



EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL TO BE ASSESSED:	SAC Grade Review
IS THIS A NEW OR EXISTING PROPOSAL?	Existing Process
WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROPOSAL?	SAC Consulting Leadership team
ASSESSED BY:	Assessment group included: Head of Service (Consulting), HR Business Partner, EDI Lead
DATE OF ASSESSMENT:	11/08/2022

Who is likely to benefit from this policy, procedure, relevant practise or decision?	Eligible SAC Consulting employees; Consultants Grade 5 – 2, Technicians Grade 7 – 6, Farm Business Analysts Grade 7 – 6	
1. What outcomes are wanted from this proposal?	A structured and fair progression process that considers both the financial and non-financial contribution made by relevant employees.	
2. <u>Could</u> the proposal have a positive or negative impact on minority ethnic groups?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	SRUC data shows that there is low representation from minority ethnic groups and therefore numbers are too low to undertake meaningful analysis. Also see 10. below
3. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to gender?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	SRUC data shows that the gender split for those who applied for grade review in 2021 was 57% Female: 43% male which is proportionate to the gender breakdown of employees eligible to apply. Our data indicates The EHRC advise that organisations must ensure there is no gender bias built into how you assess competence pay e.g. including part-timers, those on maternity or career breaks. This includes ensuring all

		<p>employees have equal access to opportunities to develop the required level of competence.</p> <p>The current policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has clearly defined criteria - Links performance to quantifiable, objective targets and also other competencies/ behavioural skills. <p>Also see 10. Below</p> <p>Action update: Grade review process details to be shared with employees on leave (e.g. maternity or parental leave, sickness absence or any other longer term leave). Line managers will be directed to contact all employees on all types of leave in email advising the grade review process is now open.</p>
<p>4. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to disability?</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>SRUC data shows that 91% of eligible employees have no known disability. Although low numbers, there is evidence through the percentages of successful grade review applications that the process does not seem to present barriers to people with disabilities.</p> <p>Employees on long term disability related will be alerted by their line manager to this process opening to ensure these employees have the opportunity to apply.</p> <p>There is provision in the application process for employees to provide context around the competencies and financial contribution where this may have been impacted by time off due to disability.</p>

		<p>The documentation and systems used are accessible in line with SRUC’s digital and document accessibility standards.</p> <p>Action: Email to all about the grade review process being open for applications will include offer to support in terms of using the new system for applications (plus demonstration of accessibility options) and support for any reasonable adjustments.</p> <p>Also see 10. below</p>
<p>5. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>SRUC data shows that for eligible employees 82% identify as heterosexual, <5% identify as bisexual, and 16% prefer not to say or the data is unknown. With the caveat of small numbers, the data we do have indicates no obvious barriers of the grade review policy.</p> <p>Also see 10. below</p>
<p>6. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to age?</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>SRUC data shows that the highest percentage of applications come from employees aged 20–29 years and generally tails off as age increases. Employees eligible to apply for grade review are mainly 30 – 49 years (54%) and then 22% aged 20–29 years and 15% aged 50–59 years. In 2021, half of those aged 30–39 who applied for grade review were unsuccessful and this was the only age group to have unsuccessful applications. In 2020, there were no successful applications from employees aged 39 years or younger. The global pandemic had an impact on the process and these observations will be reviewed in 2022 onwards to check for any ongoing impacts on age.</p>
<p>7. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to religion, faith or belief?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>SRUC data shows that for eligible employees 34% have no religion/ philosophical belief, 38% are Christian –</p>

			<p>protestant, 17% prefer not to say/ are unknown and identification with other religions/ beliefs is 5% or less. From the data we have there appears to be no barriers for people of different religions or beliefs in terms of the grade review policy.</p> <p>Also see 10. below</p>
8. <u>Could</u> the proposal have a positive or negative impact due on people with dependants/caring responsibilities?	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>		<p>SRUC data shows that for eligible employees 26% have caring responsibilities for a child(ren), 55% have no caring responsibilities, 12% prefer not to say/ unknown and 6% having caring responsibilities for adults. The data doesn't suggest any obvious barriers in terms of the grade review policy however in 2021, there were no applications from people with caring responsibilities for adults. We will keep this under review on an annual basis.</p> <p>Also see 10. below</p>
9. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to transgender or transsexual?	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		<p>SRUC data does now allow us to make an assessment for this equality group with 37% of eligible employees stating prefer not to say/ unknown and 64% identifying with the same gender as they were assigned at birth.</p> <p>Also see 10. below</p>
10. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact across all equality groups?	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>		<p>Any potential for line manager bias is mitigated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alerts to senior management on decisions and requirement that any approval/ rejection of applications for grade review to be justified by the line manager - Moderation panel in place to assess applications for grade review that are approved by line managers. - Employee control over the timing to apply for grade review

			Action: all moderation panel members to complete the 'diversity in the workplace' and 'unconscious bias' training before sitting on the panel and to complete annual refresher training.
11. Will the positive or negative impact identified in sections 2-9 have a potentially adverse effect on this proposal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
12. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	n/a
13. Does the policy, procedure or relevant practise advance equality of opportunity	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
14. If 'yes' to 13 then how does the policy advance inclusivity?	See comments in sections above.		
15. If 'no' to 13, could the policy, procedure or relevant practise be changed or revised to advance equality of opportunity and if so then how?	<p>Consideration to be given by SAT Consulting leadership team to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the quality assurance process for the grade review policy and one which includes employee feedback (agreed that this will be gathered via a survey) and where line manager peer to peer support/ training (to be agreed). - include proactive review and analysis of hard data, disaggregated by protected characteristics, for those who apply, are successful and are unsuccessful – action owner Andrew Bauer with support from HR (further meeting to be arranged in November 2022 to review latest data and agree equality related survey question). - Diversity on the moderation panel – to be addressed as far as reasonably practicable e.g. gender mix for September 2022 grade review. 		
Could this policy, procedure, relevant practise or decision result in a negative impact on people who share protected characteristics (Age, Disability, Gender reassignment, Marriage and civil partnership, Pregnancy and maternity, Race, Religion and belief, Sex and Sexual orientation) giving due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)? If YES or NOT KNOWN, what kind of evidence gathering and analysis is needed to improve this policy?	As above. We currently consider that any potential negative impacts are being mitigated by the current policy. Ongoing monitoring of data and potential improvements in terms of quality assurance will provide evidence to confirm this and highlight where changes may be required as part of a future review..		

Recommendation:

No action required – no potential adverse impact

Amendments or changes required to remove barriers

To be undertaken by 01/09/2022

Proceed with awareness of adverse impacts

Further evidence and analysis required (see actions)

To be undertaken by 30/11/2022

Approved: Job Title:	Head of Service (Consulting)
----------------------	------------------------------