EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES STAFF AUDIT 2007

This paper provides a report on the results of the Equal Opportunities Staff Audit of SPCB employees which was conducted during the summer of 2007.
KEY POINTS

- There were 443 responses to the 2007 Equalities Staff Audit representing 86.52% of Scottish Parliament staff

Access to Training and Development Opportunities
- 91.3% of respondents answering the question had never within the last twelve months been refused attendance on a training course
- 88.7% of respondents answering the question had received sufficient training and development opportunities over the last 12 months

Harassment and Bullying
- 12.6% of respondents answering the question considered they had experienced either bullying or harassment or both during the last 12 months

Trade Union Membership and Activities
- 98.1% of respondents, who answered the question, stated that they had not suffered discrimination or harassment as a result of being a trade union member, involved in trade union activities or through not being a trade union member

Work Life Balance
- 90.7% of respondents, who answered the question, stated that they were generally able to balance work and home life
- Of those who answered the question, 64.3% of respondents stated that they had used work life balance arrangements and 34.8% had not

Career Progression / Internal Promotion
- Of those who answered the question, 81.2% of respondents had not applied for promotion in the last twelve months. Correspondingly 18.8% had applied for promotion
- 86.7% of respondents, to the relevant question, did not consider that their personal characteristics, that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s equalities framework, had affected their chances of promotion. 3.6% of respondents did consider this to have been an issue and 9.7% did not know whether this had been an issue.

Appraisal Marking
- 89.6% of those who answered the relevant question, did not consider that any of their personal characteristics affected, or might have affected, their end of year appraisal marking. 9.3% ‘did not know’ and 1.8% considered that their personal characteristics had affected their appraisal marking

Disciplinary Proceedings
- Of those who answered the question, 98.3% of respondents had not been subject to disciplinary procedures

General Review
- 91.2% of respondents, who answered the question, consider that they had not been discriminated against whilst working at the Parliament
- 84.7%, of those who answered the question, considered that the SPCB was doing all it reasonably could to implement its equal opportunities policies
- 96.1%, of those who answered the question, stated that they would recommend the SPCB as an employer to other people
INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the Equalities Staff Audit (2007). The Audit was conducted during the summer of 2007. The results are presented in line with the structure of the questionnaire as distributed to Scottish Parliament staff. The key areas of questioning were:

1. Access to Training and Development Opportunities
2. Harassment and Bullying
3. Trade Union Membership and Activities
4. Work Life Balance
5. Career Progression / Internal Promotion
6. Appraisal
7. Disciplinary Proceedings
8. General Review of Equal Opportunities Policy
9. Personal Information

There were 443 responses to the 2007 Audit representing 86.52% of Scottish Parliament staff. This compares to a 90.8% response rate in 2005 and a 87% response rate in 2003. Data was collected and coded by Challenge Consultancy 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 equalities staff audit seeks to ascertain the perceptions of respondents with regard to the operation of equalities policies in the Parliament.
ACCESS TO TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Section One of the Staff Audit dealt with equal opportunities issues relating to training and development opportunities.

ATTENDANCE

Firstly, respondents were asked whether their manager had refused to allow them to attend a training course within the last twelve months. 99.1% of respondents (439) answered this question of which 91.3% (401) stated that they had never, within the last 12 months, been refused attendance on a training course, compared to 93.9% in 2005 and 90% in 2003. 8.7% (38 respondents) stated that they had been refused attendance on a training course within the last 12 months. Therefore the vast majority of respondents had not experienced any difficulty accessing training courses during the last 12 months.

Considering the personal characteristics of the individuals who had stated that they had been refused training, it was noticeable that a higher proportion of individuals who considered that they had a disability had been refused training in the last 12 months (6 out of 34 respondents or 17.6%). Although this did not emerge as a finding in the 2005 report, a similar trend was noted in 2003 where disabled staff were “17.6% more likely than average to report such refusals”1.

Of the 38 respondents who had been refused attendance 21 (55.3% of those who stated they had been refused training) provided an explanation as to the reason given for the refusal. Responses tended to fall into a number of categories:

- training was considered not directly relevant to the individuals particular post
- refusal was due to the cost of the course
- work demands within the office and / or a lack of staff in the office concerned to provide cover resulted in a refusal
- agency staff highlighting that they are not able to access all the training on offer to SPCB staff [it is important to note here that agency staff cannot access all training available to SPCB staff in order to protect the relationship between the agency staff member and the relevant employment agency]

The quotes below provide a flavour of some of the comments made:

“Although training was identified as relevant, every single request was refused and I was told to identify courses at later dates. As a result none of the training identified in my PDP took place” (Case 136)

“I was told that Microsoft Excel had no benefit to me….“ (Case 98)

“Pressure of work in the office – I was able to attend the course a couple of months later” (Case 247)

“I am not a member of SPCB staff” (Case 464)

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Respondents who had previously stated that they had been refused training were then asked whether any of their ‘personal characteristics’ that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s ‘Equality Framework’ might have affected the decision not to allow an individual to attend a training course. 23 respondents (60.5% of those who had stated above that they had been refused training) answered this question. Of these 23 respondents, 19 did not consider that their personal characteristics had contributed to the decision which is equivalent to the 83% who provided the same response in 2005 Audit.

LEVEL OF SUPPORT

Lastly in relation to training and development, all respondents were asked whether they considered that, over the past twelve months, they had received sufficient training and development opportunities to support them in their current role. 95.7% of respondents (424) answered this question whilst 19 respondents (4.3%) failed to provide a response. 88.7% (376) of those who answered the question considered that they had received sufficient training and development opportunities over the last 12 months. This represents a considerable increase upon the 76.3% who considered they had received sufficient training and development opportunities in 2005 and is higher than the 87.6% who provided this response in 2003.

However 48 respondents considered that they had not received sufficient training and development opportunities over the same time period. Those who stated they had not received sufficient training and development opportunities were asked to provide further information. There were 36 qualitative responses to this question. Accordingly it is important to note when considering these results that roughly 89% of respondents considered they had received sufficient training and development opportunities. A range of reasons were given by those who perceived a lack of training and development support, although the issues raised tended not to relate directly to equality issues but to other factors. In particular the following themes, with selected quotes, were evident among respondents:

- a lack of time being available for training / time when training is available is not suitable

  “With staff vacancies and maternity leave it has been too busy to go off on training” (Case 50)
  “Have not been able to prioritise time for training because of programme efficiency / effectiveness reviews in work area and impact on workload” (Case 176)
  “Working part-time and under pressure made it too difficult for me to allocate time to training” (Case 312)

- financial restrictions limit opportunities

  “Severe financial restrictions on training courses which can be taken per year – sometimes work demands increased skills in multiple areas but several courses can’t be taken. My impression from colleagues is that training budgets have fallen in recent years” (Case 387)
  “Professional courses are infrequent, expensive and often cancelled due to lack of numbers. I do not believe personal characteristics affect this in my office, it’s a budget issue. (Case 466)

- training is not suited to needs
“Having been in post for a long period some training would have helped me become more efficient in my current role” (Case 464)
“I would have liked more training, my role is non technical + I would have liked more training in the softer skills” (Case 429)
“My line manager does not have the skills or knowledge to teach me anything that I don’t know already. The training opportunities are too generalised and non-specific to my job to be of much use” (Case 271)

- a lack of commitment by managers to training and not following through on training which has been identified in PDPs

“Poor feedback from line manager combined with very few opportunities to take on developmental tasks” (Case 88)
“I have had an item outstanding on my personal development plan for several years which has not been pursued” (Case 440)
HARASSMENT AND BULLYING

Section Two of the audit dealt with whether respondents had experienced harassment and / or bullying during the last twelve months and any action which respondents took with regard to such behaviour. The questionnaire defined harassment and bullying as follows:

**Harassment:** Unwanted conduct that violates a person’s dignity or creates an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment which is linked to, or based on, one or more of a person’s personal characteristics (e.g. their racial group, gender, sexual orientation, disability status, religion or belief, age etc).

**Bullying:** Inappropriate, malicious and unwelcome behaviour, an abuse or misuse of power through means intended to cause embarrassment, fear, humiliation or distress to a person or to a group of people. Bullying is normally characterised by the emergence of a pattern of behaviour, but a single incident, if serious enough, can amount to bullying behaviour. It may be obvious or it may be insidious. Whatever form it takes, it is unwarranted and unwelcome to the individual. Please note that bullying does not necessarily relate to a specific personal characteristic. For example bullying can be a result of abusive behaviour towards another member of staff, constant unreasonable and unconstructive criticism or deliberate exclusion from normal work activities.

UNACCEPTABLE BEHAVIOUR

Respondents were asked whether they had experienced bullying and / or harassment during the last 12 months (question 2a). 56 respondents (or 12.6%) considered that they had experienced either bullying or harassment or both during the last 12 months. This compares to 10.6% in 2005 and 13.2% in 2003 stating that they had experienced bullying, harassment or both. Therefore, although the proportion of respondents reporting experiences of harassment or bullying was higher than in 2005 (+2%), this still represents a decrease since 2003 (-0.6%). Of this total, 38 respondents considered that they had experienced bullying, 12 had experienced harassment and, 6 had experienced both bullying and harassment.

