Equality Impact Assessment Form

Please ensure you have read the EIA Policy and Guidance document before completing this form. If you need assistance, please contact the EDU. Please return the completed form to the EDU.

STEP 1 – Define policy/practice
i. Name of policy/practice/significant change
Rewarding Contribution Policy – Grades 2-9, Professorial, Senior Professional Services
ii. Owner of policy/practice (College, School/Research Institute or Service)
POD - PPR
iii. Date of policy/practice approved
Autumn 2021
iv. Approved by? (Committee, College, School or Service)
SMG

STEP 2 – Description of policy/practice
i. What are the aims?
The policy aim is to reward sustained, excellent contribution to the University's aims and goals. In previous years this has been linked to PDR gradings, the policy change now means this is through manager nomination. This EIA is to assess this change.
ii. Who does it cover?
All staff
iii. How often is this policy/practice reviewed?
Annually

STEP 3 – Could there be any implications for a protected characteristic group (as defined by the Equality Act 2010) in this (or the development of) policy/practice?

STEP 3a – Yes, there is a potential implication or barrier for a protected characteristic group.

Please tick all that are relevant

Protected Characteristics	Tick ✓	Notes
Age	✓	
Disability (including BSL users)	✓	
Gender Reassignment (including Gender Neutral Language)	✓	
Marriage and Civil Partnership		
Pregnancy and Maternity	✓	
Race	✓	
Religion or Belief	✓	
Sex	✓	
Sexual Orientation	✓	

If any of the above have been ticked - Go to Step 4

STEP 3b – No, there are no potential implication or barrier for a protected characteristic group.
Go to Step 8

STEP 4 – What evidence do you have for this conclusion (potential implication for a protected characteristic group)?

Briefly explain:

As this process impacts all staff, there could a be a range of protected characteristics impacted. The impacts can vary, but may include:

- Not receiving nomination due to absence related to a protected group (disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity). As this is an annual process, exceptionalcontribution should be considered in the next round of applications, if the individual missed this due to an absence listed.
- Not receiving a nomination due to manager discrimination.

STEP 4a – Does the evidence show a positive impact?

Please provide an example and attach evidence:

As this is a recent change to a policy, there is no evidence from the implementation of the new policy approach. The University does have evidence based on previous policy approach where staff received rewards based on manager or self-nomination and PDR gradings. This was analysed by sex only, due to limited numbers for other protected groups. The data presented below is as a percentage, but it should be noted that manger nominations were on average double the number of self-nominations. The only anomaly is 2019, where the process was entirely linked to the PDR process. The eligible population data is the whole University population, and this is taken from the annual Staff Equality Monitoring Report.

Table 1 outlines the R&R from eligible population through to successful applicants for manager nomination:

	%Eligible population		%Applications		%Successful applications	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
2014	55	45	74.2	25.8	76.8	23.2
2015	55	45	69.2	30.8	71.3	28.7
2016	54.6	45.4	73.7	26.3	70.0	30.0
2017	55	45	70.2	29.8	67.2	32.8
2018	45.3	54.7	56.0	44.0	53.9	46.1
2019*	45.3	54.7			61.0	39.0

* 2019: Removal of application process as done via PDR process in which all "applications" were successful.

Table 1 shows the success rates of the applications are proportionate to the percentages of application for both females and males. It should be noted, that in proportion to the eligible population there are higher manager nominations for females compared to males.

Table 2 outlines the R&R from eligible population through to successful applicants for Self-nomination:

	%Eligible population		%Applications		%Successful applications	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
2014	55	45	59.7	40.3	61.8	38.2
2015	55	45	54.1	45.9	51.9	48.1
2016	54.6	45.4	48.4	51.6	51.4	48.6
2017	55	45	43.6	56.4	55.6	44.4

The self-nomination process ceased after 2017.

Table 2 shows minor variance in the applications and successful applicants between females and males – the only notable exception is 2017, where the male successful application rate is 10% lower than the applications. However, the number of applications is lower (approx. 60/year). It should be noted the self-nomination process was more aligned to the proportions of eligible staff by sex.

This data shows the previous system manager nominated system had a positive impact on female staff.

Go to Step 5

STEP 4b – Does the evidence show a negative impact?

You need to consult with relevant stakeholders – the EDU will assist with this process.
Provide brief details and attach evidence:

N/A

Go to Step 6

STEP 4c – Does the evidence show NO impact?

Attach evidence:

Go to Step 8

STEP 5 – Continue to promote good opportunity for all people

Promote and implement as exemplar policy/practice

Go to Step 8

STEP 6 – Involve and consult stakeholders to address any negative impacts?

EDU will assist with this process. Provide brief details of involvement and consultations:

Trade Unions have been consulted about the changes in the process.

Go to Step 7

STEP 7 – Outline any changes made to the policy/practice as a result of the consultation

Provide details of changes:

Go to Step 8

STEP 8 – Publish results (as required by law)

Return this form, once completed, along with copy of amended policy or practice and any relevant information, to the EDY for annual reporting and for inclusion on the University website.

Go to Step 9

STEP 9 – Regular review

Regular reviews ensure that policy and practice is kept up to date and meets the requirements of current equality legislation. Where a negative impact has been identified and remedial actions are being implemented, the policy owner should define a timescale for review.

Please give details of review process:

The change to the policy will be reviewed, including a data analysis of the applications and successful applications by sex, disability and ethnicity (dependent on cohort size).

SIGN OFF PROCESS	
Name of EIA Owner	Lesley Cummings
Signature	
College/School/RI/Service	POD
Date of Completion	21 October 2021
Date received by EDU	22 October 2021
Approved in Principle?	**YES** NO
Any actions required? Please specify	None
Signed on behalf of EDU	Mhairi Taylor
Date	22 October 2021