

Disability Equality Impact Assessment Questionnaire

Policy/Service/Change being assessed: 2012/2015 Budget Proposal : Proposed implementation of an additional 3 days unpaid leave for 2012/13 through to 2015.	Department: Resources
Person Responsible for Assessment: Joanne Machers – Head of Human Resources Person responsible for strategy where different from above:	Date of assessment: January 2012

Brief description of service and to whom provided/available:

It is proposed to consult with the trade unions and seek agreement on an additional 3 days unpaid leave for 2012/13 and the subsequent three years. The unpaid leave would be for all non schools staff. Pay deductions for this would be recouped over a twelve month basis to reduce the impact on individual employees. Savings levels have been estimated based on the basis of reaching agreement across the board and 70% saving on payroll costs to allow for essential cover. If an agreement cannot be reached an estimate based on potential voluntary take up giving a 30% saving has been given as follows,

- 70% workforce - £294k
- 30% workforce - £125k

The lowest estimated level (30%) of the possible take up has been included in the proposal for budgeting purposes and this proposal could be progressed for future years.

This proposal would only impact on the local community in terms of income for those non schools Council workforce who live and work in Darlington.

Introduction

This template should be used with the Disability Equality Scheme 2006-2009. Completing this template without following the rest of the disability equality impact assessment process outlined in the Scheme does not comprise a disability equality impact assessment.

If, after reading the guidance, you require further information on how to implement the assessment, please contact Peter Roberts, Social Enterprise Development Manager on 01325 388713

Q.1 Is your service/policy/change accessible to all disabled people? Bear in mind any economic, social, environmental, physical, intellectual, cultural, linguistic, technological or other barriers.

Issue	Yes	No	If yes, what evidence do you have to demonstrate this?	If no, what do you plan to do to remove barriers to access?
Physical or mobility impairment	√		Please see attached Equality Analysis for the Proposals to Change Terms and Conditions: 3 year Pay Freeze and 3 Days Additional Leave	
Sensory impairment	√			
Learning disability or mental impairment	√			
Other disabilities and health conditions covered by the Equality Act 2010 (eg. diabetes, HIV, multiple sclerosis, depression and cancer)	√			
Any other disability issue (e.g. frail/vulnerable people, people with mild impairments who do not perceive themselves as disabled, people with multiple impairment)	√			

Q.2 (a) For whatever reason, does your service treat any group of disabled people differently from its other service users?

Yes
No

√

If you have answered 'yes', please specify those individuals or groups affected and whether the impact has the potential to be adverse.

Not Applicable.

All employees would be treated on same basis if the proposal is agreed.

b) What needs to be done to prevent any potentially adverse impact?

Not applicable.

Q.3 (a) Do you promote disability equality within your service? (e.g. through departmental equalities group, innovative marketing or community engagement techniques)

Yes

√

No

If you have answered 'yes', please give examples of how equality is promoted.

In addition to the Council commitment to promote equality of opportunity in all services and policies, the following is specific to the promotion of Council Tax;

- Consultation events have taken place as part of the MTFP budget consultation events in both 2010 and 2011, these include;
 - Public consultation events specifically targeted for disabled, young people and older people
 - Town Crier publications
 - Online forums
 - Talking Together Events
 - Staffing road shows and internal communications to employees
 - Attendance at local community groups and action groups (i.e. DAD)
- Welfare Rights Service, Citizens Advice and other Advice organisations are aware of income benefits and associated discounts available

(b) Do you promote positive attitudes towards disabled people? (e.g. through customer care training, cultural issues awareness training, the use of images of disabled people in your publicity material)

Yes

√

No

If you have answered 'yes', please give examples.

The Council as a whole promotes a positive attitude to disabled people in the recruitment, employment and providing services to disabled members of the community.

Employees are made aware of disability issues including access to services, buildings and information. The Council is committed to ensuring that information is in an easy read format and accessible in various methods and in multiple locations

Q.4 Are there any plans in place within your Service to promote disability equality more effectively?

Yes

√

No

If yes, please outline what you intend to do (including details, if known, of timescales and areas to be covered, etc.)

Equality Analysis for the Proposals to Change Terms and Conditions: Pay Freeze and 3 Days Additional Leave

December 2011

The Council has commenced a 90 day consultation period from 15th November 2011 to make changes to 2 terms and conditions which impact on a significant proportion of the Council's workforce;

Three Year Pay Freeze

This proposal introduces a three year pay freeze for the financial years 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15 across all Council Staff including those based in Community Schools (other than those employed on Statutory Terms and Conditions). This proposal follows a 2 year pay freeze for the financial years 2009/10 and 2010/11 which was negotiated on a National basis for all National Joint Council Green Book employees. A similar pay freeze was also adopted for Chief Officers for the financial years 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/2012. It is anticipated that the three additional years pay freeze will achieve £2,350,000 savings.