Respondents who had experienced harassment were then asked (question 2b) what form of behaviour the harassment involved. 19 respondents answered this question. It should be noted here that the number of responses provided for question 2b is greater than the number of people who had said they had been harassed (12). The vast majority of respondents cited verbal comments which created an intimidatory or hostile environment as being the form that harassment had taken whilst one respondent cited unwelcome physical attention. Respondents were then asked which of their personal characteristics they believed were linked to the harassment experienced. There were 15 responses to this question. The most frequently cited personal characteristics were gender and age.

Respondents who answered that they had experienced bullying were asked in what form the bullying behaviour had taken (Question 2d). There were 39 responses to this question (38 respondents had said they had experienced bullying). The responses broadly described three main patterns of bullying which fell into the categories of verbal bullying, misuse of power and unnecessary / overbearing behaviour.
RESPONSE TO THE BULLYING / HARASSMENT EXPERIENCED

The remainder of the questions in Section 2 were directed at all the respondents who had experienced either bullying, harassment or both. Firstly respondents were asked whether the person who was responsible for the behaviour experienced had management authority over them (question 2e). 50 respondents answered this question, compared to 50 in 2005 and 57 in 2003 and Figure One displays the answers given.

FIGURE ONE – BULLYING / HARASSMENT: MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Of the 50 respondents 28% stated that the person responsible did have management authority over them. This represents a considerable decline on the 48% who provided this response in 2005 and 58% in 2003. The only category to increase was those who reported that the person concerned was not part of the staff structure – 16% in 2007 compared to 12% in 2005. However it is important to note that the category ‘people responsible were a combination of more than one of the above’ was not reported against in 2007 and this therefore distorts the degree of comparability between the two surveys.

Where the person involved was not part of the staff structure the respondents were asked to name the position of the person involved. 10 responses were provided, representing a very small proportion of the overall sample, with MSP’s, Scottish Government staff and the general public being cited. However 3 instances of SPCB staff being responsible were also raised. Where the respondent cited that the people responsible were from a combination of the positions outlined in question 2e they were asked to specify the roles which the people involved performed. 13 responses were provided to this question. Generally respondents tended to cite a person with line management or management authority over them in conjunction with people on the same or lower grades.

Respondents were then asked whether they had got in touch with a Dignity at Work contact for information and / or support (question 2f). Of the 52 responses to this question, only 13.5% (7) respondents had contacted a member of the Dignity at Work (DAW) network. Therefore 86.5% (45) of those who answered this question had not made contact with the DAW network. This does however represent a considerable increase on the 2005 Audit where only 3.6% had used the network presumably reflecting that the network had only recently been introduced at the time of the 2005 Audit. Those who had not made contact with the DAW network were then
asked their reason for not doing so. 42 respondents provided their reason for not having contacted the network. The main reasons given were:

1. The respondent felt it was unnecessary to contact the network

2. The network was not contacted due to a lack of confidence in the ability of the network

3. It was felt that the network would not be able to help due to the particular circumstances involved or lacked the power to be able to help

4. An alternative course of action was taken such as speaking to a line manager or personnel

Respondents were then asked whether they had made an informal complaint regarding the treatment experienced (question 2h). There were 49 responses to this question with 26 respondents saying that they did make an informal complaint and 23 saying that they did not. Those who had raised an informal complaint were then asked what form of action they had taken (question 2i). The responses to this question were as follows:

- 'I took personal action' – 4%
- 'I raised it with my immediate line manager' – 56%
- 'I raised it with someone with authority over me but not my immediate line manager' – 16%
- 'I raised it with the Personnel office' – 4%
- 'I prefer not to answer' – 8%
- 'Other' – 12%

Female respondents were more likely to raise an informal complaint than male respondents. 63.6% of females who had experienced bullying or harassment had raised an informal complaint compared to 42.9% of males.

Respondents were then asked whether the complaint had been resolved (question 2j). 22 respondents (5% of total respondents) answered this question of which 59.1% (13) stated that the complaint had not been resolved and 40.9% (9) stated that the complaint had been resolved. Question 2k asked whether the complaint had been dealt with appropriately. 21 respondents answered this question (4.7% of total respondents). Of these 21 respondents, 10 (47.6%) stated that the complaint had been dealt with appropriately and 11 (52.4%) that it had not been dealt with appropriately.

Respondents were then asked whether they had made a formal complaint about the treatment they had experienced (question 2l). 43 people answered this question (9.7% of total respondents) of which the vast majority – 95.3% (41) responses – stated that they had not raised a formal complaint. Accordingly only 2 respondents (4.7%) to this question stated that they had raised a formal complaint. Those who had raised a formal complaint were asked whether the formal complaint had been resolved (question 2m). Although only two respondents stated that they had raised a formal complaint in the previous question there were four responses to this question. All four respondents stated that their formal complaint had not been resolved.

Respondents who, at the outset of section 2, had stated that they had experienced bullying and / or harassment but had not made a complaint were asked for their reasons for not doing so. There were 39 qualitative responses to this section which offered a plethora of reasons for not making a complaint. Some of the main themes to emerge were:
• A lack of trust in the complaints procedure and a sense that no benefit would come from raising the issue
• Concern that raising a complaint could harm future promotion prospects and / or result in a backlash from the staff involved
• A perception that senior staff members could not be approached regarding the issue or were perpetrators of the behaviour involved and therefore could not be approached on the issue
• Respondents preferred to deal with the issue themselves
TRADE UNION MEMBERSHIP AND ACTIVITIES

Section 3 of the survey dealt with whether respondents had experienced discrimination or harassment as a result of issues relating to trade union membership and activities related to trade unions. Firstly, respondents were asked (question 3a) whether 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
- Not being a trade union member

There were 418 responses to this question, representing 94.4% of the survey sample. Of this total, 98.1% (410) stated that they had not experienced such behaviour. This represents an increase on the 94.7% who responded in this way in 2005 and is similar to the 98.3% who provided this response in 2003. 8 respondents (1.9% of those who answered this question) stated that they had experienced discrimination or harassment as a result of issues related to trade unions. Those who stated that they had experienced discrimination / harassment were asked to provide further information. There was only one response received as follows:

“If you are not in a union your opinion does not matter” (Case 366)

Those who had experienced discrimination / harassment were asked if the person involved had management authority over them (question 3b). There was only one response to this question which stated that the person involved did have management authority over them. Question 3c asked whether there was a complaint made about this behaviour. The one respondent stated that they had not made a complaint. The reason provided by the respondent for not raising a complaint was that “no action would take place” (Case 366). Lastly question 3d asked whether the complaint had been resolved. There were no responses to this question and no qualitative responses when prompted to provide further information regarding this.
WORK LIFE BALANCE

Section 4 of the questionnaire dealt with the issue of work life balance. The questionnaire provided the following commentary on the meaning of ‘work life balance’:

“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; job share; other flexible working arrangements; career breaks; home working etc”.

Respondents were asked whether they ‘generally’ felt able to balance work and home life (question 4a). There were 439 responses to this question, representing 99.1% of the survey sample. 90.7% of respondents (398) stated that they were generally able to balance work and home life. Conversely 9.3% (41) stated that they were generally not able to do so. Male respondents were more likely to state that they found it difficult to balance work and home life. 10.4% of male respondents stated this was the case compared to 7.8% of female respondents.

