

Title of EIA – Policy Proposal		Organisational Design – Senior Management capacity
EIA Author	Name	Susanna Chilton
	Position	Director of People
	Date of completion	20 th November 2024 UPDATED 03.02.25
Director	Name	Susanna Chilton
	Position	Director of People
Cabinet Member	Name	Cllr Richard Brown
	Portfolio	Resources

PLEASE REFER TO [EIA GUIDANCE](#) FOR ADVICE ON COMPLETING THIS FORM

SECTION 1 – Context & Background

1.1 In summary, what is the background to this proposal?

Work is being undertaken to introduce clear organisational design principles for the organisational structure so there is a logic and purpose. Starting with the introduction of standardised job titles, reviewing job descriptions as a consequence so these too are assimilated into an agreed format with common roles/similarities challenged, this will impact on the wider hierarchical structure.

Specific Elements of the project are;

Engagement

- Co-design and inclusion
- Challenging status quo

Organisational Design

- Spans and Layers
- Grade rules
- Levels of authority
- Cost

Consistency and optimisation

- Job title consistency
- Optimisation of job descriptions
- Process mapping, including technological input.

Workforce planning

- Performance and Reward
- Team dynamic/succession planning
- Merging complementary teams
- Making structural adjustment/changes

This review will also consider where services are co-located to maximise the best outcomes and resident experience and combined with the need to generate savings will mean a reduction in senior manager roles.

BUDGET SETTING 2025-26 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

SECTION 2 – Consideration of Impact

Refer to guidance note for more detailed advice on completing this section.

In order to ensure that we do not discriminate in the way our activities are designed, developed and delivered, we must look at our duty to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conflict that is prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
- Advance equality of opportunity between two persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not

2.1 Baseline data and information

The employee data for the senior manager (including directors) below, shows that the male/female split is even, which is unusual for the council is female dominated.

In line with the wider authority most employees are aged 45 plus, but this also reflects Coventry's long service, average is 14 years.

Finally, 14% are from the global majority, this needs to be considered in the process, not end up being disproportionate in terms of a negative outcome, it is a priority area to increase the numbers of global majority employees in senior roles.

D&I Analysis Senior Managers (D1, D2, AD1, AD2, SM1, SM2, SM3)

Age Band	% Emps	Disability	% Emps	Ethnicity	% Emps	Legal Sex	% Emps	Religion	% Emps	Sexual Orientation	% Emps
16-24	0.00%	No	83.47%	Minority Ethnic	14.05%	Female	49.59%	Any other	0.83%	LGBT+	1.65%
25-34	3.31%	Prefer not to say	2.48%	Prefer not to say	0.83%	Male	50.41%	Buddhist	0.83%	Prefer no to say	6.61%
35-44	27.27%	Unknown	9.09%	Unknown	8.26%			Christian (all denominations)	43.80%	Straight/Heterosexual	76.86%
45-54	38.02%	Yes	4.96%	White	76.86%			Hindu	0.83%	Unknown	14.88%
55-64	28.93%							Jewish	0.83%		
65+	2.48%							Muslim	0.83%		
								No Religion	25.62%		
								Prefer no to say	8.26%		
								Sikh	3.31%		
								Unknown	14.88%		

Line management responsibilities and senior management posts.

As of 25 November 2024, there are 116* senior management posts (headcount) (Grades SM and above and excluding casual posts) with a total cost x.

The table below shows the historical trend (at 3 points in time) of the number of senior manager roles within the organisation.

	Oct-14	Oct-17	Aug-24
Senior Manager FTE (grades SM upwards)	77.4	59.8	111.7
Non Senior FTE	4,475.0	3,707.1	4,060.2
Proportion of Senior Mgt Grades to Non Senior Mgt	1.7%	1.6%	2.8%

BUDGET SETTING 2025-26 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

The breakdown by senior management

Senior Management Breakdown

CX1	1.0	1.0	1.0
D1	3.0	2.0	1.0
D2	0.0	3.0	8.6
AD1	2.0	1.0	2.0
AD2	14.0	9.0	13.0
SM1	12.0	9.0	22.5
SM2	35.4	26.0	49.8
SM3	10.0	8.8	13.8
Total	77.4	59.8	111.7

The table above shows that the biggest increase has been in the number of SM1 and SM2 Posts.

2.2 On the basis of evidence, complete the table below to show what the potential impact is for each of the protected groups of residents/service users

- Positive impact (P),
- Negative impact (N)
- Both positive and negative impacts (PN)
- No impact (NI)
- Unknown impact (UI)

Protected Characteristic	Impact type P, N, PN, NI, UI	Nature of impact and any mitigations required
Age 0-18		
Age 19-64		
Age 65+		
Disability		
Gender reassignment		
Pregnancy and maternity		
Race (Including: colour, nationality, citizenship ethnic or national origins)		
Religion and belief		
Sex		
Sexual orientation		

**BUDGET SETTING 2025-26
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

Care-Experienced		
------------------	--	--

**2.3 Will there be any potential impacts in relation to health and/or digital inequalities?
Please think about issues such as socio-economic groups, areas of deprivation etc**

