SPCB Response to the Staff Equality Audit 2009

Introduction

1. Every two years the SPCB has committed to undertaking an equality staff audit to establish whether its equality policies are having a positive impact on the working culture. We asked staff to inform us about their experiences of working in the Parliament and what impact they think the SPCB equality policies have made on our employment practices. This is the fourth audit which the SPCB has carried out since 2003.

2. The findings of the 2009 audit have now been published and this report provides a response to the main findings identified in the report.

Main Strengths

3. In summer 2009, all staff received an electronic version of the staff audit questionnaire and in line with previous audits there was a positive response, with 87.5% of SPCB staff responding to the full survey. A similar response rate has been received for previous equality staff audits carried out by the SPCB.

4. Overall, the report reflects an organisational culture which promotes equality and fairness and good employment practices which are accessible and open to everyone. The report shows that:

   - over 90% of staff who responded consider that the SPCB fosters a culture which embraces equality and diversity;
   - almost 90% of staff who responded said they would recommend the SPCB as an employer;
   - over 80% agree with the view that staff understand the importance of equality in the workplace; and
   - Over 90% of staff respondents were satisfied that the organisation does its best to accommodate staff with flexible working arrangements.

5. This is indeed a positive reflection on our working practices and it shows that the SPCB has made good progress through its equality and employment practices to ensure that staff are treated equally, irrespective of their background, status or personal characteristics. There is a sense that staff feel valued by the organisation and they consider our practices to be fair and equal.

Areas for Further Consideration

6. As an organisation committed to equality, the SPCB is not complacent about the findings and accordingly the SPCB considers it important that the Clerk/Chief
Executive and the Strategic Leadership Team use the findings of this audit report to build on the success of our equality policies and identify areas where it can develop further.

7. The following information sets out those audit findings where more work is required along with the SPCB response and any actions which we propose to take forward.

Audit Finding

8. The audit reveals that there has been a steady increase in the number of staff who report they are disabled in the staffing group.

Our Response

9. These findings are encouraging as they show that there is no major difference between the number of individuals who have declared a disability anonymously through the audit and those who have disclosed their disability to Human Resources (HR). This is positive as it suggests that there is an open culture in the organisation with staff generally feeling that they will not be discriminated against if they disclose their disability.

10. There is, however, a small discrepancy in the two figures and it will be important for the SPCB to continue to be proactive in supporting the needs of disabled staff. HR has, in the past, carried out a disability audit which was a successful exercise in encouraging staff who wanted to come forward to discuss their needs with HR.

11. HR will continue to carry out these audits every year to give current and new staff the opportunity to disclose their disability. While we fully appreciate that there will be some staff who may not want to disclose their disability, it is likely that, with an ageing workforce (as was highlighted in the audit), there could be a continuing upward trend in the number of disabled staff working in the organisation. As long as the figures recorded by HR closely resemble the figures in the staff audit, we can be assured that we are doing what we can to foster an environment where disabled people can be confident about disclosing their disability.

Audit Finding

12. The audit reveals that 12 staff who consider themselves as disabled did not feel that the support they received was regularly reviewed.

Our Response

13. HR and the Strategy and Development Office (SDO) are fully aware of the need to make further improvements to the process for reviewing the support needs of disabled staff. In 2008, SDO actively sought the views of disabled staff to
ascertain whether appropriate provision was made for reasonable adjustments in the workplace. A regular review process was one area which was identified by staff who felt this would be beneficial to their ongoing review of support needs at work.

14. These views were fed into the work of the Disability Equality Scheme where specific actions have been developed to create a more effective process for reviewing support needs with a view to improving dialogue between disabled staff, HR and line managers. It will enable disabled staff to discuss their support needs more regularly, check whether they are working well and consider if any further adjustments need to be made.

15. Guidance is also being produced for line managers on how to manage disability in the workplace as most of the support needs are usually managed through the line manager with support from Human Resources. There will, of course, be some staff who may not wish to disclose their disability to their line manager, but if adjustments are needed, their line manager is likely to be involved in any support that is put in place.

**Audit Finding**

16. The audit reveals that staff in lower grades compared to staff in higher grades did not feel they are as valued and supported by the organisation.

**Our Response**

17. The SPCB is committed to creating a culture in which everyone feels valued regardless of their grade, background or personal characteristics. Additionally, every effort has been made to ensure that all staff have equal access to our employment practices, as well as professional and personal development opportunities. While this particular finding suggests that some staff in lower grades feel less valued as indicated above, the majority of staff who responded to the survey felt that the SPCB fosters a culture which promotes equality and diversity.

18. It is not entirely surprising that there should be these differences in perception between individuals in different grades in the organisation. We would expect this to be a similar issue in other organisations of a similar size and structure. However, we are not complacent and therefore looked at the breakdown of the figures and identified that these views stem mainly from one business area. Our aim will be to work closely with line managers in that particular business area to promote a strong equality ethos and working practices.
Audit Finding

The report highlights that staff who work part time perceive their career prospects as being limited because of their part time status. In addition, there is a gender dimension to this finding as the majority of staff who work part time are women.

Our Response

19. The SPCB works from the premise that anyone can apply for a post whether they work full time or part time and that all jobs can be offered on a job share basis.

20. When advertising posts, we are proactive in encouraging people who want to work on a job share basis by including a statement that we welcome applications on a job share basis. Only in extremely exceptional circumstances would a post be advertised without including this statement.

21. For internal adverts, this statement is not included and this is partly because the SPCB has a separate policy which supports staff who wish to request part time working or job share. However, to make this option more visible we will now arrange for this statement to be included in all internal job adverts.

22. HR will also look at the options available to staff for part time working, including reviewing the number of requests received from staff for part time/job share working and whether these are accepted or not.

23. Further consideration will also be given to forming a job share bank which could encourage more part time staff to apply for internal posts.

24. A specific positive development since the Audit was carried out is the restructuring of Clerking to create five business units which will operate in a more flexible way than the current team-based structure and, accordingly, will offer more development opportunities for part time members of staff.

Audit Finding

25. One in five staff who responded to the survey wished to comment about promotion in the Parliament. Most of the staff who responded felt that opportunities for promotion were limited and were concerned about the future impact on staff and their career development.

Our Response

26. Although this is not specifically an equality issue, it is important to highlight this finding. The SPCB is fully aware of this perception, which has been highlighted through other initiatives such as the Corporate Change Programme. There are a
number of factors relating to the organisational context and structure that may be influencing the views of staff on promotion.

27. Firstly, the SPS is seen as having a flat organisational structure which means there is relatively little scope for movement upwards. Secondly, there is a low turnover of staff. There are many positive aspects of working at the Parliament that make people stay which ultimately will affect opportunities for promotion. Interestingly, the audit shows that the vast majority of staff who responded (around 90%) would recommend the SPCB as an employer. This may well be attributable to the terms and conditions as well as the uniqueness of the environment within which we work.

28. It is important to note that permanent opportunities are openly advertised either internally or externally and that all eligible staff (i.e. those who have successfully completed their probationary period) are free to apply for any post they wish to. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of temporary posts are also advertised to eligible staff providing a significant number of avenues for development in the absence of large numbers of permanent promotion opportunities.