The survey then asked whether respondents had made use of the work life balance arrangements available such as, special leave, flexible working, compressed hours and home working (question 4b). There were 431 responses (97.3% of the sample). 64.3% of those respondents (277) stated that they had made use of such arrangements and 34.8% (154) stated that they had not. Those who stated that they had made use of work life balance arrangements were asked to provide information about the ways in which they had done so. There were 268 qualitative responses to this question. Generally respondents tended to cite examples of the type of work life balance policy they had used. The types of policy most commonly cited by respondents were flexible working hours, special leave, home-working, paternity leave and unpaid leave. Some examples of comments made are provided below:

“Sometimes need to work at home if child ill; use of flexible working hours to cover school holidays; flexible to cover need for leave at short notice - generally child linked” (Case 24)

“I took up the option of unpaid maternity leave after the paid period ended” (Case 174)

“I have tried to balance by going part-time but the nature of Parliamentary business means that you can't plan ahead, so you can end up working late. Also have been one member of team short for most of a year” (Case 304)

“Work compressed hours and on occasion work from home. My line manager has been very supportive of this to allow me to juggle work and study” (Case 229)

“Flexible hours. However it does appear that depending on where you work in the parliament you can be treated differently for example compressed hours may be more favourably considered in some areas more than others”. (Case 437)

“With difficulty - living at a distance from the Parliament (i.e. not in Edinburgh) I think proves quite difficult to balance work/life” (Case 438)
Those who had stated that they had not generally accessed the work life balance arrangements, 154 respondents, were also asked to provide more information as to why this was the case. There were 76 qualitative responses to this question. The majority of respondents to this question tended to state that they had never needed to access these arrangements and were content with the 'standard working hours' as the quotes below exemplify:

“Have not had any reason to do so yet, normal working hours suit me to date”. (Case 207)

“Coming from a job that involved 12 hour days, weekend + bank holidays+ night working I now find 9-5 gives me a huge amount of time outside work to enjoy life. I hope to use flexible working when I have children”. (Case 159)

“Have never had the need to use this but I am confident my line manager would be supportive” (Case 240)

Some respondents stated that they found it difficult to find a balance due to the particular work patterns they were working to:

“Most of the arrangements are not possible due to opening hours and shift patterns of the area I work in”. (Case 374)

“Our unit has to function during the 'core' hours of 9am - 5pm, Monday to Friday. As I understand it, there is limited scope for flexible working” (Case 448)

Alternatively a few respondents stated that they had either been refused or not encouraged to access work life balance arrangements:

“Although compressed hours, home working etc, appear to be available to staff there is some reluctance to use them. Working in these ways is not something really encouraged or promoted”. (Case 100)

“Application for compressed hours rejected - as being 'too busy'. Other arrangements do not really suit nature of post. Very limited use made of home working”. (Case 128)

Alternatively a couple of respondents were critical of the impact which work life balance policies were having upon their working environment. For example one respondent commented that:

“I need to cover for the growing number of colleagues who have accessed these arrangements. Little consideration is given to the impact of others when individual requests are accepted”. (Case 231)

Lastly respondents were asked (question 4c) whether they had ever been refused a flexible working request. There were 409 responses to this question representing 92.3% of the total sample. Of this total 94.1% (385) stated that they had never been refused a flexible work request and 5.9% (24) stated that they had been refused a request for flexible working at some point.

Those who stated that they had been refused such a request were asked to provide information on the basis for the request being refused. There were 26 qualitative responses to this question. A variety of reasons were given for requests being refused and these are summarised below:
Not enough staff to provide cover / Business Pressures

“Too many other people 'working flexibly' made it unfeasible for me to be granted my request”. (Case 75)

“Too much work to do. Absence of other staff creating pressure. ALL TOTALLY REASONABLE” (Case 444)

Shift Patterns

“After being forced into compressed hours. I was refused flexible working” (Case 148)

Concern at Lack of Equity within Offices

“Several years ago I asked ...... for a post with decreased hours and was told none were available. This seemed unfair at the time as more senior staff seemed to be able to make some request and have it granted without much trouble”. (Case 250)

One respondent also highlighted being made to feel uncomfortable as a reason for not taking up work life balance arrangements as follows:

“Although I could still have worked from home I was made to feel uncomfortable when asking for it as if it was for a 'skive' which I found unhelpful and decided not to pursue it further”. (Case 388)
CAREER PROGRESSION / INTERNAL PROMOTION

Section 5 of the questionnaire considered the issue of career progression and internal promotion. The questions in the section were only to be completed by SPCB staff.

Firstly, the survey asked whether the respondent had applied for a promotion within the Parliament within the last 12 months (question 5a). There were 415 responses to this question, representing 93.7% of the total sample (which comprised SPCB and non-SPCB staff). Of the 415 responses 81.2% (337) had not applied for promotion and 18.8% (78) had applied for promotion. This compares to 19.7% in 2005 (and 23% in 2003) of respondents who had applied for career progression within the last 12 months.

Analysis of the personal characteristics of respondents with regard to whether they had applied for promotion in the last 12 months raised a range of interesting results. Firstly, 23.3% of female respondents had applied for promotion in the last 12 months compared to 16.1% of males. Secondly respondents from younger age groups were more likely to have applied for promotion as the proportions by age band below indicate:

- 21-30 32.8%
- 31-40 20.4%
- 41-50 7.4%
- 51-60 16.9%
- 61-70 9.1%

Respondents who had applied for promotion were then asked whether they had been successful in the last 12 months (question 5b). There were 57 responses to this question. Of this total, 20 respondents (35.1%) had been successful and 37 respondents (64.9%) had not been successful. In 2005 42% reported that they had been successful whilst 33% in 2003 reported that they had successfully applied for career progression. Those who were successful in achieving promotion were then asked whether their progression was within the office which they already worked in. There were 22 responses to this question with 14 respondents (63.6%) stating that it was within the same office compared to 59% in 2005 and 88% in 2003. 8 respondents stated that their promotion was to a different office.

Respondents who had not been successful were asked to describe why they thought this was the case. Generally respondents’ views fell into two categories on this issue. Firstly some respondents considered that they did not have the necessary skills / experience for the post applied for or had failed to perform at interview.

“I sold myself short on the application form. I did not consider any of my activities as innovative and so did not provide adequate examples” (Case 154)

“I was rubbish. I wouldn’t have promoted me!” (Case 327)

Secondly some respondents considered that the outcome of the application process had been pre-determined as the following quotes indicate:

“The job was filled by an individual who had been on temporary promotion in the post. It was a foregone conclusion that this would be the outcome”. (Case 231)

“I passed the board twice but did not get promotion. I felt that the job was already decided that the individual who did get it had been pre picked. (Case 103)
A couple of respondents highlighted the issue of being unable to obtain feedback on their application for promotion.

Finally, with regard to career progression, respondents were asked whether over the past twelve months any of their ‘personal characteristics that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework’ may have affected their chances of promotion. There were 391 responses to this question representing 88.3% of the total sample. 86.7% (339) considered that this had not been an issue for them. 3.6% (14) thought this had been an issue and 9.7% (38) did not know whether this had been an issue. The respondents who considered that their personal characteristics had affected their chances of promotion were asked to provide more information regarding their response.

“age - perhaps perceived as not having enough working years to give to the promoted post requiring it to be filled again within a relatively small number of years. This should be balanced against experience and knowledge to be brought to the job” (Case 441)

“Disability - I perceive that my recent periods of long term sick might have affected any interview panel's perception of my ability to do the job this is only a perception though it did prevent me from applying for a recent vacancy as I felt it would be pointless”. (Case 232)

“Family status and working pattern, part-time then compressed hours and gender. Less committed due to other obligations. Assumption made by others that I have put my career on hold to have children” (Case 325)
APPRAISAL

Section 6 dealt with the appraisal system and contained questions which were only to be answered by SPCB staff.

Question 6a asked staff to indicate their overall appraisal marking in their most recent ‘end of year’ appraisal. There were 373 responses to this question or 84.2% of the total sample. Figure 3 depicts the response to this question.

FIGURE THREE – APPRAISAL MARKING

Please tick one of the boxes below to indicate your overall appraisal marking in your most recent end of year staff appraisal (staff employed by the SPCB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly exceeding the requirements of the role</td>
<td>21.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully demonstrating the requirements of the role</td>
<td>73.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating most of the requirements of the role</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory Performance</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2007 Audit represents an increase in the proportion of respondents who were marked as either ‘clearly exceeding’ or ‘fully demonstrating’ the requirements of the role at their most recent appraisal meeting in comparison with the 2005 results². In 2005 the outcomes reported were:

- Exceptional – 15.3%
- Meets job requirements / effective – 68.7%
- Needs development – 1.9%
- Unsatisfactory – 0.2%
- Prefer not to answer – 14.0%

² The 2003 Audit results are not compared as the appraisal system changed between the 2003 and 2005 Audits and therefore the 2003 results are not comparable.
Given the change in categories available to respondents between the 2007 and 2005 Audit – the omission of a ‘Prefer not to answer’ category and one less appraisal category – may largely account for the difference in results between the two Audits. Further analysis of responses to this question indicated that persons who stated that they considered they had a disability were more likely to obtain a poorer appraisal marking than those who did not consider that they had a disability as Table One indicates.

| Table One – Most recent appraisal marking by statement on disability, Number of Cases (%) |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Respondent stated they had a disability – appraisal marking | Respondent stated they did not have a disability – appraisal marking |
| Clearly exceeds | 6 (19.4%) | Clearly exceeds | 68 (21.6%) |
| Fully demonstrates | 21 (67.7%) | Fully demonstrates | 237 (75.2%) |
| Total | 31 (100%) | Total | 315 (100%) |

Secondly staff who are seconded to the Parliament were asked to provide their most recent appraisal marking. There were 30 responses to this question representing 6.8% of the total survey sample. Figure 4 depicts the response to this question.

