

# Equality analysis form - Draft

## Full Equality Analysis

1. Name of the activity (strategy, policy or practice etc)

Professorial Merit Pay Scheme

2. What is the aim of the activity (objective or purpose)?

The aim of this project is to revise the UWE reward scheme and process which recognises the contribution made by professors who deliver excellence / outstanding performance and leadership behaviours aligned to UWE's strategic research aims.

3. If amending a current activity, what changes are proposed?

The current scheme was last revised in July 2012. At this time, the criteria for establishing merit pay was reduced from five to four levels, with the added feature of a market payment for all professors of £2472 (base level) as a way of increasing competitiveness of the basic UWE professorial salary.

Review of merit pay would normally be triggered through discussion at an individual's PDR, followed by a recommendation by the Executive Dean. A moderating panel, chaired at Directorate level, would then meet to consider the recommendations made by Faculties.

However in the past 2 to 3 years, there has been no standardised system of reviewing merit pay. It is also recognised that there are shortcomings with the current professorial merit pay criteria in terms of clarity and alignment with evidence of performance including metrics.

The aim of this project is to create a workable scheme for rewarding high performing professors that:

- Aligns with the UWE research strategic ambitions which recognises professorial staff as having a key role to play.
- Aligns the leadership behaviours to create a greater link between what is being delivered and how it is delivered.
- Gives greater clarity of performance bands and alignment with evidence of performance including metrics.
- Establishes an ongoing process of transparent and regular review of professorial merit pay with strong links to PDR where common performance information is used.
- Ensures fair, equitable and transparent treatment of current and new professorial staff and avoids any accumulation of disparities over time.
- Strengthens ability to attract and retain talent in an increasingly competitive HE sector.

4. Who is responsible for developing and delivering the activity?

Martin Boddy (Pro VC Research & Business Engagement) and Andrea Barnes (HR OD Consultant)

5. What measures will be used to assess whether the activity is successful?

Ease of application (feedback from professors and Faculty Executives/Moderating Panel).

Better performance outcomes (REF indicators)

Standardisation of process and cycle (including link to PDR)

Increase in number and quality of candidate applications to vacancies

Increased retention and progression of professorial staff

Rate of progression on new scheme, particularly more positive distribution of equality characteristics

6. Does the activity have a potentially adverse impact on equality groups, in terms of employment issues and/or service delivery for students and/or staff? In the table below, please give evidence to support your yes or no answers. If the answer is not known, indicate how you will source evidence.

**Meeting the public sector equality duty**

Please also use the table below to demonstrate whether the activity has the potential to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations. Please use the ‘no’ column to highlight your responses.

	Potential impact / issues (both positive and negative)	Mitigating actions or actions to further enhance positive impact	Timing and progress
<b>All equality groups</b>			
<b>All</b> 87 professorial staff as at November 2015.	Pay schemes based on the employer’s discretion are highly vulnerable to bias.	Ensure that the scheme is well structured and visible on staff intranet site, reinforcing an expectation that it is acceptable for all professors to apply for merit pay progression, and the same opportunity is given to all staff.  Assessment of performance to be based on objective criteria and evidence where possible, and this is highly visible and transparent. Individuals will be given the opportunity to review performance metrics before they are used in the assessment of their performance. The application form will allow for both quantitative and qualitative data and narrative, giving a balance of evidence against the criteria.	
	Where the application to review pay relies on receiving a manager’s support could negatively impact which applications progress e.g. some professors may not be willing or able to ‘shout loud enough’ for their manager to take up their case.  Also sometimes manager relationships are more strained for people from equality groups	These managers may be subject to unconscious biases that results in them giving less encouragement to e.g. professors who work part time, or professors with childcare or other caring responsibilities, regardless of whether they meet targets that have been adjusted to match their working hours.  Training of managers managers who will be in a position to encourage (or discourage) staff	

	e.g. because a manager had to invest time in an Access to Work process, cultural differences or expectations etc.	applications through PDR etc. to be trained in unconscious bias.  The Professorial Merit Pay Panel (those assessing applications and evidence and making decisions) to be trained in unconscious bias.	
	Market pay allowances not underpinned by market data could increase the risk of unequal pay.	Ensure that market pay policy is adhered to, and managers are aware of this policy and apply it fairly and responsibly. The policy is visible on the HR intranet and accessible to all staff.  Monitor usage and application.	
	The allocation of personal premiums are highly vulnerable to bias and risk of unequal pay.	Expanding the number of scale points within each band, is expected to reduce the application of market and personal premiums. Managers to use the new performance bands to make a fair decision on merit pay. Ensure policy on personal premiums visible on HR intranet site.  Merit Pay Panel (chaired by PVC Research & Business Engagement and composed of Associate Deans, Research; a representative of HR) will be responsible for deciding starting salaries for internal / external candidates. Ensure panel and Exec Deans trained in new merit pay scheme, and offer/starting salaries guidelines.  Explore why and when these premiums apply. Develop guidelines to ensure strict application and adherence, with clear decision making audit trail.  Vice Chancellor to personally approve and sign of all cases of personal premia  Monitor usage and application.	
<b>Women and men</b>  30% women	Schemes that rely on 'self-nomination' may find that females are less likely to self-nominate.	Scheme will operate on the basis that applications require the support of the manager' in order to progress application.	

