnicity by Role		BAME		White		Not Known	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Academics	In Scope	51	24%	155	73%	7	3%
	Population	217	34%	456	50%	39	35%
	For Demographic	24%		34%		18%	
PSS	In Scope	128	54%	102	43%	7	3%
	Population	428	66%	447	50%	74	65%
	For Demographic	30%		23%		9%	

Table 7: Ethnicity by School		BAME		White		Not Known	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
CASS	In Scope	7	23%	23	77%		
	Population	34	26%	95	72%	3	2%
	For Demographic	21%		24%		0%	
ACE	In Scope	11	17%	49	78%	3	5%
	Population	63	39%	89	55%	9	6%
	For Demographic	17%		55%		33%	
ACI	In Scope	0	0%	13	100%	0	0%
	Population	22	21%	78	76%	3	3%
	For Demographic	0%		17%		0%	
B&L	In Scope	17	52%	16	48%	0	0%
	Population	40	49%	35	43%	7	9%
	For Demographic	43%		46%		0%	
HSB	In Scope	7	18%	30	77%	2	5%
	Population	41	34%	69	57%	11	9%
	For Demographic	17%		43%		18%	
Psychology	In Scope	9	26%	24	69%	2	6%
	Population	29	22%	96	74%	5	4%
	For Demographic	31%		25%		40%	

Table 8: Age	18-29		30-49		50+	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
In Scope	53	12%	215	48%	182	40%
Population	263	16%	857	52%	541	33%
For Demographic	28%		28%		12%	

Table 9: Disability	Yes		No		Not Known	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
In Scope	15	3%	420	93%	15	3%
Population	78	5%	1362	82%	221	13%
For Demographic	19%		31%		7%	

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

  - The restructure should not lead to direct discrimination as the make-up of those affected is diverse and consistent with overall demographics. There is no risk of indirect discrimination either. 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 (80%) who are all affected.

- **If the policy/practice contributes to advancing equality of opportunity[1]**
  - 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 disproportionally.

- **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 supports 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) will hold virtual briefing sessions to communicate the rationale and reasoning for the proposed restructures. A formal period of consultation will take 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?**
  - A formal consultation process will take place with the affected staff and trade union representatives.

---

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

- 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 18-29 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 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 the restructuring process before implementation.

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)):	Samson Olagbami – Institute 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:	27th June 2020

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