FIGURE FOUR: APPRAISAL MARKING (SECONDMENT)
Respondents were then asked whether they considered that any of their personal characteristics (which fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework) affected, or might have affected, their end of year appraisal marking (question 6b). There were 397 responses to this question or 89.6% of the total survey sample. The responses were as follows:

- 88.9% (353) did not consider that their personal characteristics had affected their appraisal marking
- 9.3% (37) did not know
- 1.8% (7) considered that their personal characteristics had affected their appraisal marking as compared to 2.1% in 2005 and 2.3% in 2003, although these figures are all fairly low and should be considered with a degree of caution

Those who considered that their personal characteristics had had an impact on their appraisal marking were asked to provide further information for their response. There were 12 qualitative responses to this question despite only 7 respondents indicating that their personal characteristics had impacted on their appraisal marking. The main characteristics cited by respondents were health, gender and age having an impact upon their appraisal marking.\(^3\)

---

\(^3\) In 2005 the main personal characteristics identified by some respondents as having affected their appraisal marking were: gender, sexual orientation, being a part time worker and disability.
DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

Section seven dealt with whether respondents had been subject to disciplinary proceedings during the last twelve months. Once again, the questions in this section were to be answered only by SPCB staff.

Firstly, respondents were asked whether they have been the subject of an investigation under the SPCB’s disciplinary procedures during the last 12 months. There were 409 responses to this question representing 92.3% of the total survey sample. Of this total, 98.3% (402) had not been subject to disciplinary procedures. Conversely 1.7% (7) had been subject to disciplinary procedures.

Those who had been subject to an investigation were then asked whether the disciplinary allegations were made after the investigation had taken place (question 7b). There were 6 responses to this question. Two respondents had allegations made after the investigation had taken place and the remaining four respondents had not.

Lastly, respondents who had been subject to the SPCB disciplinary procedures during the last 12 months were asked whether they considered that any of their personal characteristics had affected the way in which they had been treated. No comments were made in response to this question.
GENERAL REVIEW

Section 8 asked all respondents to the survey for their views regarding a range of equal opportunities issues.

DISCRIMINATION

Respondents were asked, in addition to the earlier questions in the survey regarding discrimination, whether they have been discriminated against whilst working at the Parliament (question 8a). There were 434 responses to this question representing 98% of the total survey sample. 91.2% of respondents (396) stated that they had not been discriminated against whilst 8.8% (38) stated that they felt they had been discriminated against. In 2005 6.8% stated that they felt they had been discriminated against and 90.2% stated this was not the case. However the 2005 survey also contained a 'prefer not to answer' option (3% stated this in 2005), which was not available in 2007 and therefore the results are not directly comparable. In 2003, 88.6% stated that they had not been discriminated against and 11.4% stated that they had experienced discrimination.

Of the 8.8% (38) respondents, female respondents were more likely than male respondents to state that they had experienced discrimination (10.1% of females and 5.9% of males). A larger proportion of respondents who stated that they had a disability (34) stated they had experienced discrimination (5 respondents or 14.7%) as compared to 7.5% of those who stated that they had experienced discrimination and did not have a disability (379).

35 respondents provided qualitative responses detailing the form of discrimination they had experienced. Various forms of discrimination were provided in response to this question, there was no sense of any clear themes emerging from the responses provided. The quotes below provide an indication of the type of response received:

“Being security - bottom of the pecking order. Not so much an organisational thing as a national attitude (snobbery)” (Case 77)

“This is a very difficult question to answer. I don't know. Maybe I have been. I don't think that the Parliament is a particularly good employer in some respects. I think that people get preferential treatment for various reasons - not always definable”. (Case 125)

“I think that the interview system and management discriminate against older staff” (Case 462)

SPCB AS AN EMPLOYER

Question 8b asked respondents whether they considered that the SPCB is doing all it reasonably can as an employer to implement its equal opportunities policies. Of the 425 responses to this question (95.9% of the survey sample) 84.7% (360) consider that the SPCB was doing all it reasonably could (compared to 80.3% in 2005 and 78.9% in 2003) whilst 15.3% (65) considered that the SPCB was not doing enough to implement its equal opportunities policies (compared to 13.1% in 2005 and 21.1% in 2003). Again it is important to note that in both 2003 and 2005 there was a ‘prefer not to answer’ option available to respondents which was not available in 2007 therefore not making the results directly comparable.

4 In 2005 3% and in 2003 16.2% chose not to answer this question. The 2003 results, cited above, only include those who chose to answer the question and not the 16.2% who did not.
Female respondents were less likely to consider that the SPCB was doing all it could to implement its equal opportunities policies than male respondents. 17.6% of females did not consider that more could be done as compared to 11.2% of male respondents. Respondents who stated that they had a disability were also more likely to state that the SPCB was not doing all it could to implement its equal opportunity policies. 24.2% of respondents who stated that they had a disability considered that the SPCB could do more to implement its equal opportunity policies as opposed to 13.9% of those who stated they did not have a disability.

Those who considered that the SPCB could do more in relation to its equal opportunities policies were asked what other things the SPCB could do. 57 qualitative responses were given in answer to this question. Again a vast array of issues were raised by survey respondents in relation to this issue. Some of the main issues to emerge are considered below.

**Recruitment Processes**

Respondents raised the issue of the operation of recruitment policies particularly in relation to temporary promotion positions and internal advertising of posts. The quotes below provide an indication of the issues raised:

“In relation to temporary vacancies in….., not everyone has been given the same opportunities. Individuals have been allowed to remain in temporary positions for prolonged periods of time (up to 3 years in some cases) despite the policy of one year. Others have been allowed to remain in TP while others have had to revert. Unfair practices”. (Case 163)

“There appears to still be anomalies regarding recruitment - specifically the filling of internal vacancies - some posts go through standard procedures but in other cases it seems as if some individuals just 'get the job' they were filling temporarily”. (Case 232)

“Examine gender issues, which is beginning to happen now” (Case 312)

**Management Culture**

Perceptions emerged which were critical of the management / organisation culture which they considered prevalent within the organisation. In particular a few respondents considered that there was a top-down culture where those on lower grades felt a lack of involvement in the decisions made. The quote below provides an example of comments of this kind:

“Offer opportunities for all to discuss any equal opportunities related policies, some in the Parliament won't have access to all relevant info. Get lower grades actively engaged in policy making process - too many policies discussed and agreed at Senior management level, leaving lower grades to comply with policies on which they've had little or no input”. (Case 320)

**Tokenism**

Perceptions emerged which considered that there was a degree of tokenism or 'lip service' being paid in relation to equal opportunities policy within the organisation. For example:

“Pays very good lip service to Equal Opportunities but some of the ideas of senior staff are entrenched in old working practices” (Case 136)
“I suspect that it has made up a policy and is now going through the motions. This survey will tick the "monitoring" box in that policy. At the end of the day, it's just words on a page which management may or may not implement”. (Case 125)

Alternatively there were some perceptions that the SPCB took equal opportunities far more seriously than other employers and was doing well in relation to equal opportunities policy and that further attempts to enhance the policy may prove counter productive:

“I believe it does more! For example, having "Equal Opportunities Improving Access and Equality" as one of the 8 appraisal competencies seems a bit over the top. Also very difficult to excel in for the majority of posts is Parliament, even at a low level. I don't view this as wholly positive”. (Case 131)

Views were then sought on whether 'significant progress' had been made over the last 12 months in implementing the SPCB's equal opportunities policies (question 8d). There were 340 responses to this question representing 76.7% of the total survey sample. Of this total 75.3% (256) agreed that significant progress had been made and 24.7% (84) disagreed. This compares to 66% considering significant progress had been made in 2005 and 68.7% in 2003 although in both 2003 and 2005 the option of 'prefer not to answer' was available therefore making the results not directly comparable. The favourability of respondents with regard to the implementation of equal opportunities policies increased as the age of respondents' increases. For example 75.8% of 21-30 year olds considered that significant progress had been made in the last 12 months compared to 82.5% of 51-60 year olds.

All respondents were asked to comment on equal opportunities issues, either positively or negative, within the Parliament (question 8e). There were 130 responses to this question. Generally responses to this question provided positive perceptions of the operation of equal opportunities policy. Whilst many respondents considered that 'significant progress' was a high standard to meet given that standards had previously been high there was a considerable body of opinion that progress continued to be made with regard to equal opportunities issues. The quotes below provide an indication of the views expressed:

“As far as I am concerned, the SPCB's implementation of it's EO policies has been successful/ effective for many years now. Not just the past 12 months”. (Case 151)

“I wouldn't say significant progress but certainly steady progress” (Case 83)

“Not aware of any specific steps in the last 12 months but generally I consider the Scottish parliament to be an exemplar employer in terms of Equal Opportunities”. (Case 195)

Some respondents stated that they did not know whether any change had taken place and some sought better communication with regard to what was happening in terms of equal opportunities policy.