29. Additionally, we have looked at alternative ways of supporting the development of staff. The Interchange Policy was developed in response to this need and encourages staff to consider taking up secondment or other exchange opportunities by advertising a considerable number of such opportunities with a variety of comparable organisations to all eligible staff. The organisation is also very open to publicising opportunities with organisations which do not fall within the formal interchange agreements.

30. In addition, the SPCB has supported staff investigating such initiatives themselves, and a number of staff have successfully explored and arranged highly beneficial secondments in the past. Clearly, management also has an important role to play in facilitating such secondments by being supportive of staff wishing to explore such opportunities where appropriate.

31. The revisions we have made to our performance management system will reinforce the value of taking advantage of more diverse development opportunities and encourage staff to consider a longer term approach to Professional Development Planning. To complement this approach we are developing a range of new workshops (Professional Development Planning, Interview Techniques) and approaches to support staff and managers in meeting their development needs.

Audit Finding

32. The 2009 audit shows a slight increase in the number of black and minority ethnic staff in the staffing group.
Our Response

33. This figure might only look like a slight increase, but it shows that the work we have done to tackle the under-representation of black and minority ethnic staff is having some effect on the make-up of our staff profile. Our ethnic profile now reflects the Scottish 2001 census figure of 2.2% which represents the black and minority ethnic population living in Scotland.

34. However, we recognise that this figure does not truly reflect today’s Scottish black and minority ethnic population which according to the Equality and Human Rights Commission is more likely to be in the region of 5%. We will therefore continue to focus on positive action measures towards increasing our engagement with black and minority ethnic groups by attending job fairs, providing placements, targeted advertising and other initiatives which promote positive action.

35. These commitments have been incorporated into the SPCB’s Race Equality Scheme action plan 2008-11.

Audit Finding

36. The 2009 audit has shown that there is a slight increase in the perception among some staff that they had experienced unacceptable behaviour in the workplace.

Our Response

37. As an organisation we are committed to creating a workplace where everyone is treated with dignity and respect. We will not condone any form of behaviour which is deemed to be offensive and will take serious action if anyone displays such behaviour in the workplace. The nature of people working together in an organisation is that, from time to time, conflict will arise. What matters is how that conflict is managed and that everyone is treated fairly and with respect at all times. This is why it is important that we do not shy away from asking the question of staff so that appropriate action can be taken to enable everyone to be able to fulfil their potential.

38. This year’s audit has shown that some staff perceived they had experienced unacceptable behaviour. While the figure is, on the face of it, higher than the figure in the previous survey, this is due in large part to widening the scope of the question. We previously asked staff whether they had experienced harassment or bullying in the last twelve months. We now ask the same question but with two additional types of behaviour to help staff distinguish between behaviours which they consider as unreasonable but not offensive or hostile and those which are unacceptable that constitute harassment, bullying and discrimination.
39. Whilst it is important that all staff are treated respectfully at work we are most concerned about addressing those behaviours where it adversely affects a person’s confidence and their ability to perform at work and which are serious enough to constitute harassment, bullying and discrimination.

40. In light of the audit findings, we examined the issues more closely and gathered information from Human Resources to establish the number of formal cases raised under the Dignity at Work policy during the same period as the staff audit. In total, there was only one formal complaint reported to Human Resources under our Dignity at Work policy. This complaint was resolved internally which signifies there were no Dignity at Work cases serious enough to have constituted a disciplinary offence.

41. We are also encouraged that the audit shows that the vast majority of staff (over 90% of audit respondents) believe that the SPCB fosters a culture which embraces equality and diversity and that staff (over 80% of audit respondents) understand the importance of equality in the workplace.

42. The SPCB promotes a zero tolerance approach to unacceptable behaviour and has policies in place to deal with unacceptable behaviour and which promote dignity and respect in the workplace.

43. The Dignity at Work Policy sets out a range of options to help staff deal with behaviours which constitute harassment, bullying, victimisation or discrimination. We have very recently reviewed and updated the Dignity at Work Policy, in particular, in respect of making a clearer distinction between firm management and bullying behaviour, so that staff are better informed about what constitutes inappropriate behaviour. In addition, the formal procedures have been improved and there is a greater emphasis on involving line managers at an informal level.

44. Furthermore, we recently established a new Dignity at Work network which we hope will help staff to come forward and discuss their concerns with a Dignity at Work Contact. All Contacts and Investigating Officers are newly appointed and specially trained which should hopefully encourage staff to use the service if they need it. The Clerk/Chief Executive has championed the promotion of this Network and has written to the Operational Management Group to ensure that this information is cascaded to all staff and that everyone is made aware of the revised policy. We have also arranged a briefing session for staff with a view to raising staff awareness of the revised policy and promoting the new network.
# SPCB Equality Audit Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Area</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Delivery by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>HR will conduct an annual audit of staffing group to identify individual needs of disabled staff.</td>
<td>Human Resources Advisers</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>The Disability Equality Scheme Action Plan identifies the need to develop guidance for line managers on managing disability at work and to review and develop the process for reviewing the support needs of disabled staff.</td>
<td>Human Resources Policy Adviser</td>
<td>Human Resources/ SDO Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>HR will collect data on (1) the number of requests from staff for part time/ job share working (2) the application and success rates of part time/ job share/ full time post-holders in applying for posts.</td>
<td>Human Resources Operations Manager</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>HR will ensure that all internally advertised positions will include a statement that job share applications are welcomed.</td>
<td>Recruitment Manager</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Professional and leadership development training will be offered to enable staff to maximise their full potential.</td>
<td>Learning and Capability Development Manager</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>The Race Equality Scheme identifies positive action measures to increase the representation of staff from black and minority ethnic groups.</td>
<td>Recruitment Manager</td>
<td>Human Resources/ SDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity at Work</td>
<td>Review and update the Dignity at Work policy including a refresh of the Dignity at Work Network of Contacts and Investigating Officers and communicate the revised policy to all staff</td>
<td>Equalities Manager</td>
<td>SDO Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES STAFF AUDIT

STEPHEN HERBERT

This paper reports on the results of the Equal Opportunities Staff Audit of SPCB employees which was conducted during the summer of 2009.
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SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The 2009 Equal Opportunities Staff Audit introduced a number of new questions which attempted to ascertain to what extent equality values and a culture of equality were held by employees of the SPCB. Broadly responses to these questions suggest that the organisational culture of the SPCB promotes equality considerations. Over 90% of respondents considered that the SPCB fosters a culture which promotes equality. Large proportions of respondents, broadly between 70% and 80%, considered that the organisation supported and valued staff and, fostered a culture of openness. This was reinforced by 90% of respondents stating that they would recommend the SPCB as an employer and 83% agreeing with the proposition that staff understand the importance of equality in the workplace. When general comments were sought on the performance of the organisation with regard to equality policies, this tended to favour the earlier positive findings with regard to the performance of the SPCB.

Access to training and development opportunities appear to be well-embedded across the organisation. With regard to unacceptable behaviour, 76.4% of respondents had not experienced such behaviour and a further 4.9% preferred not to answer this question. In terms of trade union membership, there was no evidence of discrimination or harassment as a result of membership of or involvement with trade union activities (or indeed as a result of non trade union membership). Trade union membership has fallen slightly across the workplace since 2007. Respondents to the survey who were female, single and younger members of staff were less likely to be members of a trade union.

