

Full Equality Impact Assessment Form

Equality Relevance High ☐ Medium ☒ Low ☐

1. Name of the policy or practice?

Procedure for the Determination and Review of Pay Grades

2. What is the aim, objective or purpose of the policy practice?

To operate the HERA job evaluation scheme* in way that achieves equal pay for work of equal value and allows roles to be compared and contrasted to allow differences to be recognised and understood. To support individual, team and organisational development in a way that links to organisational need.

*The HERA scheme was designed under guidance from the Equal Opportunities Commission. It is a requirement of those trained to operate the scheme that they undergo appropriate equality and diversity training in order to practice, including awareness of the scope for bias and stereotyping to affect job evaluation outcomes.

3. Who is responsible for developing the policy?

Ian Apperley, HR Director

4. Who is responsible for implementing the policy?

Lesley Donnithorne, HR Manager (Projects and Systems)

5. Who is the policy intended to benefit?

The University as an employer, managers and staff

6. What is intended to be achieved by the policy?

A system that is transparent and establishes clear accountabilities for ensuring equal pay for work of equal value.

7. How will you know if this policy has been successful?

No significant issues identified through the periodic review mechanism written into the procedure. No equality issues identified by periodic monitoring of individuals engaging with the procedure and of the resulting outcomes. No grievances lodged in relation to acts of discrimination relating to a grading outcome. A lack of equal pay claims lodged by individual employees.

8. Do the following equality groups have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to the intended outcomes of this policy? Please give information/ evidence to support your answer.

	Yes	No	Not known – Do you need to generate sources of information?
Women, men, transgendered people	<p>Women may be less inclined to engage the procedure if they feel marginalised and concerned about any negative consequences of raising a grade review request.</p> <p>Women may undersell their responsibilities when producing job evidence documentation</p>		<p>Analysis of the take-up by women of the PEP grade review process in 2008 shows that 58% of applicants were women compared to 57% of the workforce. This suggests that there were no gender issues in the take up of the PEP review process, however there needs to be on-going monitoring of take up of the new procedure and outcomes over time.</p>
Black and minority ethnic groups	<p>BME staff may be less inclined to engage the procedure if they feel marginalised and concerned about any negative consequences of raising a grade review request.</p> <p>BME staff may undersell their responsibilities when producing job evidence documentation</p>		<p>Analysis of the take-up by BME staff of the PEP grade review process in 2008 shows that 5% of applicants were BME staff compared to 6% of the workforce. This suggests that there were no significant BME issues in the take up of the PEP review process, however there needs to be on-going monitoring of take up of the new procedure and outcomes over time.</p>
Disabled people	<p>Disabled staff may be less inclined to engage the procedure if they feel marginalised and concerned about any negative consequences of raising a grade review request.</p> <p>In terms of producing the necessary job evidence documentation, staff with certain disabilities may need additional support if their work does not normally involve producing written</p>		<p>Analysis of the take-up by disabled staff of the PEP grade review process in 2008 shows that 6% of applicants had declared a disability compared to 4% of the workforce. This suggests that there were no disability issues in the take up of the PEP review process, however there needs to be on-going monitoring of take up of the new procedure and outcomes over time.</p>

	material. Disabled staff may not feel able to declare a disability affecting their work which would otherwise be adjusted for when their role is evaluated.		
Younger or older people		NO	
People of different religion and beliefs	Staff who feel marginalised due to their religion or belief and are concerned about any negative consequences of raising a grade review request may be less inclined to engage the procedure.		Need to monitor take up of the procedure over time, however, existing data held on religion/ belief is not yet comprehensive enough to produce meaningful monitoring statistics and steps need to be taken to increase staff declaration of this equality data.
Lesbian, gay and bisexual people	Staff who feel marginalised due to their sexual orientation and are concerned about any negative consequences of raising a grade review request may be less inclined to engage the procedure.		Need to monitor take up of the procedure over time, however, existing data held on sexual orientation is not yet comprehensive enough to produce meaningful monitoring statistics and steps need to be taken to increase staff declaration of this equality data.

9. Is there potentially adverse impact on the following equality groups as a result of this policy? Please give information/ evidence to support your answer.

	Yes	No	Not known - Do you need to generate sources of information?
Women, men, transgendered people			Checks and balances have been built into the operation of the procedure; monitoring will show whether these are sufficient to address any potentially adverse impact.
Black and			Checks and balances

minority ethnic groups			have been built into the operation of the procedure; monitoring will show whether these are sufficient to address any potentially adverse impact.
Disabled people			Checks and balances have been built into the operation of the procedure; monitoring will show whether these are sufficient to address any potentially adverse impact.
Younger or older people		NO	
People of different religion and beliefs			Checks and balances have been built into the operation of the procedure; monitoring would show whether these are sufficient to address any potentially adverse impact but this will not be possible until declaration rates increase
Lesbian, gay, bisexual people			Checks and balances have been built into the operation of the procedure; monitoring would show whether these are sufficient to address any potentially adverse impact but this will not be possible until declaration rates increase.