**DIGNITY AT WORK**

Respondents were asked whether they had used the network of dignity at work contacts (question 8f). 97.7% (433) of the survey sample answered this question. Of this total 95.6% (414) stated they had not used the network. 4.4% (19) had used the network compared to 3.6% in 2005. Those who had stated that they had used the network were then asked how they

---

5 In 2003 16.2% chose not answer this question and in 2005 6.1% chose not answer the question. In addition in 2005 the option of 'don't know' was available with 0.5% of respondents choosing this option.
would rate the support provided by the dignity at work contact they had dealt with. 19 respondents answered this question and rated the network as follows:

- Very useful – 57.9% (11)
- Useful – 31.6% (6)
- Not very useful – 5.3% (1)
- Not useful at all – 5.3% (1)

All respondents to the survey were then asked to comment on the network and the dignity at work policy more generally (question 8h). There were 61 responses to this question with respondents fairly evenly split in their perceptions of the network. Examples of supportive comments include:

“I think that the dignity at work scheme is great especially for staff who have suffered bullying or harassment. The Parliament is very forward thinking and streets ahead of other organisations with its equal opportunities policy”. (Case 59)

“It can only be a positive thing that the SPCB offers with a service to staff” (Case 405)

Of those who were supportive of the network there was a sense of a lack of knowledge of how the system operates and whether it is effective amongst some of these respondents:

“The network is a good idea and the policy in general is good. I think its time for a refresh though. (Case 217)

“I think it is a good idea in principle but I doubt it’s even used”. (Case 191)

“More awareness of the policy should be promoted”. (Case 465)

“I was not aware who the dignity at work contact is for my office until reading this question and asking another member of staff”. (Case 240)

Some respondents expressed scepticism about the value of the network and in particular the calibre of the contacts involved as the following quotes indicate:

“There are not many people who are dignity at work contacts who I know or would be comfortable talking to”. (Case 150)

“The network doesn't appear to have been very successful. I don't know any staff that have contacted the network....” (Case 100)

“Have to confess that I don’t know offhand who my contact might be. Not sure how well equipped they would be. Will now look into this. Have no need to contact them though” (Case 251)

“I would not have been keen to use a dignity at work contact if I were to experience difficulties or issues at work. I would probably approach my line manager or Parliament counselling support in the first instance” (Case 151)

Lastly, a number of respondents considered that there was the potential for duplication between the dignity at work network and the Parliament’s complaints and grievance processes:
“There is significant confusion between the Dignity at Work procedure and the grievance procedure. It has to be questioned why two separate procedures are required - the two formal processes could be joined, leaving Dignity at Work contacts in place”. (Case 225)

“I think it a good policy but there needs to be a review of the complaints procedure to ensure it fits in with (and does not duplicate) the grievance procedure”. (Case 461)

SPCB AS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES EMPLOYER

Lastly, respondents were asked questions regarding their view of the SPCB as an employer. Firstly respondents were asked if they would recommend the SPCB as an employer to other people (question 8i). There were 412 responses to this question representing 93% of the survey sample. Of this total 96.1% (396) said they would recommend the SPCB as an employer and 3.9% (16) stated that they would not. This represents an increase on the 90% of respondents who said they would recommend the SPCB as an employer in 2005 and 90.2% in 2003 although again the questions asked are not directly comparable across the three Audits. In general there were few distinctive trends evident in responses to this question when the personal characteristics of respondents were analysed.

Those who stated that they would not recommend the SPCB as an employer were asked to provide more information (question 8j) for their answer. There were 25 responses to this question although only 16 respondents stated that they would not recommend the SPCB as an employer in question 8i. A variety of comments were made in response to this question, with a number of respondents indicating that they found the management structure and organisational culture of the organisation unhelpful as the quotes below indicate:

“There is a vast amount of talent in the lower grades within the SPCB staff that is being wasted while people of lesser talent and dedication are moved swiftly up the promotional ladder. It seems if you're grade 3 or below you're expected to carry more responsibility for actually making/changing practises and procedures and ensuring they work. (if anything goes wrong the grades above dump the working problems onto lower grades who do the problem solving. Also, in corporate planning management tweak last year's plan by adding in ideas derived from the above. Needless to say, the higher grades get the credit” (Case 170)

“I've come to regret taking up employment here. There exists derision and open subversive hostility albeit instigated by a small minority. They seem immune to prosecution and in some way "protected". Senior mgmt seem unwilling to address the issue leading to an air of despondency” (Case 443)

“Undecided. Recent changes in staffing moves have been explained in inconsistent terms resulting in a certain level of bad feeling and demotivation. Still practice to appoint people to posts which have not been apparently advertised”. (Case 337)

“Poor career prospects. Too much bureaucracy. Too rigid line management structures. Golden handcuffs”. (Case 298)

Respondents were then asked whether they had any comments or ideas which would assist in the implementation of the SPCB’s equal opportunities policies. There were 63 responses to this question. In general responses to this question made positive remarks regarding the operation of equal opportunities policy in the Parliament as the quotes below exemplify:

---

6 In 2005 4.9% preferred not to answer this question and 0.4% ‘did not know’. In 2003 7.66% chose not to answer the question and 0.23% stated ‘don’t know’.
“The equal opportunities policies are fine there are wider issues that we would be better spending our time and resources on I feel”. (Case 153)

“Overall I think that the SPCB is an excellent employer regarding attitude to work/life balance, and its one of the main reasons I look on this as a long-term employment prospect, despite limited promotion opportunities”. (Case 304)

“I would say that the SPCB sets a good example as an employer by introducing these policies”. (Case 421)

“I found the Scottish Parliament to be an excellent employer in allowing me flexibility to balance work demands and my responsibility to look after my son”. (Case 422)

Some respondents considered that whilst the equal opportunities policies are excellent difficulties remained with the implementation of these policies:

“Not a lot to add, except to say that line management (including Senior management) need to be seen to give active support to the equalities framework, not just lip service. I don't perceive a big problem with this at the moment. But its something we should always keep a keen eye on as an organisation” (Case 57)

Reflecting concerns of this nature some respondents suggested training for senior management in the implementation of equal opportunities policies would be beneficial as the quotes below indicates:

“More training for senior management & line managers. Need for consistency in approach across offices to requests of flexible working. More consistency in use of special leave”. (Case 365)

“More training for management on the work life balance policy - this is an excellent policy that I take full advantage of and it works well in my directorate but having discussed this with the people from other directorates it does not appear to work well. Some managers see it as an awkward problem rather than a positive solution for staff”. (Case 79)
PERSONAL INFORMATION

Finally the survey sought a range of information regarding the personal characteristics of respondents.

WORKING STATUS

Respondents were asked a range of questions regarding their working status within the Scottish Parliament. Firstly respondents were asked what their current grade is within the organisation (question 9.1). There were 432 responses to this question representing 97.5% of the total survey sample although 35 respondents decided to opt for the ‘I prefer not to answer this question’ option. Figure Five depicts the responses to this question. The structure of respondents by grade largely mirrors that obtained in the 2005 Audit.

**Figure Five: Grade**

What is your current grade?

- 31.71% (Grade 1)
- 13.43% (Grade 2)
- 19.91% (Grade 3)
- 16.2% (Grade 4)
- 8.56% (Grade 5)
- 1.62% (Grade 6)
- 0.23% (Grade 7)
- 0.1% (Grade 8/Chief Executive)
- 31.71% (I prefer not to answer this question)

Question 9.2 asked respondents to detail whether they were contracted to work on a full-time or part-time basis. There were 435 responses to this question representing 98.2% of the total survey sample. The response to this question was as follows:

- 86.4% (376) were full-time employees
- 10.6% (46) were part-time employees
- 3% (13) preferred not to answer the question (2% in 2003 and 2005)

The proportion of full-time employees has declined from the 92% that stated they worked full-time in 2003 and 2005. Female respondents accounted for 44.2% of full-time workers which is above the average for the Scottish workforce where women accounted for 38.3% of Scottish full-time workers between April and June 2007\(^7\). Correspondingly the proportion of respondents working part-time has increased to 10.6% in 2007 from 6% in 2005 and 2003. 15.5% of total female respondents work part-time compared to 7.3% of total male respondents. Male respondents accounted for 34.8%, and women 65.2%, of total part-time workers. This is considerably higher than the position within the Scottish workforce between April and June 2007 where men account for 23.3% and women 76.7% of part-time workers\(^8\).

Respondents were then asked which type of contract they currently have with the Parliament. There were 432 responses to this question representing 97.5% of the survey sample. Figure Six details the response to this question.

**Figure Six: Contract**

![Figure Six: Contract](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/pdfdir/lmsscot1007.pdf)


\(^8\) Ibid, p.20.
The proportion of respondents who have a permanent contract in 2007 (86.6%) compared to 80.5% in 2005 and 81.4% in 2003. This is largely balanced by a decline in the proportion of respondents who have a fixed term contract which has fallen to 2.1% in 2007 from 6.5% in 2005 and 8% in 2003.

Respondents were asked which directorate they worked in (question 9.5). There were 424 responses to this question representing 95.7% of the survey sample. Figure Seven details the results to this question. The mix of respondents across directorates is broadly similar to that obtained in the 2005 Audit.