Work life balance policies appear to be well entrenched across the organisation with 90% of respondents satisfied that the organisation does its best to accommodate staff who require a flexible working arrangement and that respondents could balance work and home life. However, there were some variations in the level of satisfaction with work life balance arrangements depending upon the grade and office respondents were employed within, and the caring responsibilities of respondents. 6.5% of respondents stated that they had been refused a flexible working request. Generally, such refusals appear to have been refused as a result of workload pressures or due to a lack of cover to meet the request.

Over the past year 17% of respondents had applied for promotion. Those on lower grades were most likely to have applied for promotion whilst the proportion of those applying for promotion varied considerably by office. Respondents with a disability were less likely to have applied for promotion. Only 3% of respondents considered that their ‘personal characteristics’ may have affected their chances of promotion although 21% did not know if this was the case. However, a range of concerns were raised with regard to career progression within the Parliament. Firstly, that the organisational structure of the Parliament, and the relatively small size of the
organisation, limits the opportunities for promotion. Secondly, there was a sense amongst some respondents that it was becoming increasingly difficult to achieve promotion and a sense of demoralisation amongst some respondents with regard to promotion prospects. In relation to these issues a small number of respondents suggested that a scheme could be put in place to promote secondments in order to partly deal with this situation. Thirdly, there was unease about the use of temporary promotions. Lastly, concerns were raised regarding the overall transparency of the promotion system.

When the issues of appraisal and disciplinary proceedings were considered, few issues emerged with results largely similar to those from previous Audits. Only 3% of respondents considered that their personal characteristics may have affected their appraisal marking whilst only 1% of respondents had been the subject of an investigation under the SPCB’s disciplinary proceedings.

Finally, in terms of the personal characteristics of the SPCB workforce a number of trends were apparent. Firstly, the age profile of the workforce continues to age gradually continuing a trend which had been evident in previous Audits. Secondly, the proportion of respondents who state that they have a disability had increased in previous Audits and this trend continued in 2009. For example, in 2003 5.8% of respondents stated that they had a disability compared to 8.7% in 2009. Thirdly, female employees are more likely to have a part-time contract than male employees. 94.7% of male respondents worked on a full-time basis compared to 78.9% of female respondents. The proportion of part-time employees also continued to increase, albeit gradually, from 10.6% of respondents in 2007 to 13% in 2009. Fourthly, the proportion of staff who consider their nationality to be ‘Scottish’ declined to 68.1% in 2009 continuing a trend which has been evident in previous Audits. Lastly, the proportion of the SPCB workforce with caring responsibilities (for either a child or an adult) had been highlighted as increasing in previous Audits and this continued in 2009. In 2009, 31.4% of respondents had caring or parental responsibilities for a child and a further 8.5% had caring responsibilities for someone other than a child.
INTRODUCTION
This report presents the results of the Equalities Staff Audit (2009). The Audit was conducted during the summer of 2009. The results are presented in line with the structure of the questionnaire as distributed to Scottish Parliament staff. The key areas of questioning were:

Section 1
1. Culture and Values

Section 2
2. Access to Training and Development Opportunities
3. Unacceptable Behaviour
4. Trade Union Membership and Activities
5. Work Life Balance
6. Career Progression / Internal Promotion
7. Appraisal
8. Disciplinary Proceedings
9. Views on Equality

Section 3
10. Personal Information

There were 476 responses to the 2009 Audit representing 87.5% of Scottish Parliament staff\(^1\). This compares to a 86.5% response rate in 2007, 90.8% in 2005 and a 87% response rate in 2003. Data was collected and coded via Globalpark survey software in order to safeguard the anonymity of responses. The analysis of responses was conducted by SPICe research. The methodology adopted in the production of this report is provided in Annex One. Annex Two provides a copy of the questionnaire. It is important to note that the equality staff audit seeks to ascertain the perceptions of respondents with regard to the operation of equality policies in the Parliament.

---

\(^1\) 544 staff were employed by the SPCB in 2008. See SPCB ‘Equalities Annual Report 2008/09’ p.17. Figures for 2009?
CULTURE AND VALUES

The first section of the survey sought the views of respondents, in broad terms, regarding the SPCB working culture and whether the values of equality and fairness are widely shared across the organisation. There were 476 responses to all the questions in this section.

Firstly, the survey asked ‘would you regard the SPCB as having a culture which promotes equality?’ 90.5% (431) of respondents considered that the SPCB does have a culture which promotes equality. 5.4% (24) considered that this was not the case and 4.4% (21) ‘preferred not to answer’.

Views were then sought on whether respondents believed that ‘the culture promotes a working environment where staff feel valued and supported by the organisation?’ (Question 1.2). The responses were as follows:

- 75.6% (360) agreed with the proposition in Question 2
- 16.4% (78) disagreed
- 8.0% (38) preferred not to answer

Respondents on higher grades generally tended to be more likely to support this proposition than those on lower grades. For example, 96.9% of those on Grade 6 and 100% of those on Grade 7 and above supported this proposition compared to 73.6% at Grade 2 (see table below).

| Number and % Responding that Staff Feel Valued and Supported by the Organisation by Grade |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                               | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 / Chief Exec |
| N                                             | 89      | 44      | 54      | 55      | 31      | 7      | 4               |
| %                                             | 73.6%   | 77.2%   | 78.3%   | 87.3%   | 96.9%   | 100.0% | 100.0%          |

Similarly those in older age bands were also less likely to consider that they are valued and supported by the organisation than those in younger age bands. Responses by ‘office / group’ tended to be more uniform with the exception of the ‘Security Office’ where only 54.7% of respondents felt valued and supported as opposed to 75.6% across the organisation as a whole.
Next the survey sought views (Question 1.3) regarding ‘do you believe there is a culture of openness where staff can express their views freely and feel they can report on issues they are concerned about at work?’ The responses were as follows:

- 71.0% (338) agreed with the proposition in Question 1.3,
- 18.7% (89) disagreed,
- 10.3% (49) preferred not to answer.

Fourthly, respondents were asked whether they would ‘recommend the SPCB as an employer to other people?’ 89.9% (428) stated that they would recommend the SPCB as an employer. 3.4% (16) stated they would not recommend the SPCB as an employer and 6.7% (32) ‘preferred not to answer’. Although the 2009 question is not directly comparable with previous audits, due to there being no ‘prefer not to answer’ option, 96.1% in 2007, 90% in 2005 and 90.2% in 2003 stated that would recommend the SPCB as an employer to other people.

Lastly, in the ‘culture and values’ section of the survey respondents were asked ‘do you think staff understand the importance of equality in the workplace?’ The responses were as follows:

- 83.0% (395) agreed with the proposition in Question 1.5,
- 10.1% (48) disagreed,
- 6.9% (33) preferred not to answer.

Again, those on higher grades were more likely than those on lower grades to support this proposition. For example, 81.8% of Grade 2 respondents and 82.5% of Grade 3 respondents compared to 96.8% of Grade 5 and 96.9% of Grade 6 respondents.

| Number and % Responding that Staff Understand the Importance of Equality in the Workplace |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 / Chief Exec |
| N               | 99      | 47      | 63      | 61      | 31      | 7       | 4               |
| %               | 81.8%   | 82.5%   | 91.3%   | 96.8%   | 96.9%   | 100.0%  | 100.0%          |

There was not a considerable degree of variation by ‘Office / Group’ with the exception of the Security Office where only 69.8% of respondents considered that staff understood the importance of equality in the workplace compared to the
average of 83.0% across the Parliament as a whole. Respondents who considered that they had a disability were also less likely to support this proposition with 69.7% of respondents with a disability answering ‘yes’ to this question.