Three Days Additional Unpaid Leave

It is proposed to apply a mandatory 3 days unpaid leave on top of the current 31 days (pro-rata for part time) annual leave entitlement for all employees (excluding employees covered by statutory terms and conditions). This proposal will apply to the financial years 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15. Taking into account that some posts must be 'covered' during employee absence it is anticipated that the savings achieved would be in the region of £294,000. The wider implications and issues associated with the implementation of this proposal (should it be approved) are currently being explored.

Statistical Analysis

The following information offers an employee impact summary based on those employees who will be impacted by the proposed changes to terms and conditions identified above. A separate exercise has been conducted to assess the overall impact of other budget proposals that have and staffing impact as well as those that will have a community based impact.

The level of impact has been set against the key protected characteristics as identified in the Equality Act 2010 as well as the local key priorities to ensure that the Council meets its duty in terms of advancing equality of opportunity, eliminating discrimination and fostering good relationships with the community and its employees.

Of the 9 protected characteristics identified in the Equality Duty, the Council monitors and collates information on Age, Race, Sex, Disability, Pregnancy and Martial Status.

The Council does not record or monitor employee information relating to Gender Reassignment, Religion / Belief or Sexual Orientation. As part of any equality analysis the Council monitors and records impacts on unemployed/low income, carers, young people leaving care, refugees and asylum seekers, gypsies and travellers and people with criminal convictions and geographical location. There is limited assessment that can be undertaken from employee data relating to local priorities due to the lack of data collection.

The following employee statistics provide a point in time analysis as at 2nd October 2011 and should be read as part of the Council having "due regard" to the financial decisions it will make that impact on employees who meet the protected characteristic groups.

Gender Profile of Workforce as at October 2011	Total	Male	Female
Council based employees	2740	1015	1725
Employees based in Community Schools	717	88	629
Grand Total	3457	1103 (31.9%)	2354 (68.1%)

Ethnicity

A 92% majority of the employees / posts identified have an ethnic background of White British, with 4% undeclared. The remaining ethnic groups all had 0% counting 27 or less.

The total the number of Council employees reported to be from a minority ethnic community for the reporting year 2009/2010 was 1.58% (75 employees). This includes employees based in schools, including Teachers who have statutory terms and conditions. The Council does not have the scope to apply or negotiate local terms for those employees covered by Statutory Terms and Conditions. Therefore, the figures below indicated for Community Schools includes only those employees who will be covered by the proposals.

The following table shows the spread of BAME employees; there are a total of 112 (making up a total of 3% of the workforce). 96 employees are based in the Council, and a further 16 employees are based in Community Schools.

Ethnicity profile of Workforce as at October 2011	Male	Female	Council Total	Male	Female	Community School Total	Grand Total
	Asian or Asian British		3	3		3	3
Bangladeshi							
Asian or Asian British Indian	2	8	10		1	1	11
Asian or Asian Other	4	3	7				7
Asian or Asian Pakistani		2	2				2
Black or Black British African	2	4	6				6
Black or Black British Caribbean	2	1	3				3
Chinese or other ethnic group Chinese		8	8				8
Chinese or other ethnic group Other	1	1	2				2
Mixed Other		2	2				2
Mixed White and Asian	1	4	5	1	1	2	7
Mixed White and Black African		1	1				1
Mixed White and Black Caribbean	2	6	8				8
Undeclared	12	34	46	15	95	110	156
White British	976	1622	2598	70	521	591	3189
White English	1	2	3	1	2	3	6
White Irish	5	10	15		1	1	16
White Other	7	14	21	1	5	6	27
GRAND TOTAL	1015	1725	2740	88	629	717	3457

Disability

104 employees / posts declared themselves as having a disability and 3261 did not regard themselves as disabled with the remaining 91 not specifying / undeclared.

Disability profile of Workforce as at October 2011	Yes	No	Undeclared	Total
Council Staff	102	2615	22	2740
School Staff	2	646	69	717
Grand Total	104	3261	91	3457

The total number of employees declaring themselves as disabled in the reporting year 2009/2010 was 2.11% (103 employees). This includes employees based in schools, including Teachers who have statutory terms and conditions.