**Figure Seven: Directorate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and Information Directorate</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk/Chief Executive’s Group</td>
<td>11.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Clerking and Reporting</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Legal Services</td>
<td>10.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Resources of Governance</td>
<td>11.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and Facilities Management</td>
<td>22.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to answer this question</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENDER**

Respondents were asked two questions regarding their ‘gender identity’. Firstly, question 6a asked how respondents would describe their gender. The were 435 responses to this question representing 98.2% of the survey sample. The responses to this question were as follows:

- Female – 44.8% (195)
- Male – 51.0% (222)
- Other – 0.2% (1)
• I prefer not to answer this question – 3.9% (17)

In the 2005 Audit males accounted for 51% of respondents and females 45% and 4% ‘preferred not to answer’. The 2001 Census found that 46.5% of the economically active population in Scotland were female. At the time of the survey being conducted 46.2% of SPCB employees were female and 53.8% male.

Secondly, respondents were asked whether they had ever identified as transgender (question 6b). There were 376 responses to this question representing 84.9% of the survey sample. The responses to this question were as follows:

• Yes – 0.3% (1)
• No – 96.3% (362)
• I prefer not to answer this question – 3.5% (13)

RELATIONSHIP STATUS

Respondents were then asked two questions regarding their ‘relationship status’. Firstly respondents were asked whether they had a partner or were single (question 7a). There were 427 respondents to this question or 96.4% of the survey sample. The responses to this question were as follows:

• I have a partner – 66.5% (284)
• I am single – 22.7% (97)
• I prefer not to answer this question – 10.8% (46)

These results are virtually identical to those obtained in the 2005 Audit where 67% had a partner, 23% were single and 10% preferred not to answer.

Secondly those who answered that they had a partner, to the question above, were asked whether they were married or registered in a civil partnership (question 7b). 284 respondents stated that they had a partner in response to the previous question and 239 respondents answered question 7b. The responses to this question were as follows:

• I am married – 81.6% (195)
• I am registered in a civil partnership – 2.1% (5)
• I prefer not to answer this question – 16.3% (39)

CARING RESPONSIBILITIES

With regard to caring responsibilities respondents were asked whether they had caring responsibilities for a child, children or anyone else (question 8). There were 433 responses to this question representing 97.7% of the survey sample. Responses to this question were as follows:

• Yes, I have caring / parental responsibilities for a child / children – 28.6% (124)
• Yes, I have caring responsibilities for someone other than children / a child – 4.6% (20)
• No, I do not have any caring responsibilities – 57.3% (248)
• I prefer not to answer this question – 9.5% (41)

---

In 2005 22.2% had responsibility for a child and a further 4.7% had responsibility for someone other than a child. In the 2001 Census 26.4% of Scottish households had dependent children whilst 12.1% of the Scottish working population stated that they provided unpaid care\textsuperscript{10}.

**SEXUAL ORIENTATION**

The survey asked a number of questions regarding sexual orientation. Firstly respondents were asked how they would describe their sexual orientation (question 9). There were 434 responses to this question or 98% of the survey sample, of which 84.9% (376), compared to 87.7% in 2005, stated they were heterosexual and 6.3% (27) stated they were of another sexual orientation compared to 6.1% in 2005, with 7.1% of respondents (31) preferring not to answer this question compared to 6.1% in 2005. Figure Eight displays the response to this question. A General Register Office for Scotland small scale postal survey on sexual orientation found 2.2% of respondents stated their sexual identity as gay (with a no response rate of 6% and a prefer not to answer rate of 8.5%)\textsuperscript{11}.

**Figure Eight: Sexual Orientation**

Secondly respondents who answered that they were lesbian, gay or bisexual were asked whether they felt able to be open about their sexual orientation with other people working at the Parliament (question 10a). There were 37 responses to this question of which:

- 70.3% (26) stated that they felt able to be open about their sexual orientation
- 8.1% (3) stated that they did not feel able to be open about their sexual orientation
- 21.6% (8) preferred not to answer this question

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid, p.7.

Those who stated that they did not feel able to be open about their sexual orientation were then asked if this was to do with their working environment (question 10b). There were 10 responses to this question as follows:

- 1 respondent stated that their answer was a consequence of their working environment
- 2 respondents stated that their answer was not a consequence of their working environment
- 7 respondents preferred not to answer this question

NATIONALITY

The survey asked two questions regarding the nationality of respondents. Firstly respondents were asked how they would describe their nationality (question 9.11). There were 437 responses to this question or 98.6% of the survey sample. The responses to this question are depicted in Figure Nine.

The proportion of respondents describing their nationality as Scottish has fallen from 78.5% in 2005 to 70.3% in 2007. The 2001 Census found that 87.2% of the Scottish population were born in Scotland. In the 2007 Audit 11.7% of respondents described their nationality as being from either one of the non-Scottish UK nations or Irish. The equivalent figure from the 2001 Census, in terms of country of birth, was 9.5%.

---

Secondly respondents were asked how they would describe their ethnic background (question 9.11b). There were 437 responses to this question or 98.6% of the survey sample. The response to this question is displayed in Figure Ten.

**Figure Ten: Ethnicity**

94.1% of respondents to this question in 2007 stated that their ethnic background was ‘white’ which is slightly lower than 95.1% providing this response in 2005. The 1.8% of respondents who stated that their background was non white in 2007 is slightly higher than the 1.5% of respondents providing this response in 2005. The 2001 Census\(^\text{13}\) found that 98% of Scottish respondents stated that their ethnic background was ‘white’ whilst data from Personnel suggested that the ethnic background of 87.6% of staff was white (however the ethnic background of 11.2% of staff was ‘unknown’).

**RELIGION**

Question 9.12 asked respondents which religions, religious denominations or bodies they currently belonged to. There were 437 responses to this question representing 98.6% of the survey sample whose responses are displayed in Figure Eleven. In comparison to the 2005

\(^\text{13}\) Scrol website
Audit the proportion of respondents stating that they have no religious affiliation has increased from 52.8% in 2005 to 57.2% in 2007. Correspondingly the number of respondents stating that they do have a religious affiliation has fallen since 2005. For example, the proportion of respondents stating that their religion was ‘Church of Scotland’ has fallen from 25.64% in 2005 to 21.97% in 2007. As with previous Audits respondents to the survey are considerably less likely to state that they have a religious identity than was the case for the 2001 Census. The 2001 Census found that 27.55% stated that they had no religion and 42.4% cited their religion as being ‘Church of Scotland’, 7.89% ‘Other Christian’ and 7.66% ‘Roman Catholic’. In contrast, the position is reversed for respondents to the 2007 Audit with 57.2% stating that they do not subscribe to any religion, 21.97% ‘Church of Scotland’, 5.72% ‘Other Christian’ and 5.49% ‘Roman Catholic’.

Figure Eleven: Religion

Which of the following religions do you currently belong to?

AGE

Question 9.13 asked respondents which age band they belonged to as depicted in Figure 12. There were 438 responses to this question or 98.9% of the survey sample. There has been a slight shift in the age profile of respondents in comparison with the 2005 Audit. The proportion of respondents in the 21-30 age band has declined from 20.6% in 2005 to 16.44% in 2007 (a decline of 4.16%) whilst the older age bands tend to have increased their share of respondents suggesting a gradual ageing of the workforce. The 31-40 age band has increased its share of
respondents by 3.65%, the 41-50 age band by 0.34% and the 51-60 age band by 2.19% in comparison with the 2005 Audit.

**Figure Thirteen: Age**

![Age Distribution Chart]

**DISABILITY**

Question 9.13 asked whether respondents considered that they had a disability. 98.4% (436) of survey respondents answered this question. The responses to this question were as follows:

- 7.8% (34) considered that they had a disability
- 86.9% (379) considered that they did not have a disability
- 5.3% (23) preferred not to answer this question

The proportion of respondents stating they considered they had a disability has increased from 5.9% in 2005 and 5.8% in 2003. The 2001 Census found that 6.69% of the economically active Scottish population stated that they had a limiting long term illness, health problem or disability. Data from Personnel indicated that 3.3% of staff had a disability. Accordingly the survey indicates that the SPCB now employs a higher proportion of persons stating that they have a disability than the Scottish average for the economically average for the first time since these Audits have been conducted.

Those who stated that they considered they did have a disability were then asked to describe the form their disability took (question 9.15). There were 40 responses to this question as follows:

- Hearing impairment – 5
- Visual impairment (not corrected by spectacles or contact lenses) – 4
• Mobility impairment – 6
• Physical co-ordination difficulties – 2
• Reduced physical capacity – 2
• Progressive condition such as cancer, HIV, multiple sclerosis – 1
• Learning disabilities – 1
• Mental health condition – 4
• Other – 5
• I prefer not to answer this question - 10

TRADE UNION ACTIVITIES

Lastly respondents were asked to describe their involvement with trade unions (question 9.16). There were 432 responses to this question representing 97.5% of the survey sample. Responses to this question are displayed in Figure 14.

