

Annex F

Governance Assurance Process - Staffing Profiles ~ Equalities Analysis

1. Introduction

The current DH transition programme is large and complex in nature, involving a high degree of re-organisation and change. This paper looks at the issues for the DH workforce, specifically whether there are any issues from an equality perspective which warrant discussion and further investigation.

To fulfil its duties under the Equality Act, DH must demonstrate how it pays due regard to the protected characteristics in the decisions that are made. The Equality Act characteristics relevant to this analysis are: ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, religion/faith and belief, and disability. In addition, DH includes work pattern (FT/PT), location and caring responsibilities in all diversity monitoring and equality analysis exercises.

This paper sets out the key findings from the equalities analysis for the Governance Assurance Panel process, in which the proposals in relation to permanent staff were scrutinised for fairness and consistency. This process took place during the period October 2011 to January 2012.

2. Scope of the analysis

The analysis :

- § Covered AO to grade 6 staff.
- § Related to the governance process for people not posts (whilst recognising that the two processes are not entirely discrete and independent)
- § Reflected the impact on people – using ‘slot-ins’ as the most desirable position for individuals¹.
- § Provided an interim understanding of the impact

3. Analysis - conclusions

A total of 1557 staff were included in this analysis:

- § 75% were slotted in to ‘permanent and enduring roles’
- § 4% went forward to limited competitions
- § 16% were in time-limited transition roles
- § 5% were displaced

¹ Recognising that there is a hierarchy of ‘desirable’ positions beyond ‘slotting in’. Further analysis will take place on the results of selection exercises; transition pool activity; and exits.

There was a high slot-in rate at just over 75%. However, this rate varied by equality characteristic. In order to quantify whether there had been any potential bias in the decision making process, we used methodology called “contingency testing”. In brief, it allowed us to test whether the attributes were independent of each other or whether there was evidence of an association between them. The table below summarises the results for each equality characteristic at the 5% level of significance².

Equality Characteristics	Conclusion at 5% significance level
Gender	Acceptance for slot-in is independent of gender
Ethnicity	There is evidence of association between ethnicity and slot-in
Age	Acceptance for slot-in is independent of age
Location	There is evidence of association between location and slot-in
Caring Responsibility	Acceptance for slot-in is independent of caring responsibility
Religion	Acceptance for slot-in is independent of religion
Sexual Orientation	Acceptance for slot-in is independent of sexual orientation
Disability	There is evidence of association between disability and slot-in
Work Pattern	Acceptance for slot-in is independent of work pattern

- § The relationship with ethnicity and location was ruled out by further analysis. In both cases, the category that generated the *positive association* was “Unknown”³, which performed better than the other categories.
- § There was a *positive association* for those who have declared a disability. They were more likely to be slotted-in than those who have not (85% vs 76%).

4. Conclusions

The analysis above focuses on each of the protected characteristics in the Equality Act 2010 as well as the additional factors we are interested in as employers. The results of the work showed that there had been very little unintended effect on equality and diversity issues relating to whether people were slotted-in.

² The significance level represents the probability of rejecting a hypothesis when it is in fact true. The choice is dictated by procedural standards, it is *the customary level in statistical analyses*, and it allows for a 5% rate of errors in rejecting.

³ These results are, hence, statistically significant but do not have a specific meaning in this context.