

# **University of Leicester**

## **Report to the Equal Opportunities Committee 15<sup>th</sup> May 2008.**

### **Equality Data Management Scheme**

#### **Introduction**

1. The purpose of this paper is to articulate the main considerations associated with the capture, analysis and utilisation of quantitative equality data for the University. Additionally it is to seek an agreement of what data we will collect and utilise.
2. In order to get a scheme into operation quickly the proposed data will only relate to race, disability, age and gender in terms of students and staff. In time it may be necessary to extend this range to include sexual orientation and religion or belief.
3. Where data collected under this scheme indicates the possibility of adverse impact then it may well be necessary to drill down and collect more data so that we can better understand what is happening.
4. Any activity arising from this scheme must comply with The Data Protection Act 1998. Data utilised in the scheme will not make reference to any individuals. Data will therefore not be disaggregated where individuals could be identified.

#### **The importance of quantitative data**

5. There is a specific duty contained within each statutory equality duty that requires the University to monitor its activities relevant to equality. Quite apart from this legal imperative there are a number of other good reasons for doing so. They include:-
  - a. Decisions or assertions need to be underpinned with data.
  - b. Data helps prioritise activity.
  - c. Good data assists in the defence of legal challenge.
  - d. It is difficult to achieve recognition for progress without evidencing improvement (e.g. Athena Swan)

- e. We cannot undertake meaningful Equality Impact Assessments (a specific duty in itself) without good data.
  - f. We cannot trace improvement without adequate data.
  - g. We need good data to understand properly the consequences of our policies.
6. It is also as well to bear in mind the business, moral and legal case for taking the actions suggested by data in the furtherance of equality of opportunity and healthy diversity.

### **Format of this Scheme**

7. The various issues that arise in the consideration of data collection seem to be best examined in the reverse order in which they will happen chronologically. Consequently it is at first important to understand and agree the outcome requirements of collecting data. In other words what do we need to know, and how will we use this new knowledge. This is shown at Table 1, divided between staff and student based data. Included within this Table are suggested reporting and publication arrangements.
8. Secondly there are inevitable problems that arise with respect to data collection. These are raised as issues within Table 1, but discussed more fully in Table 2. The information is segregated in this way to assist those whose activities involve the collection and analysis of raw data to identify relevant issues. In other words there are two quite distinct functions to perform, those of collection and those of extraction and analysis.

### **Glossary**

9. It may help to briefly define some terms used in this report.
- a. Equality Strand** The name given to a characteristic on the basis of which it is generally illegal to discriminate. E.g. gender, disability, ethnic origin.
  - b. Equality Group** A group of people defined by reference to an equality strand. E.g. women, person with a disability, Chinese.
  - c. Adverse Impact** Occurs when an equality group experiences an outcome from a policy that is measurably worse than other groups' experience.

## **Equality Strand categories**

10. The following categorisation is recommended
  - a. **Ethnicity** – We should continue to utilise the standard ethnicity categorisation used in the 2001 census.
  - b. **Disability** - Propose at first only disaggregating on the basis of with or without a disability. However HESA will require the University to collect additional information on types of disability from 2008/09 for staff.
  - c. **Age** – Use age bands as follows 16-21, 22-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 60-65, 65+, in accordance with ACAS guidelines. In specific instances we may wish to adopt different banding.
  - d. **Gender** - whilst we need to provide for the recording of transgender persons, at this stage I do not propose utilising such data as there may be data protection issues.

## **External Benchmarks**

11. As internal data becomes available we will wish to assess our comparative position through benchmarking our data against relevant external sources. At this stage no attempt has been made to stipulate appropriate sources of benchmark data though it is likely much use will be made of HESA statistics.

## **Detail of data required**

12. Table 1 describes what it is proposed to measure and why. Table 2 raises specific collection issues with proposed solutions.

## **Recommendation**

13. That this report is accepted as the basis for future equality data management and that the specific arrangements outlined in Tables 1 and 2 are adopted.