10. Is the policy designed or does it have the potential to promote equality for particular groups or good relations between groups? If so, how?

The procedure provides an open and transparent process for individual staff to seek a review of their grade. This has the potential to promote equality for all groups if staff feel equally able to engage with the process. It will be important to provide reassurances to individuals who feel marginalized that engaging the procedure has no negative consequences, and that they should have confidence in the individuals appointed as role analysts and panel members that they are impartial and have been trained to be aware of equality issues. It is important that staff with disabilities affecting any aspect of the delivery of their role feel able to disclose these when

producing their job evidence so that these may be adjusted for in the evaluation.

11. Do you need to carry out a formal/informal consultation internally or externally at this stage? Who you need to consult?

The procedure was produced under a collective agreement with the University's recognised trades unions. The initial impact assessment was produced with input from the UCU branch equality officer and the Equality Support Official (Race) in the national UCU Equality Unit and this was then subject to further consultation with UCU, UNISON and Unite. No wider consultation is judged appropriate at this point however if particular issues are identified through the planned equality monitoring of take up and outcomes then it may be appropriate to consult with specialists and with the appropriate staff forum.

12. What method or mechanism would be best suited for this consultation?

See above.

13. What action could be taken to mitigate any negative impacts identified or is there an opportunity to take steps to address different needs or promote equality of opportunity more effectively? If yes, please comment and complete action plan.

Provide mandatory equality and diversity training to individuals selected as role analysts and panel members when they are appointed.
Wherever possible, form mixed gender evaluation panels.
If monitoring does identify differences in take up and outcome for particular groups, consider how to convey messages of reassurance to such groups about engaging the procedure whilst not raising expectations about the outcome, perhaps through the appropriate staff forum.
The University's Performance and Development Review (PDR) approach requires managers and staff to review the job description in the course of the annual PDR meeting which gives the opportunity for changes in the job to be identified and discussed.
Consider how to reassure and support staff from marginalised groups when they appear personally before an appeals panel. eg. by producing guidance for appellants and having appropriate statements made by the appeals panel chair in their introduction about the panel's impartiality and equality training.

14. Who will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the action plan?

Ian Apperley, HR Director

15. Please outline how you have revised the policy (if necessary) in the light of the Equality Impact Assessment . If no change is to take place please give reasons.

Potential equality issues arise not from the procedure itself, but from how individuals with job

evaluation responsibilities under the procedure are trained and their performance is monitored, and how staff who feel marginalised are given messages of reassurance and support about engaging the procedure.

The procedure requires that role analysts work in pairs when making judgement; for panel members a checklist has been produced which is referred to at the beginning of each panel session, reminding panel members about their responsibilities and vesting responsibility in the chair to monitor the proceedings.

16. Please indicate when you think this policy/practice should be reviewed next:

After one year of operation, so August 2011

Equality Impact assessment completed by:

Name	Lesley Donnithorne
Post title	HR Manager (Projects & Systems)
Faculty / service	Human Resources
Date	14 October 2010

Please return this form to the Equality and Diversity Unit. The equality and diversity unit will provide feedback and will publish the final document.

Confirmed by the equality and diversity unit:

Name	Andrew McLean
Date	22 October 2010

ACTION PLAN – Name of Policy: Procedure for Determination and Review of Pay Grades Service : HR

Issues	Actions required	Responsible Person	Resources required	Target date	Success Indicators	What progress has been made?
Information/data required	Equality monitoring of take-up of the procedure by individual employees, of panel outcomes, of appeals lodged and appeal outcomes.	HR Manager	None	August 2011	No significant equality issues identified from the statistics	Awaiting a period of operation of the procedure. Gender, BME and disability data is available.
	Improve the declaration rate for sexual orientation and religion/belief in order to monitor the operation of the procedure for these groups.	E&D Manager	HR resources to carry out a monitoring survey	December 2010	A declaration rate of more than 80%	Included in the HR work programme for 2010.
Consultation	Seek comments from trades unions.	HR Manager	None	September 2010		Completed
	Report to Joint Union Forum.	HR Director		October 2010		Completed
	Consider whether wider consultation is required when monitoring data is available.	HR Manager		August 2011		

Monitoring and review arrangements	Activate the periodic review mechanism provided for within the procedure	Joint Union Forum	HR resources to plan the review and generate data required	August 2011	No significant equality issues identified from the review	
Publication	<p>Monitor the accessibility of the procedure etc on the HR website</p> <p>Managers/staff to continue to review the job description as part of the PDR meeting.</p> <p>If monitoring of take up identifies issues, consider how to address this eg. via staff forum.</p>	<p>HR Manager</p> <p>Managers/staff</p> <p>HR Manager</p>		<p>August 2011</p> <p>On going</p> <p>August 2011</p>	<p>No issues with accessing the documents</p> <p>No evidence that staff in particular groups are not engaging the procedure.</p>	
Other actions						

Please return form to the Equality and Diversity Manager