

## **Annex C**

### **Voluntary Early Severance Scheme – Equality Analysis**

#### Summary

A total of 397 applications were considered by exit panels in February 2011, of which 254 applications were successful, making an overall acceptance rate of 66%. This rate varied by equality characteristic and further analysis was conducted in order to quantify whether there had been any potential bias in the decision making process.

#### Diversity Characteristics

The analysis examined the likelihood of bias on the basis of gender, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, location, age or grade.

#### Methodology

“Contingency testing” was used to test whether the attributes<sup>1</sup> were independent of each other or whether there was evidence of an association between them; using the 5% level of significance.

#### Conclusions

The results of the work showed that there had been very little unintended effect on equality and diversity issues relating to whether people were successful in the VES. The associations that the analysis picked up were those that we would expect in a scheme which was clear in its intention to be aimed towards those in higher grades or those for whom the financial package<sup>2</sup> would be more attractive.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 2 attributes were “being accepted for VES” and each equality characteristic in turn.

<sup>2</sup> The terms of which were set by Treasury.



## Annex E

# The hub

Everything you need to know about change  
in the Department and the wider system



[Skip to content](#)

## Transition equalities analysis – conclusions published

Posted on [12 June, 2012](#)

An equalities analysis is being carried out at each stage of the transition programme and the conclusions of each analysis will be published, as stated in the DH HR Framework. The results of the first analysis showed that there had been very little unintended effect on equality and diversity issues relating to whether people were slotted-in.

As you may know, the Department looked at the impact on equalities when determining the staffing profiles for the new DH structures. This was done at the time of approving these profiles for each directorate or branch using a Governance Assurance Panel chaired by Flora Goldhill (then Director General of the Corporate Development Directorate). There was also senior level membership from across the new DH and a representative from the Departmental Trade Unions. The process took place during the period from October 2011 to January 2012. The panel reviewed the equalities considerations before approving the proposals, quite often seeking further information before final sign-off.

An organisation wide analysis was completed at the end of the process and is detailed in full in the [attached document](#). The high-level themes are set out below.

### Headline findings

- 75% of the staff in question were confirmed in their current roles.
- The analysis went beyond the basic requirements of equalities legislation and included grade, work pattern (FT/PT), location and caring responsibilities in its scope.
- The results of this analysis showed that there had been very little unintended effect on equality and diversity issues relating to whether people were slotted-in.

### Your views count

The statistical analysis is just one piece of the equation and further work is underway to complete the picture.

HR have sought views from the staff diversity networks on people's experience of the processes that informed the directorate structures and the staffing profiles. The themes that we have covered include:

- § general communications
- § consultation and engagement on the new structures (at directorate, team and individual levels)
- § line manager support
- § perceptions of fairness and consistency (within and across directorates).

The feedback will be taken forward to the next stages of transition and will inform the broader diversity strategy. If you have thoughts and comments on what worked well, what was less effective, and what we should be focussing on in the coming months, do get in touch using the [HR mailbox](#).

HR plans to publish the findings from the equalities analysis for the open competition in June.

For more information contact [Karen Fonseca](#), Head of Diversity, HR, or [Pip Parr](#), Deputy Director, HR Change team.

This entry was posted in [Home](#) and tagged [June 2012](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

← [New Very Senior Manager \(VSM\) posts at the NHS Commissioning Board](#)

[NHS Blood and Transplant – non executive directors reappointed](#) →

## **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 individuals<sup>3</sup>.
- § 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

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

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

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 significance<sup>4</sup>.

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”<sup>5</sup>, 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> These results are, hence, statistically significant but do not have a specific meaning in this context.