

Equality Analysis

A. Policy/practice details

1. The title of the policy being analysed

Workload Allocation Model, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences.

2. Please explain the main purpose of the policy being analysed

The WAM is intended as a tool for ensuring that research, teaching and administrative/managerial responsibilities are distributed among academic staff, including Teaching Fellows, within departments and across departments of the Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences in an equitable, transparent and effective way.

It is H&SS Faculty policy that the WAM and allocations should be given to all relevant members of a specific department. Transparency across departments only takes place in the Faculty Executive, which includes the Heads of Department and which seeks in the longer run to further refine the WAM.

3. Who will be affected?

Academic staff of the six departments that form the Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences: Economics; Education; Health; Politics, Languages & International Studies; Psychology; Social & Policy Sciences.

Total core staff: 281

Since the various roles involve teaching and delivery of programmes, students and administrative staff will also be affected. However, only academic staff have been consulted for this Equality Analysis.

4. Aspects of the policy that particularly impact on equality and diversity

The Workload Allocation Model quantifies duties and provides guidelines for those who implement it, thus reducing the risk of discrimination. However, whilst the Head of Department can make special allowances, the overall prescriptiveness results in a degree of inflexibility which may prevent them from making adjustments to meet the needs of certain groups. Conversely, discretion in certain areas such as research allocations based on past performance and/or future promise may also lead to inequalities.

These aspects have the potential to impact on staff belonging to the following groups: Age, Disability, Gender, Pregnancy/Maternity, and staff with Parenting and Caring responsibilities.

One department appeared to depart substantially from the WAM in allocating higher percentages for research. While this leads to inequalities across departments, it does not appear to have negative consequences for protected groups.

B. Analysis

5. Please indicate evidence used and the process by which you have arrived at your conclusions.

Data used (provided by Human Resources)

There are a total of 281 Core Staff in the Education & Research Job Family within the Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences as at 30 June 2012.

Breakdown by Equality groups:

Total Number by Gender

Gender	Total Number
Female	138
Male	143
Grand Total	281

Total Number by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Total Number
Bangladeshi - Asian or Asian British	1
Black or Black British-African	2
Chinese or Other Ethnic Background-Chinese	4
Indian - Asian or Asian British	6
Information not yet sought	2
Information Refused	1
Mixed-White/Black African	1
Not known	11
Other Asian Background	3
Other Ethnic Background	4
Other Mixed background	1
Other White Background	78
White British	161
White Irish	6
Grand Total	281

Total Number by Age Range

Age Range	Total Number
22-30	28
31-40	79
41-50	81
51-60	58
60-65	27
Over 65	8
Grand Total	281

Total Number by Disability

Disability	Total Number
No	204
Not Known	71
Yes	6
Grand Total	281

16 staff were selected for consultation from all 6 departments. Individual interviews were held with 15 of them; 1 was consulted by email and by means of a written questionnaire. Out of the 16 interviewees, 8 were men and 8 women; 4 were non-white, 7 were white British and 5 of other white backgrounds. Some also volunteered the following information: 1 was gay; 1 was disabled; 7 had parenting and caring responsibilities; 2 belonged to the age range 51-60. There were 3 professors, 8 senior lecturers, 4 lecturers and 1 teaching fellow.

5 interviewees were responsible for implementing the Workload Allocation Model: 4 males and 1 female. The Head of Department is responsible for

allocating workloads, though this may be delegated. NB: All the Heads of Department in the Faculty are currently male.

Two slightly different sets of questions were used to guide the interviews for the two different groups of interviewees, those responsible for implementing the WAM and other staff.

Questionnaire for Heads of Department:

1. From your experience of implementing the WAM, do you have any concerns that the WAM could disadvantage academic staff belonging to the protected groups?
2. Were you aware of the particular needs of different protected groups when you made the workload allocations and what steps did you take to meet these needs? Can you give me some examples?
3. Can you think of any specific adjustments that had to be made in response to requests of protected groups? Did you encounter specific difficulties? Can you give me some examples?
4. Were academic staff informed of the existence of schemes such as Parents & Carers Flexible Working Policy? If so, how and at what stage of the workload allocation process?
5. What is the process by which academic staff can request amendments to their workload allocations if they feel amendments are needed?
6. Is there any section of the WAM that is discretionary and could adversely impact on protected groups?
7. Do you think the new WAM is an improvement to the model previously applied in your department?
8. With the benefit of experience and hindsight, do you think the WAM was well implemented? Is there anything that you feel could have been done better?
9. What did you learn from the experience of implementing the WAM? Is there anything else that could be done?
10. Please score the risk of potential adverse impact of the WAM on different protected groups in the table below (High = 3; Medium = 2; Low = 1).