**TABLE 1 / STAFF**

<b>No</b>	<b>What do we want to measure? (All by equality groups based on gender, race, disability &amp; age)</b>	<b>Why and what will we do with it? (All data may be utilised for Equality Impact Assessments)</b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Data capture issues</b>
1	Representation by :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department</li> <li>• Grade</li> <li>• Job type</li> <li>• Contract type</li> <li>• F/T P/T</li> </ul>	To determine the extent of occupational segregation and the extent, if any, of differences in the success/contractual rights of different groups. Significant differences in representation may point to the existence of adverse impact on a particular group. If that is discovered further examination is required to understand why. <p><b>Reporting &amp; publication.</b> Report to Faculty EOC every term &amp; University EOC once per annum. Published through annual report of Equality Scheme.</p>	SAP	1.1 Numbers of employees where disability and ethnicity data is not known is high (17.5%). 1.2 Disability (and other HR data) is not validated periodically. 1.3 Some employees are known to fall within the definition of having a disability but are not recorded as such.
2	The relative success of different equality groups and home & international status in recruitment. We need to see proportions of each group broken down by department, grade and contract type in terms of:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications attracted</li> <li>• Being shortlisted</li> <li>• Being appointed</li> </ul>	To determine whether or not different groups apply for jobs in expected numbers and are successful in proportion to their relative population. Significant variance would suggest that those groups that do worse than expected may be experiencing adverse impact through the process. We would need to understand how and why this adverse impact was arising. A better understanding will lead to improvements in a process that is key to the success of the University. <p><b>Reporting &amp; publication.</b> Report to Faculty EOC every term &amp; University EOC once per annum. Published through annual report of Equality Scheme.</p>	SAP	2.1 Currently this will require the parallel use of an Access database. A permanent SAP solution will be preferable. 2.2 Recruitment for jobs in Estates (weekly paid), Bookshops, and Accommodation, Catering are not processed through SAP. They will therefore be missing from the data. A solution for this is required.

**TABLE 1 / STAFF**

<b>No</b>	<b>What do we want to measure? (All by equality groups based on gender, race, disability &amp; age)</b>	<b>Why and what will we do with it? (All data may be utilised for Equality Impact Assessments)</b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Data capture issues</b>
3	The relative success of different equality groups in promotion. We need to see proportions of each group broken down by department.	To determine whether or not different groups are successful in proportion to their relative population. Significant variance would suggest that those groups that do worse than expected may be experiencing adverse impact through the process. We would need to understand how and why this adverse impact was arising. A better understanding will lead to improvements in the process.  <b>Reporting &amp; publication.</b> Reported to Faculty EOC & University EOC once per year.	Tracking document held in HR	3.1 Promotion records not drawn from SAP so cross reference with other data will be difficult.
4	The relative access to training and development. Initially we need to identify a measure of training which I propose is defined in terms of training days irrespective of the type of training undertaken.	To determine if different groups are accessing or have access to training to broadly the same extent.  <b>Reporting &amp; publication.</b> Reported to Faculty EOC & University EOC once per year.	SAP	4.1 Only internal training courses are currently recorded.
5	The relative access to appraisal.	The process of appraisal is the University's main formal mechanism for setting objectives and identifying training needs. As such it is a mechanism that has significant influence on career prospects. Indeed outcomes are used to help inform promotion considerations at departmental	Dept	5.1 Record of appraisal is retained within departments. This would be cumbersome to collect.

**TABLE 1 / STAFF**

<b>No</b>	<b>What do we want to measure? (All by equality groups based on gender, race, disability &amp; age)</b>	<b>Why and what will we do with it? (All data may be utilised for Equality Impact Assessments)</b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Data capture issues</b>
		<p>level. Additionally it provides the opportunity for some staff to raise issues that may have an equality dimension.</p> <p><b>Reporting &amp; publication.</b> Reported to Faculty EOC &amp; University EOC once per year.</p>		
6	Occurrence of disciplinary and grievance processes.	<p>Disproportionate numbers of any group experiencing disciplinary processes or raising grievances may indicate issues relating to their equality group membership. This would require further examination.</p> <p><b>Reporting &amp; publication.</b> Reported to Faculty EOC &amp; University EOC once per year.</p>	HR	6.1 Information regarding discipline and grievance is not captured on any electronic database currently.

<b>TABLE 1 / STUDENTS</b>				
<b>No</b>	<b>What do we want to measure? (All by equality groups based on gender, race, disability &amp; age)</b>	<b>Why and what will we do with it? (All data may be utilised for Equality Impact Assessments)</b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Data capture issues</b>
7	Student admissions by:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Choice of subject</li> <li>• Home/International status</li> <li>• Selection method</li> <li>• Applications/offers/accepts</li> <li>• Part time/full time</li> </ul>	It is clearly useful for the University to know if there are groups that are not applying or are not as successful as others in being admitted. This might impact on how courses are marketed etc. Significant under representation of any group could mean that potential talent is being missed.  <b>Reporting &amp; publication.</b> Reported to Faculty EOC & University EOC once per year in February.	SITS	7.1 Disability data is not known until student arrives. 7.2 There is a high level of unknowns amongst distance learning and part time students 7.3 On a general basis equality data is not currently collected for international students.
8	Student representation by:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subject</li> <li>• Part time/full time</li> <li>• Distance Learning/Campus</li> <li>• u/g, pgt, pgr</li> </ul>	The University needs to know if certain groups are significantly under represented in some areas in order to alert itself to hidden barriers that may be a cause. Very significant subject based segregation will lower the advantage gained from having a diverse group.  <b>Reporting &amp; publication.</b> Reported to Faculty EOC & University EOC once per year in February.	SITS	