<p>Health Inequalities Ensure a healthy living standard for all. This reorganisation is about ensuring there is a sustainable structure going forward, therefore enabling Coventry to continue being a good employer - still one of the largest in the city, plus approximately 70% of the council employees live in the city. The new sustainable structure that this will enable the council to continue to provide high-quality services to our residents that are value for money aligned to the council's strategic priorities</p> <p>Digital Inclusion yes - as the city council is their employer provides access to digital equipment and systems</p>

3.0 Will there be any potential impacts on Council staff from protected groups? If yes complete the table below:

Protected Characteristic	Number of Employees impacted	Impact type P, N, PN, NI, UI	Nature of impact and any mitigations required
Age 16 -18			
Age 19-64		PN	<p>Both positive and negative impacts - The positive impact could be a positive for those who view the restructure as an opportunity to work in a different way/area/exit but the negative could be loss of organisational knowledge/skills. Potential to decrease the average age of the workforce. Consideration will need to be given for the organisational skill mix going forward, plan for knowledge handover, support for those moving or changing roles to give the greatest chance of success, enabling exit with grace.</p> <p>Mitigation: Support to those potentially and then subsequently actually impacted by the organisational design process. Consideration to anti-discrimination during the design so no unintended consequences and during the subsequent change process. Reasonable adjustment where appropriate, decisions made with inclusivity in mind. Dignity at all times in the process.</p>

BUDGET SETTING 2025-26
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

Age 65+		PN	<p>Both positive and negative impacts - There are small numbers in this category, so consideration needs to be given to ensuring there is not a disproportional impact, reasonable adjustments are provided during a process and in a new role/function. Effective use of occupational health, personal adjustment passport should be used as appropriate. Employees with a disability are under reported within the council and this needs to be considered within the restructure process, many employees have not declared this data.</p> <p>Mitigation: Support to those potentially and then subsequently actually impacted by the organisational design process. Consideration to anti-discrimination during the design so no unintended consequences and during the subsequent change process. Reasonable adjustment where appropriate, decisions made with inclusivity in mind. Dignity at all times in the process.</p>
Disability		PN	<p>Both positive and negative impacts - There are small numbers in this category, so consideration needs to be given to ensuring there is not a disproportional impact, reasonable adjustments are provided during an process and in a new role/function. Effective use of occupational health, personal adjustment passport should be used as appropriate. Employees with a disability are under reported within the council and this needs to be considered within the restructure process, many employees have not declared this data</p> <p>Mitigation: Support to those potentially and then subsequently actually impacted by the organisational design process. Consideration to anti-discrimination during the design so no unintended consequences and during the subsequent change process. Reasonable adjustment where appropriate, decisions made with inclusivity in mind. Dignity at all times in the process.</p>
Gender reassignment		NI	No impact - N/A
Pregnancy and maternity		NI	No impact - Under employment law, any pregnant employee or on maternity leave are protected within the process of change.
Race (Including: colour, nationality, citizenship ethnic or national origins)		PN	Both positive and negative impacts - The lack of diversity of the organisation at senior levels is an area of concern, so the issue of disproportional impact on this group needs to be considered, it may also be an opportunity to increase numbers. The change

**BUDGET SETTING 2025-26
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

			<p>process must consider this aspect and ensure application is anti-discriminatory.</p> <p>Mitigation: Support to those potentially and then subsequently actually impacted by the organisational design process. Consideration to anti-discrimination during the design so no unintended consequences and during the subsequent change process. Reasonable adjustment where appropriate, decisions made with inclusivity in mind. Dignity at all times in the process.</p>
Religion and belief		NI	<p>No impact - Again the issue of disproportional impact on this group needs to be considered, the change process must consider this aspect and ensure application is anti-discriminatory.</p>
Sex		PN	<p>Both positive and negative impacts - The balance of male/female is even, important the process/consideration is gender neutral as research shows that men - white men are significantly overrepresented at a senior level.</p> <p>Mitigation: Support to those potentially and then subsequently actually impacted by the organisational design process. Consideration to anti-discrimination during the design so no unintended consequences and during the subsequent change process. Reasonable adjustment where appropriate, decisions made with inclusivity in mind. Dignity at all times in the process.</p>
Sexual orientation		PN	<p>Both positive and negative impacts - Again the issue of disproportional impact on this group needs to be considered, the change process must consider this aspect and ensure application is anti-discriminatory.</p> <p>Mitigation: Support to those potentially and then subsequently actually impacted by the organisational design process. Consideration to anti-discrimination during the design so no unintended consequences and during the subsequent change process. Reasonable adjustment where appropriate, decisions made with inclusivity in mind. Dignity at all times in the process.</p>

BUDGET SETTING 2025-26 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

4.0 How could you monitor and evaluate the effect of this proposal?

The EIA will need to be continually reviewed during the course of the process for accuracy, relevancy and to reflect any changed or new risks

5.0	Action Planning	
Issue Identified	Planned Actions	Timeframe

6.0 Completion Statement

The potential equality impact of this proposal is as follows:

- No impact has been identified for one or more protected groups
- Positive impact has been identified for one or more protected groups
- Negative impact has been identified for one or more protected groups
- Both positive and negative impact has been identified for one or more protected groups**
- The potential impact of this proposal on protected groups is not yet known

7.0 Approval

Name of Director: Susanna Chilton	Date: 21/11/2024 – reviewed 3/2/25
Name of Lead Elected Member: Richard Brown	Date sent to Councillor: 02.12.24 / 10.02.25