Figure Fourteen: Trade Union Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of a trade union</td>
<td>55.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of a TU and I'm involved in TU activities here</td>
<td>31.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not a member of a TU</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to answer this question</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of these statements best describes your trade union activities?

There has been a slight increase in trade union activity (whether active or not) from 2005 when 60.2% were involved in trade unions compared to 61.11% in 2007. However the proportion stating that they are not a member of a trade union has also increased from 28.4% in 2005 reflecting a lower proportion of respondents in 2007 ‘preferring not to answer the question’ (in 2005 11.4% took this option). The response to this question suggests a shift back to the finding from the 2003 Audit when 62.4% stated that they were a trade union member (whether active or
not) and 31.4% stated that they were not a member of a trade union. This suggests that the membership of trade unions has remained static over the period 2003 to 2007 (with the 2005 results having been skewed by a higher proportion of respondents preferring not to answer the question).
CONCLUSIONS

Overall the 2007 Equalities Audit results provide a positive representation of the implementation of equal opportunities policies. In part the focus of the equalities audit is to identify ‘areas for improvement’ and this is reflected in the structure of the audit which to a certain extent focus upon ascertaining the views of respondents with regard to any perceived failings in policy (particularly in terms of seeking qualitative responses).

Compared to previous audits the 2007 survey found a similar proportion of respondents stating that they had never been refused attendance on a training course in the last twelve months. Of those who had been refused attendance a number of reasons were given including: training not relevant to the post; refusal was due to the cost of the course; due to work demands within the office concerned; and agency staff highlighting that they are not able to access all training on offer to SPCB staff. The proportion of respondents stating that they had received sufficient training and development opportunities over the last 12 months increased markedly from the 2005 Audit.

In terms of harassment and bullying the 2007 results found that 12.6% of respondents had experienced harassment and bullying during the last 12 months compared to 10.6% in 2005 and 13.2% in 2003. Respondents who stated that they had a disability were more likely to have experienced bullying and / or harassment than respondents as a whole. The personal characteristics of gender and age were highlighted by respondents as most likely to have linked to incidents of harassment experienced. The 2007 survey also saw a decline in the proportion of respondents who stated that the person responsible for the behaviour experienced had management authority over them. A larger proportion of respondents had used the dignity at work network than was the case in 2005 reflecting that the network had only been recently introduced at the time of the last Audit being undertaken. With regard to the complaints procedure respondents offered a range of reasons for not having made a complaint (whether formal or informal) with regard to the bullying / harassment which had been experienced. This included: a lack of trust in the complaints procedure; concern that raising a complaint could harm future promotion prospects or result in a backlash; a perception that senior staff could not be approached regarding the issue concerned; and, that respondents preferred to deal with the issue themselves. The Audit found a decline in the proportion of respondents who had experienced discrimination or harassment, in comparison to the 2005 results, as a result of trade union activity or membership.

A high proportion of respondents (90.7%) felt that they were generally able to balance work and home life. Male respondents were more likely than female respondents to state that they found it difficult to balance work and home life. Reasons given by respondents who had been refused a work life balance request included not enough staff being available to provide cover / business pressures; shift patterns; and, a concern at a lack of equity of treatment between staff within offices.

In terms of career progression the Audit found that females who had applied for promotion were less likely than males to have been successful although females had been more likely than male respondents to have applied for promotion in the last 12 months. Personal characteristics which respondents cited as having affected their chances of promotion included age, disability, health condition and, the impact of maternity leave. The Audit findings in relation to the appraisal process found that respondents who stated that they had a disability were more likely to have obtained a poorer appraisal marking than the sample as a whole. Health, gender and age were cited by respondents as personal characteristics which had had an impact on the appraisal marking received.
Returning to the issue of discrimination 8.8% of respondents stated that they had been discriminated against. 84.7% of respondents considered that the SPCB was doing all it could to implement its equal opportunities policies although females and respondents with a disability were less likely than the sample as a whole to take this view. Issues were raised regarding areas where more could be done in relation to equal opportunities policies. This related to the recruitment process, a top-down management culture and a suggestion of tokenism in relation to equal opportunities policy.

96.1% of respondents would recommend the SPCB as an employer although again respondents with a disability were less likely, than the sample as a whole, to do so.
ANNEX ONE - METHODOLOGY

The Equalities Survey was developed by Corporate Policy in conjunction with SPICe Research. A key objective in developing the 2007 survey was to minimise the degree of change from the previous survey, in order to ensure comparability over time, wherever possible. The Equalities Audit 2007 was sent out to all Scottish Parliament staff, in hard copy, on 18 May 2007. A number of reminders were also sent to Scottish Parliament staff who had not completed the survey by both e-mail and via the Corporate Bulletin. The closing date for responses was 9 July. Accordingly respondents had 7 weeks to provide responses. All responses to the survey were sent to Challenge Consultancy who then collated the responses received in a Microsoft Access database. All responses to the survey were provided on an anonymous basis but the commissioning of Challenge Consultancy to undertake this data collection role was intended to provide a further safeguard with regard to respondent anonymity. Accordingly only Challenge Consultancy had access to completed questionnaires. The Access database was sent to SPICe research where it was transferred into a SPSS (statistical package) for data analysis. All data analysis and report writing was conducted by SPICe research.

In terms of quantitative data, analysis was conducted via SPSS. Primarily simple percentages, cross tabulation of results and correlation analysis (Chi square) was conducted. No correlations are provided in this report as no significant results were obtained\textsuperscript{14}. In addition comparison of the 2007 results against the outcomes reported for the 2003 and 2005 Equalities Audit are provided where appropriate as are external data, primarily 2001 Census data, in order to provide a degree of context to the report. As all data was anonymised it was not possible to engage in process of triangulation with regard to qualitative data as the positionality of respondents was not known. Accordingly, 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 questions in the Audit would be reflected in the final report.

\textsuperscript{14} One of the conditions necessary in order to produce an statistically reliable Chi square result is that no cell in a cross tabulation should account for less than 5 frequencies in more than 20\% of cells. Due to the large number of categories in questions (particularly with options such as 'prefer not to answer') this frequently led to this requirement not being met and accordingly a considerable number of correlations having to be discarded. As a result no correlations are reported in this report.
ANNEX TWO - QUESTIONNAIRE

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES STAFF AUDIT QUESTIONNAIRE

IN CONFIDENCE

Please read this before completing this form

All members of staff are required to complete and return this questionnaire. However, in each section of the form, you have the option of not answering the questions in that section if you would prefer not to. You are encouraged to answer as many of the questions as possible, as this information will greatly assist us in implementing the SPCB’s equal opportunities policies.

The information you provide on this form will be treated as confidential and you are not asked to provide your name. This information will be used solely for the purpose of monitoring how effective we are in delivering our framework for equality and ensuring that all staff are treated equally and fairly. No member of staff at the Parliament will have access to this form once you have completed it. The Equalities Manager, Adviser or members of staff in the Personnel Office will not have access to these completed forms. An external organisation, Challenge Consultancy, will collate the information from the forms and provide the data to SPICE in an anonymous format. SPICE will carry out the analysis of the data and produce a report of the main findings. This report will be made available to all staff.

The policies in the SPCB’s Equality Framework make it clear that all employees must be treated fairly, with respect and without bias at all times. The SPCB expects all staff to contribute proactively to the creation of a working environment in which everyone is treated with dignity and respect irrespective of their gender; gender identity; sexual orientation; racial group (which includes colour, race, nationality, national or ethnic origin); religion, religious belief, or philosophical belief; disability; age; trade union membership status/activities; marital or family status, and part-time or fixed-term contract status.

COMPLETING AND RETURNING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Step 1: Complete this questionnaire. Although the questionnaire appears to be quite long, it should only take you around 10 minutes to complete it.

Step 2: Send this completed questionnaire to Challenge Consultancy Limited in the enclosed envelope marked “Private and Confidential” (via external mail)

Step 3: Send an email to “equalities.manager@scottish.parliament.uk” advising that you have returned your audit form. This will be checked regularly and a list of those returning their forms maintained. Anyone who has not sent an email will be contacted about returning the audit form.

For more information about this audit, or if you require this form in an alternative format (for example, large print, Braille or audio tape), please contact the Equalities Adviser on extension 86838 (RNID Typetalk calls welcome) or by email (mairi.pearson@scottish.parliament.uk). More information is also contained within the Equality Framework on SPEIR.
SECTION 1: EQUALITY MONITORING QUESTIONS

Please read this before answering the questions in Section 1

Some of the questions in this section of the form refer to your “personal characteristics that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework”. These characteristics are:

- your gender,
- your sexual orientation,
- your gender identity (i.e. your status if you have undergone or are planning to undergo a sex change operation),
- your ethnic group (which includes colour, race, nationality, national or ethnic origin),
- your religion,
- your religious belief or similar philosophical belief (or lack of any of these),
- any disability you might have (it could also be from a previous condition)
- your age,
- your marital or family status,
- your part-time or fixed-term contract status, and
- your trade union membership status/activities.