EQUALITY MONITORING QUESTIONS
Section 2 of the survey sought views on equality issues in relation to a number of areas of policy, namely:

- Training and Development Opportunities,
- Unacceptable Behaviour,
- Trade Union Membership and Activities,
- Work Life Balance,
- Career progression,
- Appraisal,
- Disciplinary Proceedings, and
- General Views on Equality.

ACCESS TO TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES
Section 2.1 of the Staff Audit dealt with equal opportunities issues relating to training and development opportunities.

Firstly, respondents were asked whether their manager had ‘refused to allow you to attend a training course within the last twelve months?’ (Question 2.1a). There were 460 responses to this question representing 92.4% of all survey respondents, as depicted in the graph below.
The 92.4% who stated that their line manager had not refused attendance on a training course within the last 12 months compares with 91.3% in 2007, 93.9% in 2005 and 90% in 2003. In previous audits, it had been noticeable that a larger proportion of individuals who considered that they had a disability had been refused training. In 2007 17.6% of those who considered that they had a disability had been refused training. In 2009, this figure stood at 12.1% which, although still above the average rate of refusal of 7.6% for all respondents, is a decline compared to the previous audit.

Those who stated that they had been refused permission (35) were then asked to provide details of the reasons that were given for this refusal. 29 qualitative responses were provided with the main reasons for attendance being refused being due to the cost of the course, pressures individually or across teams in terms of workload and, that the content of the course did not seem to be sufficiently linked to business priorities.

Those who had responded 'yes' to the question above, were then asked whether they considered that any of their ‘personal characteristics that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework affected, or might have affected, the decision not to allow you to attend this training course?’ (Question 2.1b). There were 34 responses to this question as follows:

- Yes – 14.7% (5) of responses to this question
- No – 67.6% (23) of responses to this question
- Don’t Know – 17.6% (6) of responses to this question

Those who answered ‘yes’ to Question 2.1b were asked to provide more information. There were 3 qualitative responses to this question and no particular themes were evident from the responses which tended to focus more on individual personal characteristics rather than those which fall within the SPCB Equality Framework.

Respondents were then asked whether, over the previous twelve months, they believed that they had ‘received sufficient training and development opportunities to support you in your current role?’ (Question 2.1c). There were 450 responses to this question which are detailed in the graph below.
Those who answered ‘no’ to this question, 55 respondents, were then asked to provide more information and in particular, whether any of the personal characteristics which fall within the scope of the SPCB Equality Framework, had affected the training and development opportunities which had been received. 32 qualitative responses were provided. Generally respondents tended not to highlight ‘personal characteristics’ as being the cause of the lack of sufficient training and development opportunities. The three main themes which emerged were due to the cost of training, that there were a lack of training opportunities for those on temporary / contractor or part-time contracts, and lastly, that there were workload and planning issues and a lack of discussion about training on the behalf of the line manager concerned.

UNACCEPTABLE BEHAVIOUR

Section 2.2 of the survey sought responses to a wide range of questions regarding ‘unacceptable behaviour’. Unacceptable behaviour was defined as ‘behaviour that is abusive, threatening, lewd, discriminatory or otherwise inappropriate. Harassment, bullying, discrimination and unreasonable behaviour are different forms in which unacceptable behaviour can manifest itself’.
In previous years, the staff audit asked whether respondents had experienced bullying and/or harassment during the last 12 months and was therefore narrower in scope than the question in the 2009 audit. It is important to note that the question asked in the 2009 Audit was wider in scope than that asked in previous years, as it dealt with the wider concept of ‘unacceptable behaviour’, and therefore it was expected that a larger number of responses would be obtained in response to this question than had been the case in previous years. As a result, the question asked in the 2009 Audit is not directly comparable with the response to the question on bullying and harassment in previous Audits.

Firstly responses were sought to the question ‘during the past 12 months, have you experienced unacceptable behaviour?’ (Question 2.2a). There were 448 responses to this question with 74.6% (334) of respondents not having experienced such behaviour whilst 4.9% (22) preferred not to answer.

Those who answered that they had experienced unacceptable behaviour (92) were then asked what form the behaviour(s) had taken. There were 100 respondents who answered this question, with 115 responses being provided in total.

Note: Respondents could provide more than one response to this question. The responses were as follows:

- Discrimination – 7 respondents
- Harassment – 15 respondents
- Bullying – 57 respondents
- Unreasonable behaviour – 36 respondents

Question 2.2d sought the views of respondents regarding the position of the person responsible for the unreasonable behaviour, in terms of whether the person was a member of SPCB staff, a Scottish Parliament passholder but not a member of SPCB staff or a non-passholder, for example, a member of the public or an external organisation. Again there were 100 responses to this question. Respondents could select one or more, or none, of the options available. 100 respondents provided responses although 96 respondents indicated the source of the unacceptable behaviour and 4 respondents did not. The responses were:

- Experienced unacceptable behaviour from an SPCB passholder – 76 respondents
- Experienced unacceptable behaviour from a non SPCB passholder – 11 respondents
- Experienced unacceptable behaviour from a non passholder – 9 respondents
The remainder of the questions regarding ‘unacceptable behaviour’ asked respondents to answer questions based on the main form of ‘unacceptable behaviour’ experienced. Firstly, respondents were asked whether the person or people involved had management authority over the respondents. As before, respondents could tick more than one option or none of the options available. There were 100 responses with 85 respondents indicating the management position of the person(s) responsible for the unacceptable behaviour. The responses were:

- It was my immediate line manager – 23 respondents,
- They had line management authority over me but were not my immediate line manager – 19 respondents,
- They were at a higher grade than me within the organisation but they did not have management authority over me – 6 respondents, and
- They were at the same grade or a lower grade than me, within the organisation – 37 respondents.

The survey then sought responses with regard to what action the person concerned had taken with regard to the unacceptable behaviour (Question 2.2e). As before respondents could tick more than one option. In total 100 respondents answered this question. Across all the options available there were 120 responses reflecting that respondents could select more than one form of response. The responses were as follows:

- Ignored the behaviour and did nothing – 22 respondents,
- I asked the person to stop – 20 respondents,
- I pretended it didn’t offend me – 21 respondents,
- I asked someone to speak to them on my behalf – 6 respondents,
- I avoided the person – 17 respondents,
- I spoke to a colleague for advice – 16 respondents, and
- I spoke to my line manager – 18 respondents.

14 respondents (2.9%) indicated that they had taken a different course of action to those outlined above.

Respondents were then asked whether they had got ‘in touch with a Dignity at Work Contact for information and / or support?’ 95 respondents answered this question, representing 20% of total respondents, of which 6 respondents had contacted a Dignity at Work representative. The 89 respondents who stated that they had not contacted the Dignity at Work network were then asked to comment on why they chose not to. 54 respondents offered explanations on not approaching the Dignity at Work network which can be broadly summarised into six categories:

- The issue was dealt with by the individual concerned,
- A lack of confidence in the network,
• That the behaviour involved was an isolated incident,
• The individual concerned did not wish to escalate the situation,
• That the person responsible for the 'unacceptable behaviour' was not an SPCB employee and so not covered by the Dignity at Work network, and
• That support received from a line manager / peer network / external support had resolved the situation.