Questionnaire for academic staff:

1. From your experience of the new Faculty WAM, do you think there is a risk that the WAM could disadvantage academic staff belonging to specific protected groups, and you in particular?
2. Are you willing to share any information about your membership of any of these groups?
3. Can you think of any specific adjustments to your workload that were made in response to your needs? Could you give me an example?
4. Were you informed of the existence of schemes such as Parents & Carers Flexible Working Policy? If so, how and at what stage of the workload allocation process?
5. Were you given an opportunity to request amendments to your workload allocation if you felt amendments were needed?
6. Is there any section of the WAM that is discretionary and you feel it adversely impacted on you?
7. Are you aware of any other adverse impact of the WAM in relation to protected groups?
8. Do you think the WAM was well implemented? Is there anything that you feel could have been done better? Is there anything else that could be done?
9. Do you think the new WAM is an improvement to the model previously applied in your department?
10. Please score the risk of potential adverse impact of the WAM on the protected group(s) that we have discussed using the following table (High = 3; Medium = 2; Low = 1).

The interviews yielded differing views and experiences:

Most interviewees saw transparency as the most positive aspect of the WAM. 10 out of the 16 thought that it was an improvement compared to past models (in one department there was no model at all), while they also pointed out underlying limitations and areas for improvement. The remaining 6 thought that it was either worse than the earlier model or that it had not been implemented well. A few said that there had been no consultation and that the WAM had been imposed from above. Many stressed that the WAM cannot be considered to reflect the real number of hours academic staff work, especially in the area of research, and that this must be kept in mind when assessing its potential impact on protected groups.

Differences in the implementation process adopted by the 6 departments emerged, especially in the collection of data concerning staff, consultation over duties, dissemination of the WAM, and making the allocations of all staff available. Not all of this had been done in all departments and staff in the same department had had different experiences. 5 interviewees had little idea of the WAM, had not been given it when they received their workload allocation, or had not yet seen their allocations. Those who had received their allocation had been invited to request adjustments: all of them were able to negotiate and their requests had been taken on board.

Further general comments on the merits and drawbacks of the WAM concerned the following areas:

- The degree of prescription, flexibility and discretion allowed by the WAM. Some thought it was too restrictive to allow adjustments for the diverse needs of protected groups as well as academic disciplines; others thought it left too much margin for discretion. Transparency was held to be essential for the WAM to work well and to reduce the risk of adverse impact on protected groups.

- Not all of those who implemented the WAM were aware of equality-related needs of staff in advance of preparing the allocations, which meant a number of adjustments had to be made after the provisional allocations were distributed. It was suggested that the WAM include: 1. a sentence on the Equality Duty; 2. a table of protected groups with impact scores (like the one required in this Equality Analysis); and that departmental Equalities & Diversity Officers be consulted when allocating tasks.

- Not all departments advertise the Parents & Carers Flexible Working Policy and new staff were not aware of it. It was clear to interviewees with parenting and caring responsibilities that the Policy is about organization of teaching and administration rather than exemptions. Some of them believed that exemptions should be applied, but they were aware that the WAM is bound by university and governmental policies.

- Many interviewees emphasized the added practical benefits of the WAM, if it is used well and appropriate preliminary consultation with staff is carried out. It enabled the Head of Department to obtain a clearer view of their staff's profile and activities, thus ensuring that appropriate advice was given and suitable tasks were allocated to promote staff's career progression. It granted staff a sense of ownership of their workload, helped them visualise their duties

and their developmental needs, encouraging them to think strategically and to plan their careers. It was suggested that WAM could be used as a tool for self-development to complement SDPR. This could be especially useful for such groups as women, disabled, probationers, staff from ethnic minorities, and parents and carers.

— The challenge for Heads of Department is to make adjustments for certain groups without discriminating against other staff. In that the new WAM affords a clearer picture of departmental capacity in relation to individual staff, Heads of Department felt they were better equipped to meet this challenge.

The interviewees voiced the following concerns with regard to protected groups:

1. The WAM is too inflexible to allow adjustments to meet the needs of parents of young children and carers, disabled staff, and older staff who are planning for retirement. These groups have less free time to carry out certain duties out of working hours or may require more time to carry out the same duties. Although there was no expectation of exemptions, it was noted that adjustments must be made to allow these groups to keep up with the pace.

2. Administrative and examination deadlines, a high number of temporary appointments, and uncertainty about staff retirements were identified as problematic with regard to groups listed in Point 1. Deadlines are imposed more and more from above and often at short notice, regardless of staff's needs and levels of experience. Additionally, frequent changes in staff make it difficult for managers to plan and may result in last-minute alterations to allocations to which the aforementioned groups may find it hard to adjust. This is an area of high impact for staff with disability.

3. The removal of the allowance for the preparation of new courses was considered as potentially damaging for staff from the same groups, who may have to find time for it outside working hours (this would also act as a disincentive to diversify one's teaching).

4. The issues highlighted in the previous points may in turn adversely impact on research, an area that most staff interviewed regarded as something that has to be done more and more during one's personal time. The knock-on effect on career progression was pointed out by many, as it is easy to fall into the vicious circle of not producing enough or not good enough research and being then regarded as non-research active. The fact that research is currently driven by REF compounds this problem.

5. Reduced allocations for research compared to previous models further reduce the ability of the same groups to produce research. This reduction has potential negative impact on mid-career staff, possibly women more than men, who thanks to experience (and the fact that they are regarded as reliable) are given demanding and time-consuming administrative responsibilities which further curtail their research time. At the same time it was recognised that senior women in administrative roles are good role models.