Maternity

51 females are classified as pregnant or on maternity leave as at October 2011. This figure will however be subject to change based on individual maternity leave arrangements.

Maternity profile of Workforce as at October 2011	Yes	Undeclared	Total
Council Employees : Total	45	2695	2740
Community Schools : Total	6	711	717
Grand Total	51	3406	3457

Service Group Split

The service group split of employees across the authority is as follows;

	Place	People	Resources	Community Schools	Total
Female	787	790	148	629	2354
Male	766	178	71	88	1103
Total	1553	968	219	717	3457

As can be seen above the highest concentration of females employees are within Services for People and Services for Place Groups. The highest ratio between males and females by service group is within Community Schools.

The general workforce profile for the Council is a 40% male and 60% female split. This has been a relatively static split for a number of years and represents the community gender split. These statistics may change when the Council makes a decision on its direction of travel for the Place Group if services are provided by alternative providers. Similarly, with the progress made to partnership People Services with Hartlepool, a large proportion of social care roles are currently fulfilled by females, and a change of employer / service provider could potentially change the overall gender profile for the Council.

The profile of Community School Employees is approximately 10% male and 90% female split.

Age

The age range split indicates two thirds of employees falling within the age range of 31 to 60, with one third of those falling within the range 41 to 50. These statistics have been relatively static over a number of years.

Age profile of Workforce as at October 2011	16-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61+	Total
Council Employees : Total	528	574	833	638	167	2740
Male	201	185	313	255	61	1015
Female	327	389	520	383	106	1725
Community Schools : Total	83	151	279	153	51	717
Male	24	15	19	15	15	88
Female	59	136	260	138	36	629
Grand Total	611	725	1112	791	218	3457

Contracted Hours

Just over half of the employees / posts affected by the proposals to change terms and conditions, the pay freeze and 3 days additional leave are part time with 55%, covering a range of hours per week, 45% are working full time.

Working hours profile of Workforce as at October 2011	Part Time	Full Time
Council Employees : Total	1471	1269
Male	388	627
Female	1083	642
Community Schools : Total	445	272
Male	34	54
Female	411	218
Grand Total	1916	1541

There are 205 Term Time Only contracts in the Council and a further 583 employees with Term Time Only contracts based in the Community Schools. Term time only contracts make up 22% of the contracts affected by the proposals.

There is a specific issue associated with applying additional unpaid leave to term time only employees; largely associated with the fact that school based staff cannot normally take holidays during the school term. This implicates on mainly female lower paid employees working in areas such as school meals, school crossing patrol, supervisory assistants, classroom assistants and lower graded administrative roles within schools.

Profile of Term Time Only Workforce as at October 2011	Term Time Only
Council Employees : Total	205
Male	26
Female	179
Community Schools : Total	583
Male	42
Female	541
Grand Total	788

Length of Service

Most employees / posts affected have worked for Darlington Borough Council between 6 and 10 years (26%), with a further 48% employees working between 3 and 10 years

Linking length of service with age and sex, it is clear to see that women within the age band of 41 to 50 and 6 to 10 are the highest for both Council and Community Schools.

Please see detailed tables at Appendix 1 for further information relating to age, sex and length of service.

Length of service profile of Workforce as at October 2011	<1	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
Council Employees : Total	116	272	608	712	355	248	429
Male	30	105	225	249	113	98	195
Female	86	167	383	463	242	150	234
Community Schools : Total	48	105	171	193	119	43	38
Male	7	18	31	17	10	3	2
Female	41	87	140	176	109	40	36
Grand Total	164	377	779	905	474	291	467

A high proportion of long term employees are in the pension scheme with two thirds of the total number of employees contributing to the Local Government Pension Scheme being female.

Pension profile of Workforce as at October 2011	Male	Female	Total
Council Employees contributing to the LGPS	731	1143	1874
Community Schools Employees contributing to the LGPS	50	416	466
Grand Total	781	1559	2340

Historically female employees do not have as much service as male employees and therefore when accessing their pension they have a reduced number of years service. This is largely associated with part time working and career breaks for child care and / or other dependants.

From a workforce profile point of view the impact of three year pay freeze as well as a 3 day unpaid leave proposal may have severe detrimental impact on employees approaching their latter years of employment and approaching pensionable age. This is in addition to a potential increase in Council Tax for those employees who are residents of Darlington alongside the general economy of increased inflation and general costs of living. Unfortunately this may be the difference between employees wanting and or needing to work additional years in order to meet financial expectations.