Those who had got in touch with a Dignity at Work contact were asked how they would 'rate the level of support provided by the contact?' (Question 2.2g). 9 respondents provided an answer to the question, as follows:

• Very useful – 3 respondents,
• Useful – 3 respondents,
• Not very useful – 1 respondent,
• Not useful at all – 1 respondent, and
• Don’t Know – 1 respondent.

Respondents were then asked whether they had raised an informal or formal complaint (Question 2.2h). 95 responses (20% of all respondents) were received to this question. 11 respondents (11.6% of those who had answered the question) had raised an informal complaint. No respondents had raised a formal complaint. Those who had not made a complaint were then asked why not. There were 52 responses to this question. Broadly responses fell into three main categories:

• Those who had dealt with the issue personally felt no need to raise a complaint,
• Those who didn’t want to ‘rock the boat’ or be perceived as a troublemaker, and
• Respondents who lack confidence in the system and therefore believed that making a complaint would not assist the case or help their position, and perhaps possibly make it worse.

Those who had made an informal complaint were then asked what approach they had made to raising the complaint (Question 2.2j). 18 respondents provided information on the approach taken as follows:

• 5 respondents raised the issue with their immediate line manager,
• 4 respondents raised the issue with someone who had management authority but was not their immediate line manager,
• 2 respondents raised the issue with the Human Resources Office (formerly Personnel),
• 2 respondents raised the issue with the Equalities team,
• 1 respondent raised the issue with a Dignity at Work contact,
• 2 respondents preferred not to answer, and
• 2 respondents stated that they had taken an ‘Other’ approach.

Respondents were then asked whether they were satisfied with the way the informal complaint was handled (Question 2.2l). There were 13 responses to this question or 2.7% of all survey respondents. 5 respondents were satisfied and 8 were not.

Lastly, in this section, respondents were asked whether their complaint was resolved (Question 2.2l). 16 responses, 3.4% of all survey respondents, were provided to this question, of which 7 respondents considered that their complaint had been resolved and 9 did not. All respondents were then asked to provide further comments on their experience. 13 respondents commented on their experience with three main themes evident from the comments made:

• Concerns were raised regarding the behaviour of external contractors and the suggestion made that contractors should be required to do equalities training,
• Some respondents did not want to take the issue any further due to concern at being seen as a troublemaker or ‘rocking the boat’ whilst some suggested that management would not deal with the issue and in some instances tacitly supported the behaviour involved, and
• That there was a lack of evidence to take the issue any further.

TRADE UNION MEMBERSHIP AND ACTIVITIES

Section 3 of the survey considered equalities issues with regard to ‘trade union membership and activities’. Firstly, respondents were asked whether, ‘whilst working at the Parliament during the past twelve months, that they had suffered discrimination or harassment as a result of being a trade union member, being a trade union member and involved in trade union activities, or because they were not a member of a trade union’ (Question 2.3a). There were 413 responses to this question or 87.2% of all respondents to the survey. Of this total 99.5% (413) considered that they had not experienced any discrimination or harassment of this kind. 2 respondents (0.5%) stated that they had experienced discrimination or harassment. 99.5% stated that they had not experienced discrimination or harassment in relation to trade union activities. This compares with 98.1% in 2007, 94.7% in 2005 and 98.3% in 2003.

Generally, the survey results in this section indicate that in 2009 the issue of discrimination or harassment as a result of trade union activities in the Scottish Parliament was not an issue which featured amongst respondents to the survey.
WORK LIFE BALANCE

Section 4 of the survey dealt with issues relating to work life balance. The questionnaire defined ‘work life balance’ as follows:

“Work life balance will mean different things to different people. In general terms, it is about having a measure of control over when, where and how you work leading you to be able to enjoy an optimal quality of life whilst still meeting business requirements. For staff, there are many ways in which you can be supported in achieving a balance between home and work life. This could mean, for example, time off for childcare responsibilities, to care for a dependent, to update your skills or gain a qualification, to become involved in your local community, to attend cultural celebrations or to pursue interests and hobbies. Work-life balance arrangements range from flexible working hours, part-time working and job share to other flexible working arrangements such as career breaks and home working etc”.

Respondents were asked whether they were ‘satisfied that the organisation does its best to accommodate staff who require a flexible working arrangement (whether it is a temporary or a permanent arrangement)?’ (Question 2.4a). There were 413 responses to this question or 86.8% of all survey respondents. Of the respondents to this question, 90.1% (372) stated that they were satisfied with the work life balance arrangements and 9.9% (41) were not satisfied. When the responses from this section were considered, in terms of the personal information provided, the following trends were evident:

- Respondents from Grades 3 (8, 14.5% of Grade 3 respondents) and Grade 4 (8, 11.6% of Grade 4 respondents) tended to be least satisfied with the arrangements in place.
- Respondents from the Committee Office (4, 13.8% of Committee Office respondents) and the Security Office (6, 11.5% of Security Office respondents) were least satisfied with the flexible working arrangements.

Those who answered that they were not satisfied were asked to provide more details in relation to their answer. 36 qualitative responses were provided which broadly fell into the following categories:

- The Parliament does too much in terms of flexible working
- Flexible working arrangements favour those in higher grades
- That those on part-time contracts, contractors and those employed in shift patterns do not obtain the full benefits of the flexible working scheme
- The application of the process varies between Offices / Groups
- Work-life balance policies are not effective due to pressure of workload
Respondents were then asked whether they generally feel able to balance their work and home life (Question 2.4b). There were 412 responses to this question or 86.6% of all respondents to the survey. 89.8% (370) of those who answered the question considered that they could balance work and home life. This result is similar to that in 2007 when 90.7% stated that this was the case. 10.2% (42) stated that they were not able to balance work and home life. Respondents who have caring responsibilities for someone other than a child were considerably more likely (16.1%, 5) to state that they were not able to balance work and home life. Similarly respondents aged 41-50 were also more likely to feel unable to balance work and home life (14.6%, 15) compared to other age bands.

The survey then sought views on whether respondents had ‘ever made use of the work life balance arrangements available?’ (Question 2.4c). 411 respondents (86.3% of all survey responses) answered this question of which 66.2% (272) had used the work life balance arrangements available whilst 33.8% (139) stated that they had not used these arrangements. Those who had used the work life balance arrangements were then asked to provide more information on how this had enabled them to balance their home and work life. There were 215 qualitative responses to this question which indicated widespread use of the work-life balance arrangements available to staff. As is evident from the large number of responses received with regard to this question a wide range of work life balance arrangements were cited. In particular use of the following arrangements tended to predominate amongst responses received:

- Special leave,
- Job share arrangements,
- Home working,
- Part time working, and
- Compressed working hours.

Those who had indicated that they did not use the work-life balance arrangements were also asked to provide more information. There were 49 responses to this question. Two main views tended to emerge from the responses provided. Firstly, that it was difficult for some staff to access these arrangements as they are required to be in the office and / or work for specific hours as part of their job. Secondly, that respondents had never felt the need to apply for such arrangements although in a number of instances respondents did note that they would have no difficulty in doing so if it was considered necessary.

