

Equality Analysis (EA)

School of Management

Work Allocation Model

A. Policy/practice details

1. The title of the policy being analysed.

Work Allocation Model, School of Management

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

The WAM is used as a tool to allocate teaching and ensure equitable distribution of lecturing, PhD supervision, and related responsibilities are allocated in a transparent way

3. Who will be affected?

Individuals responsible for teaching cohorts both at the undergraduate, post graduate and research intensive level (PhD) in the School of Management

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

The workload allocation model is designed in such a way that there should be very limited scope for discrimination, as it quantifies duties and provide guidelines for the implementation. The load model is based on the guidelines for the School of Management that outlines the teaching load for each grade, taking account of all other duties, research funding buy outs and any other factor that may impact on the teaching allocation distribution.

B. Analysis

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

This analysis comprises three elements, one descriptive element, a quantities regression analysis and a qualitative element. Each analysis is presented separately below.

A descriptive overview of individuals for protected groups is presented below. This is based on the data provided by HR, they did not provide information on sexual orientation, marriage/civil partnerships/transgender or religious believes.

Age break down:

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| 22-30 years of age: | 9 individuals |
| 31-40 years of age: | 28 individuals |
| 41-50 years of age: | 27 individuals |
| 51-60 years of age: | 15 individuals |
| 60-65 years of age: | 6 individuals |
| Over 65 years of age: | 5 individuals |

Only 1 male individual over 65 years of age was self- certified disabled.

34 members of academic teaching staff were women, 55 are men

Two women were on maternity leave over the relevant period.

The ethnical breakdown of the relevant staff affected by WAM is as follows:

| | |
|--|------|
| Black or Black British background | = 2 |
| Chinese or Other Ethnic Background-Chinese | = 8 |
| Indian - Asian or Asian British | = 2 |
| Not known | = 3 |
| Other Asian Background | = 1 |
| Other Ethnic background | = 1 |
| Other mixed background | = 1 |
| Other white background | = 31 |
| White British | = 37 |
| White Irish | = 3 |

The following analysis was conducted using linear regression analysis, descriptive statistics and Means testing. The data was based on the WAM for the School of Management.

The results of the descriptive analysis shows that the mean teaching load across the school was 562.48. The smallest load was 412 and the highest 723. Gender was binary coded, and the hierarchical level and ethnicity was

nominal so the results for these two groups are excluded, as we can allocated an average gender, or similarly an average ethnicity.

The regression analysis was conducted based on the following equation

$$Y = \alpha + \beta x^1 + \beta x^2 + \beta x^3 + \varepsilon$$

Where:

Y = Load allocated through the model

α = Intercept

βx^1 = gender

βx^2 = ethnicity

βx^3 = hierarchical level

ε = Error term

The dependent variable was therefore the load, gender and ethnicity were entered as the independent variables and hierarchical level (i.e. lecturer, senior lecturer, reader/professor) was controlled for.

Using case wise diagnostics with outliers 2 standard deviations, the results from the regression analysis shows that holding for gender, ethnicity and rank the intercept was 523.7, slightly lower than the outright mean. There was no statistically significant relationship found between load allocation and gender ($t=0.973$) so the results shows that there is no evidence that men or women are discriminated against through the use of the WAM. Similarly, there was no statistically significant relationship between ethnicity and load allocation ($t=-1.117$) again showing that there is no evidence that any particular racial group contributes significantly to explaining the load allocated. There was however a significant finding ($p=0.05$) between rank and WAM suggesting that more senior members of staff have a higher teaching load as we would expect, given that more junior members of staff are given a teaching remission in the load to focus on their research.

To further investigate the relationship between gender, ethnicity and WAM, a means test was conducted, which showed that on average, men have a marginally higher teaching load than women (<5%), though this is likely in part attributed to the higher number of male members of teaching staff than women. Similarly, the means testing for ethnicity showed that Whites, and Mixed-White/Black Africans had the highest teaching load with Asians and Other Backgrounds having the lowest. The difference between the highest and the lowest load was however less than 8%, and as it does not account for

the hierarchical distribution of staff across the grades, the real difference might even be smaller.