Grade

The range of grades affected by the proposals are across the whole grade bands but in gender terms the Council has a higher concentration of female workers who are lower end of the NJC grade range, from Grades E to I.

In relation to the Council Employees grade and wage levels, there are a number of grades with a high concentration of employees; Grades G, I and K, have the highest number of employees falling within them (764 employees - 27% of workforce). These grades are also predominately occupied by females. Grade G equates to an hourly rate between £7.63 and £8.00, Grade I between £8.32 and £8.72 and Grade K between

£9.22 and £10.17; for comparability purposes the National Minimum Wage rate from October 2011 is £6.08 for over 21 year olds. The minimum wage that the Council would award to an employee would be Grade A which equates to £6.29 per hour.

In relation to Community Schools employees, Grades E and L, have the highest number of employees falling within them (342 employees - 47% of workforce). Again these are occupied predominately by female employees. Grade E equates to an hourly rate between £6.83 and £7.04 and Grade L between £10.17 and £11.15.

In terms of the impact on employees at the top of their grade for both the pay freeze and the 3 Days unpaid leave, there are a higher number of employees who have reached the top of their incremental progression point at the lower grade ranges than the higher. This is reflective of the shorter grade bands for the lower grades within the NJC pay model which is made up of 2 increments for Grades A to E, 3 increments Grades F to J, 4 increments Grade K to N and 5 increments Grades O to T. Other grades structures are included in the analysis including Chief Officers (JNC) Youth and Community, Soulbury, Bectu, Craft, Tutors, Coaches and other local pay groups. Those excluded are only those on Statutory Terms and Conditions (Teachers).

The following is a summary of employees covered by the proposals who are currently on top of the incremental progression within their allocated grade.

Top of the Grade – not including Schools			
As at 29th November 2011	Total	Female	Male
Number of Posts / Employees (excluding Teaching and Soulbury)	3560	2448	1112
Number of Posts / Person at top of grade	2555	1721	834
% of total number of posts	72%	48%	23%
Number of Posts / Person projected at top of grade on 1.4.12	2882	1958	924
% of total number of posts	81%	55%	26%

Again, there is a higher proportion of females who have already reached the top of their grade as at April 2011. When analysing the proposed impact as at April 2012, there is only a small percentage increase in employees reaching the top of their grade.

Grade profile of Workforce as at October 2011											
Grade	Male		Female		Council Total	Male		Female		Community School Total	Grand Total
	PT	FT	PT	FT		PT	FT	PT	FT		
Grade A	1				1						1
Grade B	4		3		7						7
Grade C	1	1	3	1	6			3		3	9
Grade D	2		1		3						3
Grade E	47	2	122	1	172	2		134		136	308
Grade F	38	2	111	1	152	15		44		59	211
Grade G	29	6	207	20	262	1	4	80	12	97	359
Grade H	51	22	76	37	186						186
Grade I	17	22	153	59	251	13	13	25	16	67	318
Grade J	14	64	57	27	162						162
Grade K	32	105	75	42	254		2	8	5	15	269
Grade L	5	16	37	53	111	3	17	79	107	206	317
Grade M	21	51	67	94	233		9	32	45	86	319
Grade N	5	56	33	110	204		7	3	29	39	243
Grade O	12	55	20	71	158		1	1	2	4	162

Grade P	2	29	4	34	69	1	2	3	72
Grade Q	4	32	2	37	75				75
Grade R		18	1	15	34				34
Grade S		8		10	18				18
Grade T		6		4	10				10
AD1		1	1	4	6				6
AD2		1		1	2				2
AD3		2		2	4				4
BECTU 1	9		23		32				32
BECTU 2	1		1		2				2
BECTU 3	13		8		21				21
CHECX				1	1				1
CHEXP		1			1				1
COA2	2	1	5		8				8
CR1	33		23		56				56
CR3	13		16		29				29
CR6	12		17		29				29
CR7	4		6		10				10
CRAFT1	4	41			45				45
CRAFT2	3	59			62				62
CRAFT3		9			9				9
DIR100		1			1				1
DIR2		2			2				2
FLA01						2		2	2
LSC006				1	1				1
LSC007		1			1				1
MISC50		1			1				1
NMW		2		7	9				9
SA117			1		1				1
SA118			2	1	3				3
SA120		1		1	2				2
SA123				2	2				2
SB110				2	2				2
SEP112				1	1				1
Y&CPROF1		1			1				1
Y&C									
SWLEV1	8		7		15				15
Y&C									
SWLEV1A			1		1				1
Y&C									
SWLEV2	1	3	1	2	7				7
Y&C									
SWLEV2C		4		1	5				5