Respondents were then asked whether they had ever ‘been refused a flexible working request?’ (Question 2.4d). There were 403 responses to this question representing 84.7% of all survey responses. Of these responses, 93.5% (377) stated that they had never been refused such a request and 6.5% (26) stated that they had been refused a flexible working request.
Those with caring responsibilities for a child were slightly more likely to state that they had been refused a flexible working request (11, 9.3% of respondents with caring responsibilities for a child) and those with caring responsibilities for someone other than a child were considerably more likely (4, 12.9% of respondents with caring responsibilities for someone other than a child) to have been refused such a request. In terms of the nationality of respondents, there was little variation from the overall response rate with the exception of respondents who stated that their nationality was ‘English’ of whom 14.3% (5) stated that they had been refused a flexible working request. This compared with 5.6% (14) of respondents who stated that their nationality was ‘Scottish’.

Those who stated that they had been refused were then asked on what basis their request had been refused and whether they considered the decision to have been fair. There were 31 responses to this question. Generally responses tended to indicate that their request had been refused as a result of workload pressures and other staff already being on leave or having flexible working arrangements and a lack of cover existed for those who applied at that stage. Responses tended to be fairly evenly split as to whether the decision was fair or not.

CAREER PROGRESSION

Section 5 of the staff audit dealt with issues surrounding career progression and internal promotion. This section of the audit was only applicable to SPCB staff and not to those on secondment or contractors. Firstly SPCB staff were asked whether they had ‘applied for a promotion within the Parliament in the last twelve months?’ (Question 2.5a). There were 390 responses to this question or 81.9% of all survey respondents. Of those who answered this question, 17.4% (68) stated that they had applied for a promotion within the Parliament in the last 12 months whilst 82.6% (322) stated that they had not. Unsurprisingly those on lower grades were more likely to have applied for promotion. This was particularly the case with Grade 3 respondents, 38.9% of Grade 3 respondents had applied for promotion in the last twelve months. At Grade 2, 13.8% had applied for promotion similar to that for Grade 4 (11.9%) and Grade 5 (13.1%) whilst only 6.7% of Grade 6 respondents had applied for promotion. The proportion of those applying for promotion by Office / Group was highest in the Chamber Office (37.5%), Committee Office (39.3%) and Human Resources Office (45.8%) and lowest in Research, Information and Reporting Group (8.9%) and the Security Office (9.8%)\(^2\). In terms of gender, 17.1% of female respondents had applied for promotion in the last 12 months as compared to 15.6% of male respondents.

\(^2\) There were lower rates of applying for promotion in Facilities Management Office (0.0%), Presiding Officer’s Office (0.0%), Solicitor’s Office (0.0%) and the Strategy and Development Office (0.0%).
Those who had applied for promotion within the last 12 months were then asked whether they had been successful (Question 2.5b). There were 66 responses to this question or 13.9% of all survey respondents. Of this total 43.9% (29) stated that they had been successful and 56.1% (37) had not been successful. Those who applied for promotion were then asked whether the position they had applied was a temporary or permanent position. Again there were 66 responses to this question of which 65.2% (43) had applied for permanent positions and 34.8% (23) had applied for temporary positions. Respondents were also asked whether the post applied for was within the office in which the person already worked (Question 2.5d). Once more 66 respondents answered this question. Of this total, 71.2% (47) stated that the position was within the same office whilst 28.8% (19) had applied for a post within a different office.

Respondents who had not been successful in achieving a promotion were then asked to describe why they considered they had not been successful (Question 2.5e). There were 23 responses to this question which offered a wide range of reasons why respondents considered they had not been successful including:

- There were better candidates for the post,
- That reputation had been harmed by a previous poor performance marking,
- Poor performance at interview,
- Perception that ‘face did not fit’ with those interviewing, and
- Perception that internal candidates should be encouraged more than they currently are.

Respondents were then asked whether their ‘prospects of promotion over the past twelve months was, or might have been, affected’ by any of the personal characteristics which fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework? (Question 2.5f). There were 372 responses or 78.2% of all survey respondents to this question. Of this total 3.2% (12) considered that their ‘personal characteristics’ had, or might have had, affected their prospects of promotion. A further 76.1% (283) considered this was not the case whilst 20.7% (77) stated that they ‘don’t know’. Women were more likely than men to have answered ‘yes’ to this question, with 4.5% of female respondents answering ‘yes’ compared to 0.6% of male respondents. Respondents who considered that they had a disability were also more likely to consider that their chances of promotion had, or might have been, affected by their personal characteristics with 12.5% (4) of those with a disability answering ‘yes’ to this question. Eleven respondents who considered that they had a disability answered this question.

Respondents who answered yes to the previous question were asked to provide more information. There were 10 responses to this question which cited a range of personal characteristics, which respondents considered had affected their chances of promotion, as follows:
Part-time working, with a family, diminishes chances of promotion,
Concern that an unseen disability may impair chances,
Illness affected performance in the workplace,
Line manager has said that part-time working / compressed hours have blocked promotion prospects,
Mental health issues have affected chances of promotion, and
Having children within a short timescale have diminished chances of promotion.

Lastly, in this section, respondents were asked whether they had ‘any other general comments about promotion in the Parliament?’ (Question 2.5g). There were 93 responses to this question.

Four main themes emerged from the responses provided.

Firstly, that the relatively small size and flat structure of the organisation limit the promotion opportunities which are available and that greater use of secondment opportunities and exchanges should be made available.

Secondly, there was a clear theme amongst respondents that it was becoming increasingly difficult to achieve promotion and a sense of demoralisation amongst some respondents with regard to promotion prospects.

A third theme to emerge strongly through the qualitative responses was a considerable sense of disquiet with various aspects of how temporary promotions are dealt with, in particular, with regard to the length of time which individuals can spend on temporary promotion and the issues which this can raise when returning to the substantive grade.

Lastly, there was a sense amongst some respondents that the system of promotion was not transparent and that decisions regarding promotion were made in advance.

**APPRAISAL**

This section of the report applied only to staff who were employed by the SPCB or secondees. Firstly respondents were asked to indicate their overall appraisal marking in their most recent ‘end of year’ staff appraisal (Question 2.6a). There were 352 responses to this question representing 73.9% of all survey respondents.

Of this total, the responses to this question were as follows:

- Clearly exceeding the requirements of the role – 25.0% (88),
- Fully demonstrating the requirements of the role – 71.9% (253),
- Demonstrating most of the requirements of the role – 2.6% (9), and
- Unsatisfactory performance – 0.6% (2).
The results are broadly similar to those in 2007 where 22% exceeded requirements, 73.5% fully demonstrated the requirements of the role, 4.3% met most requirements and 0.3% were unsatisfactory.

The survey then sought views on whether it was considered that ‘personal characteristics that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework’ affected, or might have affected, the most recent end of year appraisal marking (Question 2.6b). In total, 370 respondents answered this question or 77.7% of all respondents. 3.2% of respondents (12) to this question considered that their personal characteristics had affected the appraisal marking. In contrast, 85.4% (316) of respondents did not consider this had affected their appraisal marking and 11.4% (42) answered ‘don’t know’. When these results were broken down further no particular trends were evident with the exception of 12.9% of those with a disability having stated that they considered their personal characteristics affected, or might have affected, their most recent end of year marking.