As there was a desire for qualitative data to be included in the completion of this report, the views of some deemed part of a protected group was sought.. Those who could talk to the relevant topic were targeted as individuals whose views could offer the most relevant insight. Therefore, the second stage of this analysis sought to understand the views of some individuals who fell into one of the other protected categories, namely those who had been on maternity leave or otherwise had responsibilities for young families. As the descriptive information provided by HR for reasons of data protection and confidentiality did not include any information as to who were deemed to be transgender, in a civil partnership or provide the sexual orientation of members of academic staff covered by WAM, these groups could not be covered. Two women had made use of maternity leave provisions in the relevant academic year and I received input from one of these women. The individual was asked to the following questions:

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). Table attached

The individual respondent raised no issues associated with her pregnancy. In responses to question one, which, sought to understand whether the WAM could be discriminatory against protected groups, she commented that; *“Some citizenship activities are currently not specified within the model and should be for this to be a complete workload model. This is true of all staff, not just those with ‘protected status’.”* In responding to adjustments made to the WAM in response to her maternity leave she stated that *“I was away for part of a summer and a term with no teaching so my maternity leave was not disruptive to activities other than my own research and needed few adjustments for others such as covering classes. There was informal help given to me by colleagues when my baby was born early and I thus could not attend supervisory meetings with my Masters students. I maintained all other activities other than research using keeping in touch days. So there were very few adjustments needed in my activities and nothing changed in my workload.”* Consequently, in response to question 5 she noted that no amendments were needed. She was not made aware of the Parents & Caterer’s’ flexible leave policy, but she did not feel that the WAM had negatively impacted on her, nor was she aware of any other protected groups who had been negatively impacted. She felt the WAM had been well implemented but that she could not comment on the old versus new model, as the current model was the same model that had been in use since her arrival in Bath. In response to question 10 she noted that: *“I think there is always the possibility that something like this can have a negative impact. However, this would be based more on individual needs than on status in a particular group. Therefore, I can’t answer the items in the table as I don’t know.”*

Additionally I sought out the responses from two heads of groups who had either had members of staff go on maternity leave or who themselves had young families. They were asked to respond to the following questions:

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? If yes, can you give me some examples?
3. If yes to the above, can you think of any specific adjustments that had to be made in response to requests of protected groups?
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. Is there any section of the WAM that is discretionary and could adversely impact on protected groups?

6. Do you think the new WAM is an improvement to the model previously applied in your department?

Neither of the two heads of groups noted any problems with implementing WAM. One noted that he saw it as a useful tool to discuss and distribute work loads across the group. In response to question 2, one respondent indicated that he was aware that individuals in the group required accommodation of child care and maternity leave but that “No special steps were taken in the allocation of workload, because, given the nature of the workload to be allocated the only issue for this group would be the timing of the work, not its scale. The timing of work is partly a matter for individual members of staff (in regards of various research and administrative duties which can be done when whenever the childcare schedule permits) and partly a matter for the timetabling office (in regards of teaching), which permits staff to opt-out of availability at certain times to accommodate childcare commitments during the working day.” Neither indicated that amendments to the WAM had been necessary to accommodate any protected groups, as the work load model was already flexible enough to accommodate existing requirements. One noted that any issues in this regards, if there were any, were not issues of the WAM but of the time tabling, which neither the WAM nor the Head of Group had any control over. There was no formal dissemination of parental and carer’s leave policy information, from the respondents to the other questions, this does not appear to have created any problems. Neither indicated that they perceived there to a problem with protected groups being adversely impacted by the model. Neither were aware of any other WAM model that had been used before.

6. Risk of adverse impact on protected groups.

From this analysis it is evident that the risk of adverse impact of discrimination in the WAM on the basis of ethnicity and gender is very low.

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

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.

From this analysis, there appears not be any issues that negatively impacts on protected groups stemming from the WAM. The statistical analysis showed that there are no statistically significant relationships suggesting that gender or ethnicity are groups that are negatively impacted by the WAM. Similarly, neither those who classified themselves as being in a protected group, nor those who were responsible for implementing WAM to individuals who were in protected groups noted any issues with the WAM, but noted that the way the time tabling office allocates teaching, does have scope for issues e.g. late scheduled classes the may clash with child care etc. The focus of any further work, should therefore lie with the timetabling office's practices, not with the WAM.

8. Time

scale for implementation of changes or introduction of new policy.

See above

D. Publication

9. Final reporter: Dr. Johanne Grosvold

10. Date: February 6 2013

11. Review date: February 6 2015