GRAND TOTAL	388	626	1084	642	2740	34	54	411	218	717	3457
--------------------	------------	------------	-------------	------------	-------------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	------------	-------------

Postcode and Geographical Location Analysis

Employees working for the Council travel from a wide range of areas. Post code categories include Darlington, Durham, Harrogate, Leeds, Newcastle, Sunderland, Teesside and York. On analysis of the postcodes within the Darlington boundary (DL1, DL2 and DL3), 2,612 or 75% of employees live within these postcode areas. The highest number of proposals impact on employees living within the DL1 postcode, closely followed by DL3. These areas house a large number of Council tenants.

Travel costs for employees who are residents of Darlington may well be impacted by wider budget proposals linked to transport. Some proposals look at reducing the level of subsidy or reducing services across the town and rural areas. This may impact on households with low income and when combined with the reduction in take home pay as a result of the two terms and conditions proposals and general cost of living and increased fuel costs, increase residents parking schemes reducing 'free' parking on streets and increased car parking charges all have a negative impact on potentially lower income families.

Employees can sign up to salary sacrifice schemes for contract parking which reduces costs for the employee however salary sacrifice schemes are not always viable or appropriate for low wage earners.

Postcode / Geographical Profile of Workforce as at October 2011	Council Employees	School Based Employees	Grand Total
DL1	935	306	1241
DL2	196	53	249
DL3	896	226	1122
DL4	17	8	25
DL5	124	29	153
DL6	6	3	9
DL7	9	3	12
DL8	6	1	7
DL9	12	1	13
DL10 – DL18	174	44	218
DH	54	3	57
HG	3	1	4
LS	1		1
NE	21	1	22
SR	9	1	10
TS	269	37	306
YO	8		8
GRAND TOTAL	2740	717	3457

Legal Equality Risks Associated with the Implementation of the Proposed Terms and Conditions

As part of the equality analysis, there are a number of legal equality risks that need to be considered prior to approval. These are specifically associated with challenges from employees rather than the wider Community and associated challenges regarding consultation.

Risk Area / Issue	Scale of Risk	Level of Risk 1 to 5 (1 is lowest - 6 is highest)
The Council currently has a number of methods of calculating a days' pay. As part of the proposal for the three days unpaid leave, savings have been identified on a 1/5 th . Those employees who are currently paid on a 1/7 th basis could raise an unlawful deduction of wages challenge.	Scope could be applied to all former weekly paid employees. In 2006 as part of the Single Status Agreement, pay was converted to monthly pay and the notice period was converted to a month but the apportionment of salaries was not addressed. There are approximately 700 employees in former manual roles.	Likelihood of claims limited Risk Level 3
It is anticipated that there will be an agreement to harmonise the calculation of a days' pay as part of the proposal	Linked with the above issue is the risk of schools not adopting a change in the calculation of a days' pay causing a disparity and potential claim between	

School and Council employees and community school and community school employees		
<p>Term time only employees within Community Schools have a different term time only formula to those employees who are employed by the Council on a term time only basis. There are potential terms and conditions and equal pay challenges between the two sets of employees. These groups of staff are also general female, part time and occupy lower grades within the Council's grade structure.</p>	<p>Terms and conditions claims would amount to sex discrimination but a male equivalent comparator would have to be identified.</p>	<p>Likelihood of terms and conditions claims been submitted on their own is limited. It is more common to identify terms and conditions disputes alongside equal pay claims. Unless equal pay can be identified the risk is relatively low to moderate.</p> <p>Risk Level 2</p>
<p>If community schools / governing bodies do not adopt the revised terms and conditions there is a potential of equal pay risk where relevant comparators can be sighted between the Council and school and also between similar community schools.</p>	<p>Initial discussions with schools to canvas intentions on the adoption of the proposals is varying but until a full consultation exercise is complete the risk level is unknown. The level and scope of the risk will depend on numbers of employees and appetite to take claims forward. This may be of interest to 'no win no fee solicitors' currently undertaking work in the Council and exploring both current and historic terms and conditions</p>	<p>Likelihood of claims currently unknown, risk level to be determined.</p>
<p>TUPE employees will have to be consulted with on an individual basis as part of changing protected terms and conditions. Numbers are perceived to be limited (Learning and Skills Council employees, Connexions)</p>		<p>Likelihood is limited</p> <p>Risk level 1</p>
<p>Possible implications associated with recruitment and retention issues for Community Schools; if VA Schools and Academies do not adopt the changes their salaries and grades are likely to be more attractive than community schools grades which have adopted the revised terms and conditions</p>	<p>There is no obligation for VA and Academy Schools to adopt the revised terms and conditions.</p> <p>Implications likely to be felt in the longer term rather than shorter term.</p>	<p>Likelihood of issues will be on a small scale initially but suggest that this is reviewed and schools made aware of risks.</p>
<p>Both budget proposals propose a dismissal and re-engagement exercise should a collective agreement not be reached. The risk associated with dismissal and re-engagement exercises are</p>	<p>Highly unlikely to be whole of workforce affected but pockets of service areas / similar job roles could be swayed if dissatisfaction is expressed. Higher risk associated with two</p>	<p>Likelihood of breach of contract claims should be on a small scale but is a high risk area which could also attract negative media for Council and downtime for essential services.</p>