Those who had answered yes to the previous question were asked to provide more information. There were 10 responses to this question. No clear trends were evident from the responses provided which largely tended to provide specific instances of specific personal characteristics, such as disability or health issues, and that these had either affected performance in the post or had influenced the attitudes of others during the appraisal process.

**DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS**

Section 7 of the staff audit dealt with disciplinary proceedings and only applied to those employed directly by the SPCB. Firstly, respondents were asked whether they had been ‘the subject of an investigation under the SPCB’s disciplinary procedures during the last twelve months?’ (Question 2.7a). There were 377 responses to this question or 79.2% of all survey respondents. The responses to this question were as follows:

- Yes – 1.3% (5)
- No – 98.7% (372)

Respondents were then asked whether disciplinary allegations were made after the investigation (Question 2.7b). There were 6 responses to this question as follows:

- Yes – 5
- No - 1

Those who answered yes to the previous question were then asked whether they were ‘required to attend a disciplinary hearing to answer any allegations?’ (Question
2.7c). There were 4 responses to this question all of which answered ‘yes’ to this question.

YOUR VIEWS ON EQUALITY

Section 8 of the staff audit consisted of one question where the general views of respondents with regard to equality policies were sought. In particular, comments or ideas were sought which would assist with ‘promoting equality in the workplace’ whilst it was also suggested that ‘it would be helpful to know if you think we are getting things right in any particular respect, as well as knowing how you think we can improve our performance’. There were 112 responses to this question with a wide array of issues being raised. A large proportion of those who responded tended to praise the equality policies of the SPCB. Whilst a number of respondents considered that the SPCB had equality policies in place and that they were pursued it was questioned whether these policies filtered all the way down to individual offices and teams. Whilst a wide range of issues were raised some specific issues which featured relatively regularly are summarised below.

Maternity Monitoring Scheme – A number of respondents praised this new initiative.

Contractors – Some respondents expressed concern over how contractors interacted with the SPCB’s equality policies.

Appraisal – A view was expressed that the equal opportunity competency should be removed from the appraisal process which some viewed as a ‘box ticking exercise’.

Common Sense – Some respondents suggested that the SPCB goes ‘over the top’ with regard to equality policies and that a greater degree of common sense should be allowed to prevail.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Part 3 of the staff audit sought a range of information regarding the personal characteristics of the respondents in order to inform the analysis of results to the questions in the previous two sections.

Firstly respondents were asked what their current grade was within the organisation (Question 3.1). There were 386 responses to this question or 81.1% of all survey respondents. The graph below details the breakdown of responses by grade. The structure of employment by grade has changed very little since 2007. For example, 16.32% of respondents were employed in Grade 5 posts in 2009, compared to 16.2% in 2007.

Grade
Secondly respondents were asked whether they were ‘currently contracted to work at the Parliament on a full-time or a part-time basis?’ There were, again, 386 responses to this question as follows:

There was a noticeable gender dimension to responses to this question with 94.7% of male respondents working full-time compared to 78.9% of females. Conversely, 19.6% of females respondents worked part-time compared to 5.3% of male respondents. The proportion of part-time employees has increased slightly from 10.6% of respondents in 2007. Correspondingly the proportion of full-time employees has declined, slightly, from 86.4% in 2007.
Thirdly, respondents were asked what type of contract they currently have within the Parliament. There were 386 responses to this question as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contract</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A permanent contract</td>
<td>90.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fixed term contract (please state for how many months or)</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an agency worker</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am currently seconded to the Parliament</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to answer this question</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of respondents who had a permanent contract in previous Audits was 86.6% in 2007, 80.5% in 2005 and 81.4% in 2003. The proportion of staff who are employed on permanent contracts has therefore steadily increased since 2005.

Those who answered the previous question that their current contract was a ‘fixed term’ contract (9 respondents, 2.3% of responses to the question) were asked to state what length of contract it was in months and years. There were 8 responses to this question as follows:

- One year – 1,
- Eighteen months – 1,
- Two years – 4,
- Twenty One months – 1, and
- Three years – 1.

One respondent answered ‘Other’ to the type of contract question. This prompted the respondent to be asked to specify the nature of the contract. The one respondent answered ‘on probation, will be permanent when I pass’.

Respondents were then asked which ‘office or group’ they currently worked in (Question 3.4) with the results to this question depicted below.
It is not possible to compare staffing levels by ‘Office / Group’, as respondents to the 2007 Audit, were asked to identify which Directorate they worked in. These Directorates no longer exist in 2009.

**Gender Identity**

Respondents were then asked two questions about their ‘gender identity’. Firstly respondents were asked to describe their gender (Question 3.5a). There were 384 responses to this question, representing 80.7% of respondents, as follows:

- Female – 51.8% (199) of responses to this question,
- Male – 44.5% (171) of responses to this question, and
- I prefer not to answer this question – 3.6% (14) of responses to this question.

This represents a considerable change with both the 2007 and 2005 Audits having 51% of respondents being male compared to females respondents being 44.8%
(2007) and 45% (2005) of respondents. The non-response rate to this question was 3.9% in 2007 and 4% in 2005.

Respondents were then asked whether they had ‘ever identified as transgender?’ (Question 3.5b). The 384 responses to this question were as follows:

- Yes – 0.5% (2) of responses,
- No – 97.4% (374) of responses, and
- I prefer not to answer this question – 2.1% (8) of responses.

Relationship Status

The ‘relationship status’ of respondents was the subject of the next two questions in the staff audit. Firstly, respondents were asked whether they had a partner or were single. (Question 2.6a). The responses to this question, of which there were 384, were as follows:

- I have a partner – 255 responses (66.4%),
- I am single – 87 responses (22.7%), and
- I prefer not to answer – 42 responses (10.9%).

The ‘relationship status’ results are virtually identical to the 2007 Audit where 66.5% had a partner, 22.7% were single and 10.8% preferred not to answer.

Respondents were then asked whether any of a range of relationship types applied to them (Question 3.6b). There were 252 responses to this question or 52.9% of all survey respondents. The responses were:

- I am married – 171 (67.9%),
- I am not married – 67 (26.6%),
- I am in a civil partnership – 5 (2.0%), and
- I prefer not to answer this question – 9 (3.6%).

Question 3.7 of the survey asked whether respondents had any caring responsibilities for children or for anyone else. The responses, of which there were 388 or 81.5% of all survey respondents, to this question were:

- Yes, I have caring / parental responsibilities for a child / children – 122 (31.4%),
- Yes, I have caring responsibilities for someone other children / a child – 33 (8.5%),
- No, I don’t have any caring responsibilities – 208 (53.6%), and
- I prefer not to answer this question – 25 (6.4%).

A slightly higher proportion of male (60, 35.5% of male respondents) than female respondents (57, 28.6% of female respondents) stated that they had caring
responsibilities for a child. Conversely, of those who had caring responsibilities for someone other than a child 72.7% (24) of such respondents were female and 27.3% (9) were male. This equated to 12.1% of female respondents and 5.3% of male respondents. The proportion of the workforce with caring responsibilities has been increasing over time. In 2007 28.6% had responsibility for a child and 4.6% for someone other than a child. In 2005 the figures were 22.2% and 4.7% respectively.