70% men		<p>Managers will need to encourage applications from all staff (regardless of gender or other protected characteristics) and ensure that all staff have the same opportunities to apply. This will be written into the guidelines.</p> <p>Merit pay progression to be built into the PDR process enabling manager's discussion around application for merit pay review, exploration of career aspirations and development opportunities.</p> <p>Monitoring of gender data and talent should help to assess and address this particular issue.</p>	
	<p>Statistically women are less likely to try to negotiate, and, if they do try to negotiate a higher salary, are less likely to be successful in that negotiation.</p>	<p>Guidelines for starting salaries to be updated to reflect new merit pay scheme and use of allowances.</p> <p>Training for managers to negotiate salary offer with complete understanding of merit pay scheme, make up of 'total offer', rationale for decision making, equal pay risks, and to be trained in unconscious bias.</p>	
<p><b>Part time</b> 20% of group are part time 30% women 70% men</p>	<p>Some targets may be difficult or impossible for part time staff to achieve.</p>	<p>Target setting should be adjusted to reflect the number of working hours and adjusted to reflect constraints imposed by those hours in a less-direct way, e.g. it might be impossible for a part time staff member, or staff with caring responsibilities, or a disabled staff member to attend a week long international research or industrial conference, which in turn will impact their ability to form collaborations or partnerships that could enhance the quality of their work.</p>	
<b>Gender Identity</b>	<p>The assessment or review period for determining reward, may negatively impact those on leave.</p>	<p>Scheme guidelines to include section on how to keep professors informed of invitations to apply and deadlines for submission while they're on leave, as appropriate to the situation.</p>	
<b>Black and</b>	<p>BME staff are less successful in</p>	<p>Offer refresher training to</p>	

<p><b>minority ethnic groups</b> 8% BME</p>	<p>securing career development opportunities, therefore may be less able to progress. (Staff compendium 2014).</p>	<p>existing managers on recruitment and selection process. Consider external and internal adverts to attract wider candidate pools. Ensure there is a robust process for internal opportunities.</p>	
<p><b>Disabled people</b> No declared disability in the group (27% not known)</p>	<p>Any assessment measure must take into account reasonable adjustments for disabled staff (EHRC guidance).</p>	<p>Targets and measures must be realistic and achievable, and individually focused. Make reasonable adjustments to where required. Training and guidance will reflect this.</p> <p>Scheme guidelines to include section on how to keep disabled people informed of invitations to apply and deadlines for submission while they're on leave, as appropriate to the situation.</p>	
<p><b>Younger or older people</b></p>	<p>Linking the performance criteria to length of service, is likely to negatively impact younger staff.</p>	<p>Avoid reference to length of service in performance criteria.</p>	
<p><b>People of different religion and beliefs</b> (majority of the group have no faith or religion or prefer not to say)</p>	<p>People of different religious or beliefs may take time away from the university for a religious holiday or observance, and this may impact ability to meet deadlines.</p>	<p>Ensure people are aware of timescales for submitting an application for their merit pay to be reviewed, and that such timescales adequately reflect differing equality group needs to ensure best opportunity is given for everyone to apply and meet deadlines for submission of application form.</p>	
<p><b>Lesbian, gay, bisexual people</b></p>	<p>There is a negative perception on fairness of pay among this group (staff survey 2014), however there is a lack of data for this group.</p>	<p>Continue to seek information and guidance from organisations such as Stonewall.</p> <p>Managers involved in assessment to be trained in unconscious bias. Ensure that the same opportunity to be considered for merit pay scheme fairly applies to all staff.</p>	
<p><b>Marriage and civil partnership</b></p>	<p>No impact known.</p>		
<p><b>Pregnancy and maternity</b></p>	<p>The assessment or review period for determining reward, may negatively impact those on maternity/paternity/adoptive leave.</p>	<p>Training of managers involved in assessment to be trained in unconscious bias. Ensure that the same opportunity to be considered for bonus scheme fairly applies to all staff, and those on leave are kept</p>	

		informed of invitations to apply and deadlines for submission.	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------	--

7. Please give evidence of how you have engaged equality groups in the equality analysis process. Is further engagement required?

Not yet achieved.

8. What action can be taken to mitigate any potential negative impacts or address different needs? Please comment and then complete an action plan (see appendix 1).

See above.

9. Please indicate the level of equality relevance:

High

Medium YES

Low

10. **Equality analysis sign off:**

Faculty Dean or Head of Service	Martin Boddy
Faculty / service	Directorate
Date	January 2016, updated in March 2016

**Please return this form to the Equality and Diversity Unit for feedback, the start of the consultation process and publication.**

**Equality analysis - action plan**

**Appendix 1**

Name of activity: Introduction of new professorial merit pay scheme

Plan completed by:

Service / faculty: University wide (strategic project)

Issues	Actions required	Responsible Person	Resources required	Target date	Success Indicators	What progress has been made?
<b>Information/data required</b>	External scan of other HEi schemes.  UCEA data for salary comparative purposes.  Assimilation exercise to understand potential gender and equality issues.  Audit of files to log decisions on current allowances – to inform guidelines.	Andrea Barnes		31/01/2016		
<b>Consultation</b>	Sign off – project brief and principles.  Informal consultation with Directorate, PVC Group, professors, AD Research, TU's  Formal consultation with above plus wider stakeholders e.g. AD L&T and	Martin Boddy		January 2016  February 2016  Feb/March 2016		

	Associate Professors.					
<b>Monitoring and review arrangements</b>	<p>Review movements within and between performance bands.</p> <p>Review performance criteria and evidence following submission of cases in 2016, and perfect wording where necessary.</p> <p>Write full guidelines following open invite to reflect process and decision making outcomes.</p> <p>Build in annual cycle and compulsory review (on 5 year basis).</p>	Martin Boddy / Andrea Barnes				
<b>Publication</b>						
<b>Other actions</b>	<p>Build in training for recruiting managers, Merit Pay Panel.</p> <p>Build into PDR process and recruitment / job description.</p>	Martin Boddy / Andrea Barnes				

Please return form to the Equality and Diversity Unit