associated with employee relations and risks associated with breach of contract claims	elements of terms and conditions both affecting pay. Claims may be likely from trade unions if collective agreement can not be reached. Employment relations issues may result in strikes etc	Risk Level 2
Recruitment and Retention may become an issue for key posts for Darlington if other Council's in the Tees Valley region adopt the National Pay increases for staff groups. There is a potential that key comparable roles seek higher salaries in neighbouring authorities.	Market supplements can be applied where there is a suitable justification; however there is a risk of losing quality employees to higher paying authorities. There is also an equal pay risk between employees if market supplements are not justified and / or genuinely applied to all relevant employees.	Likelihood of losing key employees to neighbouring authorities will depend on national and regional pressures over the medium term. Market supplement challenges can be mitigated with continued tight control over market supplement procedures.

Summary

The proposed changes to terms and conditions are being fairly applied in terms of coverage, however there are considerations and points to note including;

- Term time only employees are predominately female; applying additional leave outside of the term time period is likely to be pose a number of operational issues and in equality terms has a larger impact on females.
- Female employees falling within the grade range of Grade E to Grade I are the highest percentage of employees impacted on, these employees are also generally part time and will be harder hit in terms of the deduction in both the pay freeze and 3 days unpaid leave.
- Older employees facing their latter years of employment have their pension to consider and the combination of the two terms and conditions proposals is likely to produce a reduced estimated pension package
- A higher percentage of males are at the top of their grades than females, however females dominate the lower grades and are generally in a part time capacity, reducing the scope of higher pay levels
- Employees at the lower grades and working part time hours may be disproportionately affected by the three days unpaid leave proposal due to tax and NI contributions deductions. This is in comparison with higher wage earners who are taxed at 40% on earnings but are subject to lower national insurance contributions. On a gross calculation basis employees paid at lower grades are worse off in percentage terms than higher graded employees, employees in lower grades pay a higher percentage.
- Carers may well welcome 3 days unpaid additional leave but may find the unpaid element difficult when combining this with the hours available to work, carer commitments and associated carer benefits.
- Similarly, employees receiving income support benefits may find themselves 'hit twice' by a reduction of pay as benefits are calculated on gross income, by reducing this further with the proposals, benefits are potentially reduced.
- There are a number of equality risks associated with implementation of the terms and conditions identified

APPENDIX 1

Analysis of length of service against age and gender

Council Employees

Age Years	Male						
	Length of Service						
	<1	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
16-30	12	42	69	67	11		
31-40	3	19	46	61	33	18	5
41-50	7	21	65	61	30	49	80
51-60	7	19	34	38	29	27	101
61+	1	4	11	22	10	4	9
Total	30	105	225	249	113	98	195

Age Years	Female						
	Length of Service						
	<1	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
16-30	39	62	130	86	10		
31-40	20	52	90	126	54	32	15
41-50	15	28	105	140	94	58	80
51-60	12	21	49	86	66	48	101
61+	4	9	25	18	12	12	38
Total	86	167	383	463	242	150	234

Community School Employees

Age Years	Male						
	Length of Service						
	<1	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
16-30	5	5	9	5			
31-40		4	6	4	1		
41-50		4	7	4	3	1	
51-60		1	5	3	5	1	
61+	2	4	4	1	1	1	2
Total	7	18	31	17	10	3	2

Age Years	Female						
	Length of Service						
	<1	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
16-30	12	16	15	14	2		
31-40	10	28	36	39	15	7	1
41-50	10	29	58	86	55	8	14
51-60	9	8	16	33	36	20	16
61+		6	15	4	1	5	5
Total	41	87	140	176	109	40	36