Respondents were then asked a series of questions regarding ‘sexual orientation’. Firstly respondents were asked how they would describe their sexual orientation (Question 3.8a). There were 382 responses to this question or 80.3% of all survey respondents. 86.9% of respondents stated they were ‘heterosexual’, 5% stated a non hetero sexual orientation and 8.1% preferred not to answer. In 2007, 84.9% stated they were heterosexual with 87.7% providing this answer in 2005. The responses to the question are provided in the graph below.

![Sexual Orientation Graph](image)

Those who answered ‘other’ were asked to provide more information. There was one ‘other’ response who stated that they would prefer ‘not to define their sexual
orientation’. Respondents were then asked whether they felt able to be open about their ‘sexual orientation with other people working at the Parliament’. There were 18 responses to this question, or 3.8% of all survey respondents. The responses were as follows:

- Yes – 15 respondents (83.3%)
- No – 2 respondents (11.1%)
- I prefer not to answer this question (1 respondent, 5.6%)

In 2007, there were 37 responses to this question with 70.3% stating that they felt able to be open about their sexual orientation, 8.1% did not consider this to be the case and 21.6% preferred not to answer.

Those who answered ‘No’ to the previous question were then asked whether their response was to do with their working environment. Both respondents answered “No” to this question.

NATIONALITY

Respondents were then asked how they would describe their nationality. There were 382 responses to this question, or 80.3% of survey respondents, of which 54.6% (260) stated ‘Scottish’, 7.8% (37) ‘English’, 5.9% (28) ‘Other European’ and 6.3% (30) ‘Other’. Those who answered ‘Other European’ (28) were asked to specify their nationality. There were 30 responses of which 26 stated British. Those who answered ‘Other’ (30) were also asked to specify their nationality. Twenty of these thirty respondents stated ‘British’.

The proportion of staff considering their nationality to be ‘Scottish’ has fallen over time from 78.5% in 2005, 70.3% in 2007 to 68.1% in 2009.

All respondents were then asked how they would describe their ‘ethnic background’ (Question 3.9b). There were 382 responses to this question or 80.3% of all survey respondents. The graph below details the response to the question.
The 92.7% of respondents stating that their ethnic background is ‘white’ is slightly lower than the 94.1% in 2007 and 95.1% in 2005 providing this response. 2.2% of respondents stated that their ethnic background was ‘non-white’ a slight increase on 1.8% in 2007 and 1.5% in 2005.
RELIGION

Question 3.10 asked respondents ‘which of the following religions, religious denominations or bodies’ they currently belong to? There were 382 responses, or 80.3% of all survey respondents, to this question with the results depicted below.

In 2007 57.2% stated that they had no religious affiliation whilst 52.8% provided this answer in 2005.

AGE

Respondents were asked, in Question 3.11, which of a range of age bands they fitted into. The graph below depicts the result of 381 responses received representing 80% of survey respondents. The 21-30 age band has decreased slightly from 16.4% in 2007 as has the 31-40 band from 35.1% in 2007 to 30.7% in 2009. The 41-50 and 51-60 age bands have both increased as proportion of respondents employed within them. The 41-50 band has increased from 19.4% in 2007 to 27.3% in 2009 whilst the 51-60 age band has increased from 15.8% to 18.1%. Whilst the proportion of those aged 61-70 has declined from 2.5% in 2007 nevertheless the age profile of the workforce continues to age over time, a trend which has been evident in previous Audits.
Respondents were then asked whether they considered that they had a disability (Question 3.12a). Disability was defined in the survey as ‘a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long term adverse effect on a person’s ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities’. Again there were 381 responses to this question or 80% of all survey respondents. The responses were as follows:

- Yes – 33 (8.7%)
- No – 329 (86.4%)
- I prefer not to answer this question – 19 (5%)

The proportion of respondents stating that they have a disability has gradually increased over time from 5.8% in 2003, 5.9% in 2005 and 7.8% in 2007.

Those who considered that they do have a disability, were then asked how comfortable they felt communicating that they are disabled to other colleagues in their office (Question 3.12c). There were 33 responses, as follows:

- Yes – 24 (72.7%)
- No – 9 (27.3%)
- Prefer not to answer – 0 (0%)
The same respondents were then asked whether they considered that the organisation provides ‘the necessary support in order for you to carry out your work effectively?’ (Question 3.12d). There were 32 responses to this question, as follows:

- Yes – 24
- No – 3
- Prefer not to answer – 5

Lastly, respondents were asked whether the support provided was regularly reviewed (Question 3.12e). Again, there were 32 responses as follows:

- Yes – 15 (46.9%)
- No – 12 (37.5%)
- Prefer not to answer – 5 (15.6%)

**TRADE UNION ACTIVITIES**

Lastly, respondents were asked which of a number of statements best described their trade union activities (Question 3.13). There were 380 responses to this question or 79.8% of all respondents. The graph below details the response to this question.

The proportion of respondents involved in trade union activities (either as a member or in a more active manner) has fallen in 2009 to 57.4% compared to 61.1% in 2007
and 60.2% in 2005. Correspondingly the proportion stating that they are not a member of a trade union has increased to 35.3% in 2009 as compared to 31.5% in 2007 and 28.4% in 2005. The proportion of respondents preferring not to answer this question is similar to the 7.4% who provided this response in 2007 (albeit lower than the 11.4% who took this option in 2005).

When responses to this question were broken down further a number of trends were evident. Female respondents (39.9%) were more likely not to be members of a trade union than male respondents (31.5%). Respondents who were single were also more likely not to be trade union members. 47.1% of respondents who were single were not trade union members compared to 34.1% of those with a partner. As the age of respondents increased so too did the likelihood of the respondent being a trade union member. For example, 62.3% of those aged 21-30 were not members of a trade union compared to 20.3% of those aged 51-60.

**ANNEX ONE: METHODOLOGY**

The Equal Opportunities Staff Audit was based upon the survey design of previous Audits conducted in 2003, 2005 and 2007. A number of new questions were added to the 2009 Audit to reflect changing policies, however, the majority of the Audit was presented in the same manner as in 2007 in order to allow for the comparison of results from previous Audits.

For the first time the Equality Audit was sent out electronically to all Scottish Parliament staff. The electronic survey package, developed by Globalpark, provided the survey software for the project. This ensured that all responses would be provided anonymously. The data collected via the software was expressed as SPSS data file which was then downloaded by SPICe Research. All data analysis was conducted by the SPICe Research. Unfortunately significant problems were experienced by users when completing the Audit on-line. A range of measures were put in place to try to resolve these problems and to assist users, however, technical problems did persist. Accordingly, the timescale for completion of the project was substantially extended in order to allow staff who had experienced technical difficulties to be able to complete the survey. It is important to note that only Audits which had been successfully completed were then downloaded by Globalpark and analysed by SPICe Research.

In terms of quantitative data, analysis was conducted via SPSS consisting primarily of simple percentages and cross tabulation of results. Comparison of results from previous Audits was reported where possible. As all responses were anonymous it was not possible to conduct triangulation of qualitative responses. Instead, common themes or trends were sought from qualitative responses and reported (either in terms of actual quotes or a summary of the theme) in order that the qualitative responses received could be incorporated into the report findings.