<b>TABLE 1 / STUDENTS</b>				
<b>No</b>	<b>What do we want to measure? (All by equality groups based on gender, race, disability &amp; age)</b>	<b>Why and what will we do with it? (All data may be utilised for Equality Impact Assessments)</b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Data capture issues</b>
9	Student progress by:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drop outs</li> <li>• Qualification outcomes</li> <li>• Destinations</li> </ul>	Do members of certain groups under-achieve? If so the University will want to discover why and what can be done about it.  <b>Reporting &amp; publication.</b> Reported to Faculty EOC & University EOC once per year in May.	SITS  DLHE	9.1 Destination data is not currently linked to SITS therefore outcomes cannot be correlated to equality data.
10	Student experience by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfaction feedback</li> <li>• Complaints (e.g. harassment/bullying complaints)</li> </ul>	Do members of some groups experience more problems than other groups? Do some groups seem to be better served by the University than others? These are all issues that are important for the University to understand and hopefully be in a position to utilise success to promote the University.  <b>Reporting &amp; publication.</b> Reported to Faculty EOC & University EOC once per year in May.	Satisfaction survey outcome (Excel)	10.1 Disability data not currently collected.

**TABLE 2 / STAFF**

<b>No</b>	<b>Data Capture Issue</b>	<b>Comment and Proposed Action</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>
1.1	Numbers of employees where disability and ethnicity data is not known is high (17.5%).	The wording on the equality monitoring form should be amended to encourage improved declaration rate. A short definition (under DDA) should be given against which employees are able to make an assessment together with a clear statement that we will make reasonable adjustments during the selection process and at work if appointed. This is a shift in the University's current approach which requires staff to make a declaration without reference to the statutory definition.	Equality Adviser	May 08
1.2	Disability (and other HR data) is not validated periodically.	Disability and other information relating to people changes from time to time. A periodic validation process (perhaps linked to a staff survey) should be carried out in order to capture this information and encourage non returners. Equality Officers have a valuable role in encouraging those few reluctant to give information. Data must be handled sensitively and confidentially and assurances given to that effect. The additional information on disability type required by HESA from 2008/09 will need to be collected through a validation process.	HR	Project work in HR is currently being prioritised. An accurate timeframe will be determined after this exercise.
1.3	Some employees are known to fall within the definition of having a disability but are not recorded as such.	See recommendation above.	HR	As above
2.1	Currently this will require the parallel use of an Access database. A permanent SAP solution will be preferable.	The HR Manager has already put in place a process to do this. There is also an agreed action within HR to reach a permanent solution utilising SAP.	HR	As above

**TABLE 2 / STAFF**

<b>No</b>	<b>Data Capture Issue</b>	<b>Comment and Proposed Action</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>
2.2	Recruitment for jobs in Estates (weekly paid), Bookshops, and Accommodation, Catering are not processed through SAP. They will therefore be missing from the data. A solution for this is required.	It is recommended that HR and the relevant departments are asked to seek a solution to this issue. It is proposed that they seek a solution that utilises information technology to lesson current administrative burdens and increase the 'added value' provided by a professional HR service.	HR	As above
3.1	Promotion record not drawn from SAP so cross reference with other data will be difficult.	Numbers here are not great and the Equalities Assistant is able cross reference appropriate data.	n/a	n/a
4.1	Only internal training courses are currently recorded.	A good record of internal courses attended is currently held for each individual employee. Initially this will provide a sufficient indication as to whether some groups have significantly more or less access to training.	n/a	n/a
5.1	Record of appraisal is retained within departments. This would be cumbersome to collect and the current scheme requires such information remains in Staff Development.	Appraisal is a key tool within the University's performance management processes. Assurance that they take place as agreed and in a way that is worthwhile seems a very valid aim for the University quite apart from the equality issues. It is recommended that this matter is examined through HR to find ways of collecting equality information regarding appraisal.	HR	Awaiting prioritisation exercise
6.1	Information regarding discipline and grievance is not captured on any electronic database currently.	Numbers are relatively small and could be collected manually.	HR	On going

**TABLE 2 / STUDENTS**

<b>No</b>	<b>Data Capture Issue</b>	<b>Comment and Proposed Action</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>
7.1	Disability data is not known until student arrives.	This is the subject of a current investigation arising from the last meeting of Equal Opportunities Committee. It is proposed one collection method will be identified and used throughout the University as soon as students arrive at the start of the year.	PC	Sept 08
7.2	There is a high level of unknowns amongst distance learning and part time students.	This data is collected only once. Data will be collected on line in future to encourage more returns. Also consideration could be given to follow up actions to chase missing data.	JM/Equalities Adviser	Ongoing
7.3	On a general basis equality data is not currently collected for international students.	This is a complex issue. Recent advice indicates we need to monitor international students and also students who study abroad. This report merely flags up the need to attend to this issue and report back.	Equality Adviser/JM	Nov 08 (report back)
10.1	Disability data not currently collected on student satisfaction survey.	It is proposed that disability data be collected with effect from the survey carried out in January 2009.	MG	Jan 09