

Pay and Reward Policy, Contribution Related Reward and Non-Pay Rewards Procedure

Evidence based equality analysis

The main aims and purpose of the policy and procedure are to outline the rules and process around pay and reward, specifically payment of Contribution Related Reward and Non-Pay Rewards, following the annual performance review process and the assignment of performance ratings to individual employees.

The HR team supports managers in applying this policy and procedure, and monitors the results of Contribution Related Reward. This helps to ensure a fair and consistent application, and identification / resolution of any potential equality issues.

Lead officer: Alison Maxson

Stakeholders: All employees, Trade Unions

Equality analysis is a valuable tool to help embed equality into everything we do

While process is important, equality analysis is essentially about outcomes

Lack of evidence of discrimination is not evidence of a lack of discrimination

It is not acceptable to say that a policy is applied uniformly to all groups and is therefore fair and equal. Applying a policy or procedure consistently may result in differential outcomes for different groups.

For each of the areas below, an assessment needs to be made on whether the policy has a positive, negative or neutral impact, and brief details of why this decision was made and notes of any mitigation should be included. Where the impact is negative, this needs to be given a high, medium or low assessment. It is important to rate the impact of the policy based on the current situation (i.e. disregarding any actions planned to be carried out in future).

High impact – a significant potential impact, risk of exposure, history of complaints, no mitigating measures in place etc.

Medium impact – some potential impact exists, some mitigating measures are in place, poor evidence

Low impact – almost no relevancy to the process, e.g. an area that is very much legislation led and where the Council has very little discretion

	Neutral	Positive	Negative
Target group / area			
Race and ethnicity (including Gypsies and Travellers; migrant workers, asylum seekers etc.)			<p>Could have language barriers either in terms of explaining outcomes to staff, or if staff wish to raise queries / concerns / complaints about the process.</p> <p>The policy does allow for employees to receive support from TUs so this could mitigate if support sought early.</p> <p>HR would take direct action to support staff and managers in finding a resolution as required.</p> <p>Low</p>
Disability (as defined by the Equality Act - a person has a disability if they have a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities)			<p>Could have impact on ratings given if staff are absent from work – training / guidance is in place for managers to ensure they are aware that disability-related absences should not have a negative impact on rating provided .</p> <p>HR would take direct action to support staff and managers in finding a resolution as required.</p> <p>Low</p>
Gender			Absence from work for

			<p>maternity / parental reasons similarly could have an impact on ratings. Again, training / guidance is in place for managers to ensure they are aware that such absences should not have a negative impact on rating provided.</p> <p>Human Resources would take direct action to support staff and managers in finding a resolution as required.</p> <p>Low</p>
Gender reassignment	No impact identified		
Religion and belief	No impact identified		
Sexual orientation (including heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual)	No impact identified		
Age (children and young people aged 0 – 24, adults aged 25 – 50, younger older people aged 51 – 75/80; older older people 81+. The age categories are for illustration only as overriding consideration should be given to needs)			<p>Risk of potential conscious / unconscious bias from managers when applying ratings based on perception of ability linked to age / experience.</p> <p>Human Resources would take direct action to support staff and managers in finding a resolution as required.</p> <p>Low</p>
Rural communities	No impact identified		

Areas of deprivation	No impact identified		
Human rights	No impact identified		
Health and wellbeing (consider both the wider determinants of health such as education, housing, employment, environment, crime and transport, as well as the possible impacts on lifestyles and the effect there may be on health and care services)		Non-pay rewards include options which can have a direct positive impact on health and wellbeing e.g. additional annual leave, gym membership, Medicash.	
Procurement/partnership (if project due to be carried out by contractors/partners etc, identify steps taken to ensure equality compliance)	No impact identified		

Evidence:

Human Resources advise and support managers in assigning appropriate ratings to individuals, taking into account equality issues such as disability-related absences.

Extensive training and guidance is provided for managers on these issues.

HR also carry out monitoring and moderation of ratings given in order to identify any specific concerns relating to equality.

The workforce metrics for Cheshire West and Chester Council do not show any specific trends or concerns regarding the implementation of the procedure in relation to any of the protected characteristics. As some fields on the employee personal information include the options; other, prefer not to say and are not compulsory fields the self-reported data is limited and this in turn has an impact on the reporting – further work is to be undertaken to improve the self-reporting in Cheshire West and Chester and as such should have a positive impact on the accuracy of information held on employees.

The procedure was developed by experienced Human Resources practitioners and the Cheshire West and Chester Council Trade Union Representatives were involved in the consultation and development of the procedure.

Action plan:

Actions required	Key activity	Priority	Outcomes required	Officer responsible	Review date
Review Equality Analysis		Low		Human Resources Team	2019 or sooner if policy is amended
Continue with work to improve data captured on employees		High	Annual data cleanse prompt in self-service to include personal information	Human Resources Team with relevant technical support	September 2016
Ensure ongoing training and support is available to managers, particularly at mid-year and end-year review time when ratings are assigned		High		Human Resources Team	September 2016 and January 2017

Sign off	
Lead officer:	Alison Maxson
Approved by Tier 4 Manager:	Debbie Thompson
Moderation and/or Scrutiny – Chief Executive’s Portfolio Equality and Diversity Group	
Date: 12 July 2016	
Date analysis to be reviewed based on rating (high impact – review in one year, medium impact - review in two years, low impact in three years)	Three years – July 2019