6. The way additional research allocation is granted can be very divisive and may impact on other staff, compounding the difficulties already highlighted. Staff who obtain grants that include buy-outs are normally

replaced with part-time Teaching Fellows, and this results in certain duties and responsibilities being shifted onto other staff.

7. The WAM makes no provisions for staff who have come out of research for any reason (pregnancy/maternity, illness etc.) to help them to get back into it.

8. Discretion over research gives too much power to the Heads of Department, leading potentially to discrimination. Even though transparency protects against abuse of the WAM, cultural differences and small numbers of academics from ethnic minorities at Bath may make it harder for these groups to request and negotiate changes and adjustments.

9. The prescriptive nature of the WAM might entail an increase in duties for older staff at a time when some may feel that their energy is decreasing. However, reduced workloads for this age group would impact on other staff. Conversely, it was also pointed out that managers could be tempted to use discretion to increase certain duties for colleagues who do not retire and do not carry a full load in order to force them out. Managing this age group was identified as a potential major issue. The risk of unfair treatment was considered high for this group.

10. The removal of differential, favourable, allocations for professors was welcomed, in that it helps to reduce impact on other groups, as professors tend to be male. By contrast, some interviewees felt that the WAM does not take into account sufficiently seniority and experience, which are likely to be linked to age, and which often entail an increase in external commitments and contributions to the wider academic community.

11. Some believed that managers interpret Age and Pregnancy/Maternity in too narrow a sense and suggested that a more nuanced interpretation was required to meet the needs of individual cases (to include, for example, time-off to attend clinics for fertility treatment).

12. The WAM is heavily skewed towards research and does not work well for Teaching Fellows, producing an intensification of work during the teaching periods. There is also a risk that one tutor becomes responsible for too many units and roles in relation to the same student cohort with the consequence that groups of students especially from ethnic minorities may find themselves unable to seek support. The Faculty's practice to only appoint fixed-term Teaching Fellows (rather than Lecturers) means that Teaching Fellows may be early career academics who are waiting to obtain lectureships. The WAM results in a high teaching load which impacts on other aspects of their career development. It appears that a high percentage of Teaching Fellows are women.

13. Fractional contracts do not scale down well in the WAM, bearing disproportionately on staff on such contracts, with the potential of impacting on older staff on phased retirement. Phased retirement and fractional contracts will also impact on other staff because of lack of university resources to compensate. Similarly, part-time replacements of full-time staff on maternity or sickness leave will impact adversely on other staff.

14. It was noted that certain central administrative posts (such as the departmental representative on the Equality & Diversity Network) were not

included in the WAM. It was believed that this work must be recognised and that allowances must be included in the WAM. This would also bring their existence to the attention of staff from protected groups and encourage them to get involved in areas where they could make an important contribution.

6. Risk of adverse impact on protected groups.

	High impact	Medium impact	Low impact
Age		√	
Disability		√	
Gender		√	
Pregnancy/Maternity*	√		
Race/ethnicity			√
Religion/belief			√
Sexual Orientation			√
Transgender			√
Marriage/civil partnership			√

*In relation to staff

C. Mitigating potential adverse impact

7. Conclusions and recommendations for amendments to the policy/practice. Please give an outline of the key actions based on any gaps, challenges, priorities and opportunities you have identified.

There is no element in the Workload Allocation Model which is directly discriminatory in respect of protected groups. However, the survey indicated that some aspects may have indirect differential impacts on some groups, also as a consequence of other Departmental, Faculty and University procedures and policies. The groups most at risk are: Age, Disability, Gender, Pregnancy/Maternity, and staff with Parenting and Caring responsibilities.

Recommendations:

1. Monitor the impact of WAM on older staff and staff on phased retirement to ensure they are treated fairly and consider allocating them duties that utilize their experience.
2. Review the WAM for Teaching Fellows and fractional posts.
3. Re-introduce allocation for the preparation of new courses.
4. Review discretionary research allocation.
5. Investigate ways of supporting staff who have come out of research for any reason (pregnancy/maternity, illness etc.) to help them get back into it, while also ensuring that this does not impact negatively on other staff.

Pregnancy/maternity should be taken to include related issues such as fertility.

6. Agree a procedure for the process of implementation of WAM, stating its different stages (including advertising Parents & Carers Flexible Working Policy), and apply it uniformly in all departments. Departmental Equalities & Diversity Officers to be involved in allocating duties.

7. Use data from the WAM to monitor distribution of administration, teaching and research by gender.

8. Heads of Department should monitor the impact of other University and Faculty procedures (including deadlines) on workloads.

9. Work out allowances for university administrative roles and include them in the WAM document, especially those related to Equality & Diversity, and promote these roles among staff.

10. Include a sentence about the Equality Duty and the score table for protected groups in the WAM document, in order to remind managers of considering Equality and Diversity issues when allocating workloads.

8. Timescale for implementation of changes or introduction of new policy.

2012-13

D. Publication

9. Final reporter:

Dr Adalgisa Giorgio

10. Date:

21st July 2012

11. Review date:

Spring of 2013, prior to preparation of workload allocations for 2013-14.