

Equality screening and Full Impact Assessment template

Note: Please delete guidance notes (in italics) after completing the form

Name of a policy / procedure / function / project: Appraisal process and Competencies Framework (360 degree feedback tier 1-2; psychometric testing)	
Date: 11 November 2009	
Carried out by:	
Name	Role
Gill Chamberlain	Appraisal Process & Competencies
Monica Thornton	360° feedback
Petra Dexter Duskova	External

Aims of the policy / procedure / function / project: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define behaviours to underpin performance management 2. Apply consistent approach to measurement of performance

Stakeholders: All employees (no teaching staff); TU

Considering the purpose of the Equality Impact Assessment process, is the policy (function, procedure etc.) relevant? <p style="text-align: center;">Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

Potential impact on target groups:		
Target group	Potential impact <i>Please describe</i>	Measures currently in place
Race <i>(also ethnicity, nationality and associated aspects such as culture and language)</i> Gypsy and Travellers	Culture: different cultural behaviour (e.g. body language, praise, team playing)	Training to include E+D element to raise awareness of cultural issues during appraisal

Potential impact on target groups:		
Target group	Potential impact <i>Please describe</i>	Measures currently in place
Disability (<i>consider full rainbow of mental and physical impairments: mobility, manual dexterity, speech, hearing, learning, understanding, visual sight, MS, cancer, HIV etc.</i>)	Communication: - sensory impairment; learning disability Issue of long-term illnesses	Reasonable adjustment - line managers' responsibility to put communications arrangements in place TU rep or a colleague (managers led) OD and HR strategy to put measures in place to ensure appraisal is fair for people with long-term illness / disability
Gender (<i>consider associated aspects e.g. safety, single-parenting, caring responsibility, potential for bullying and harassment,</i>) Transgender	Caring responsibilities / time off	OD and HR strategy to put measures in place to ensure appraisal is fair for people who take time off due to pregnancy, care (both children/adults). Guidance to be issued to managers
Sexual orientation <i>(includes heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bi-sexual)</i>	No impact	
Age (<i>including all groups - children, young people, working age, elderly</i>)	No impact	
Religion and belief (<i>the most common religions include Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Sikhism, Shinto, Nonconformists</i>)	Time off for R&B reasons	Flexible working built in – managers to be aware
Rural issues	-	
Socio-economic issues		
Other (<i>there may be other target groups relevant to your service</i>)		

Is the Policy/Function likely to have an impact on Human Rights?
Degree of conformity required, which may be seen to personal individuality

Evidence:
Oracle keeping outputs from appraisal; equality profiling of the outcomes from appraisal (year 2 available); Staff survey

Proposed actions (to be reflected in the Directorate plans):
Actions emerging from the " Potential impact on target groups" and the" Evidence" sections in order to address any gaps

Action	Target date	Responsibility
Equality data to be captured from the pilot evaluation. Questionnaire to be sent to representative sample	31 st December 2010	Gillian Chamberlain
OD and HR strategy to put measures in place to ensure appraisal is fair for people with long-term illness / disability. Guidance to be issued to managers.	1 st June 2011	Gillian Chamberlain
OD and HR strategy to put measures in place to ensure appraisal is fair for people who take time off due to pregnancy, care (both children/adults). Guidance to be issued to managers.	1 st June 2011	Gillian Chamberlain
Liaise with staff equality groups (once established Feb 2011) concerning feedback on the appraisal process, mainly with regard to disability and gender	1 st June 2011	Gillian Chamberlain

Rating:

In light of the above how would you rate the impact of your policy/function etc. on any of the target groups, for guidance please see footnotes.

	Race	Disability	Gender	Sexual orientation	Age	Religion & belief	Rural Issues	Other
High ¹ <i>Please continue below</i>		X	X				-	-
Medium ²	X				X	X		

¹ High = significant potential impact, risk of exposure, history of complaints, no mitigating measures in place or no evidence available, urgent need for consultation with service users, general public, employees

² Medium = some potential impact, some mitigating measures in place but no evidence available how effective they are, would be beneficial to consult with service users, general public etc. but not urgent

<i>Please exit the process</i>								
Low³ <i>Please exit the process</i>				x				

IMPORTANT!

Only policies (functions, procedures etc.) rated as high have to be fully Impact Assessed. Full Impact Assessment requires consultation with members from the target groups highlighted as being at the receiving end of any potential impact. EIA consultation exercises will be undertaken by relevant service with the help and support of the Research and Intelligence team and Equality and Diversity Officers.

³ Low = almost bordering with non relevance to the EIA process (heavily legislation led - very little discretion exercised, limited public facing aspect)

Full Equality Impact Assessment part:

Affected target group <i>(e.g. people with disabilities)</i>	Race	Disability	Gender	Age	Religion & belief	Rural
<p>Any particular segment within the target group</p> <p>Employees who may be on maternity / paternity leave</p> <p>Employees who are off for prolonged periods of time owing to a disability</p> <p>Employees who may not have English as a foreign</p>	x	x	x			
<p>Specific issues to be a subject of consultation</p> <p>Is the appraisal process fair?</p> <p>Are there any barriers for staff based on E&D issues which are barriers to having a positive appraisal?</p> <p>Have managers been able to deal with employees as individuals taking their specific E&D attributes into account when discussing and assessing performance?</p>						
<p>Outcomes of consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having a consistent performance appraisal approach was fair. However, there was discussion about 'one size fits all' – employees work at different levels and the scheme may not suit all parts of the organisation (although it was recognised that the use of team appraisals is an approach which works well in many areas). • Some cultures have a tradition of modesty which might make it harder for employees from that background to promote their achievements. • Employees who do not have 						

<p>English as their first language or who have literacy difficulties will find it more difficult to use the performance management process. In particular, the language used in the competency framework was felt to be complex and difficult to understand, and clearer English should be used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The message that there is now a mandatory Equality and Diversity Objective has not yet reached many parts of the organisation. 						
<p>What changes have been made as a result of the consultation outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competency framework is being revised to simplify the language and complexity. • Guidance • Focus groups to be held to get more detail on any barriers to employees having positive appraisals. Special focus on team appraisals • Updated guidance included on the i-West intranet for managers on how to manage employees who have been on long term maternity leave or sick leave as a result of a disability related illness • Review to be undertaken of the e-learning modules on appraisals for managers and staff to assess if they deal effectively with E&D issues in the performance management process. 						
<p>Feedback given to the consultees? Yes/No Feedback to be given to the</p>						

Employee Everybody In Panel during September 2011						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Gill Chamberlain

Lead person responsible the EIA

.....

Approved by Head of Service

Date: 30 October 2011

Next review of the EIA, measures put in place, changes:

(high – 1 year, medium – 2 years, low – 3 years)