If you do not wish to answer a particular question in this section, please leave it blank. However, you are encouraged to answer as many of the questions as possible as this information will greatly assist us to implement our equal opportunities policies fully.

This questionnaire is completely confidential and the information collected will only be used for monitoring the effectiveness of our policies. Please, therefore, remember that when you provide information on this form about your own circumstances or your work history, this will not be the same as raising a complaint. If you do wish to make a complaint which is related to an equal opportunities issue, please speak to your line manager, refer to the Equality Framework or speak to a Dignity at Work Contact or a member of staff in the Personnel Office for advice or assistance.

1. ACCESS TO TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The questions in this section, on access to training and development opportunities, are to be completed by all respondents.

1a Has your manager refused to allow you to attend a training course within the last twelve months?

Yes [1] □  No [2] □  If ‘No’, please go to question 1c

If ‘Yes’, what reason was given for this refusal?

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________
1b If your answer to 1a is ‘Yes’, do you consider that any of your “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?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □ Don’t Know □ If ‘No’ or ‘Don’t Know’, please go to question 1c

If ‘Yes’, you are welcome to provide more information if you wish to. (If you do provide more information, it would be helpful if you would refer to the particular personal characteristic or characteristics that you think were relevant.)

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

1c Do you believe that, in general over the past twelve months, you have received sufficient training and development opportunities to support you in your current role?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □

If ‘No’, you are welcome to provide more information if you wish to. (If possible, please also describe whether or not you believe that any of the “personal characteristics that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework” have affected the training and development opportunities that you have received.)

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________


2. HARRASSMENT & BULLYING

Before answering the questions in this section, you should read through these two definitions:

**Harassment:** Unwanted conduct that violates a person’s dignity or creates an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment which is linked to, or based on, one or more of a person’s personal characteristics (e.g. their racial group, gender, sexual orientation, disability status, religion or belief, age, etc.).

**Bullying:** Inappropriate, malicious and unwelcome behaviour, an abuse or misuse of power through means intended to cause embarrassment, fear, humiliation or distress to a person or to a group of people. Bullying is normally characterised by the emergence of a pattern of behaviour, but a single incident, if serious enough, can amount to bullying behaviour. It may be obvious or it may be insidious. Whatever form it takes, it is unwarranted and unwelcome to the individual. Please note that bullying does not necessarily relate to a specific personal characteristic, For example bullying can be a result of abusive behaviour towards another member of staff, constant unreasonable and unconstructive criticism or deliberate exclusion from normal work interaction.

2a Do you believe that you have experienced either of the following types of unacceptable behaviour whilst working at the Parliament during the last twelve months? (Please tick all that apply)

- [ ] Harassment (see above for a definition)
- [ ] Bullying (see above for a definition)

If you have not ticked either of these two boxes, please go to question 3a.

**Harassment**

2b If you ticked the box on harassment, what kind of behaviour did this involve? For example was it unwelcome physical contact, harassing emails, verbal comments?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

2c Which of your personal characteristics do you believe to be linked to this behaviour? Was it your ethnic background, sexual orientation, age etc?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
Bullying

2d. If you ticked the box on bullying (at Question 2a) what kind of behaviour did this involve? For example was it overbearing supervision or other misuse of power or position, deliberate exclusion, verbal insults or behaviour, constant criticism etc or did it relate to a personal characteristic?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

The following questions, 2e to 2m, apply to instances of both bullying and harassment.

2e Did the person or people who behaved towards you in this way have management authority over you?

☐ [1] Yes, it was my immediate line manager
☐ [2] Yes, they had management authority over me but were not my immediate line manager
☐ [3] No, they were in a higher grade than me within the organisation but they did not have management authority over me
☐ [4] No, they were at the same grade as me, or at a lower grade than me, within the organisation
☐ [5] No, they were not part of the staff structure (e.g., they were an MSP, a member of staff employed by an MSP, a contractor, a member of the public, etc).

In this case, without naming the individual(s), please specify what their role is:

____________________________________________________________________________

☐ [6] The people responsible were a combination of more than one of the above, please specify:

____________________________________________________________________________

2f Did you get in touch with a Dignity at Work Contact for information and/or support?

☐ [1] Yes,
☐ [2] No,

2g If you did not use a dignity at work contact why not? i.e. are you unaware of the network of Contacts, do you feel, uneasy accessing the network, do you have no confidence in the network or did you feel it was unnecessary to contact the network.

____________________________________________________________________________

2h Did you make an informal complaint about this treatment?

Yes [1] ☐
No [2] ☐

If you ticked no to 2h, please go to question 2L.
### 2.1 If you ticked yes, how did you raise the informal complaint?

- [ ] [1] I took personal action
- [ ] [2] I raised it with my immediate line manager
- [ ] [3] I raised it with someone who had management authority over me but is not my immediate line manager
- [ ] [4] I raised it with the Personnel office
- [ ] [5] I raised it with the Equalities team
- [ ] [6] I raised it with a Dignity at Work contact
- [ ] [7] I prefer not to answer
- [ ] [8] Other (please specify) _______________________

### 2.2 Was the complaint resolved?

- [ ] [1] Yes
- [ ] [2] No

### 2.3 Was it dealt with appropriately?

- [ ] [1] Yes
- [ ] [2] No

### 2.4 Did you make a formal complaint about this treatment?

- [ ] [1] Yes
- [ ] [2] No

If you ticked no to 2L please go to question 2n.

### 2.5 If you ticked yes to 2L, was the complaint resolved?

- [ ] [1] Yes
- [ ] [2] No

### 2.6 If you ticked either of the two boxes in question 2a and did not make a complaint why was this?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

*If you would like to give further comments on your experience, please use the space below if you wish.*

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please remember that the SPCB takes any complaint of harassment or bullying very seriously. Should you experience such behaviour you are encouraged to discuss any such issues with your line manager, a Dignity at Work Contact or the Personnel Office.
3. TRADE UNION MEMBERSHIP AND ACTIVITIES

3a Do you consider that, whilst working at the Parliament during the past twelve months, you have suffered discrimination or harassment because of any of the following characteristics:

- Because you were a trade union member
  - Because you were a trade union member and involved in trade union activities, or
  - Because you were not a trade union member?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □  If ‘No’, please go to section 4

If ‘Yes’, you are welcome to provide more information about this if you wish to. In particular, it would be helpful if you would tell us about the nature of this discrimination or harassment. For example refusal to attend a trade union meeting, lack of support from line manager to carry out trade union activities etc.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

3b If your answer to 3a is ‘Yes’, was it someone who had management authority over you who acted in this manner?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □

3c If you answered ‘Yes’ to question 3a, did you make a complaint about the behaviour?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □

If ‘No’, you are welcome to provide more information about this if you wish to. For example, if you did not make a complaint, why was this? Is there more that we could do to enable staff to challenge this type of unacceptable behaviour?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
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If you answered ‘Yes’ to question 3c, was your complaint resolved?

Yes [1] ☐ No [2] ☐

If ‘No’, you are welcome to provide more information about this if you wish to.
4. WORK LIFE BALANCE

Before answering the questions in this section, you should consider what is meant by Work-life balance:

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; job share; other flexible working arrangements; career breaks; home working etc.

4a Do you generally feel you are able to balance your work and home life?

☐ Yes [1]
☐ No [2]

4b Have you ever made use of the work life balance arrangements available to you? For example, special leave, flexible working, compressed hours, home working etc.

☐ Yes [1]
☐ No [2]

If you ticked yes, could you provide information about the ways in which you have balanced your home and work life?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

If you ticked no, could you provide more information as to why this was the case in the space below.

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________
5. CAREER PROGRESSION /INTERNAL PROMOTION

This section of the report relates only to those employed by the SPCB, therefore if you are not directly employed by the SPCB please do not complete this section and go to Section 6.

5a  Have you applied for a promotion within the Parliament within the last twelve months?

☐ Yes [1]
☐ No [2]

If ‘No’, please go to question 5e

5b  If you did apply for promotion within the Parliament in the last twelve month period, were you successful?

☐ Yes [1]  ☐ No [2]  If ‘No’, please go to question 5d

5c  If you were successful in applying for promotion within the Parliament within the last twelve months, was your progression within the office where you already worked?

5d If you were not successful, you are welcome to use the space below to describe why you think you were not successful if you wish to.

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

5e Do you think that your prospects of promotion within the Parliament over the past twelve months was, or might have been, affected by any of your “personal characteristics that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework”? (See the start of Section 1 for a list of these characteristics.)


If ‘Yes’, you are welcome to provide more information if you wish to. If you do provide more information, it would be helpful if you would refer to the particular personal characteristic or characteristics that you believe were relevant (e.g. your gender, your ethnic origin, your sexual orientation, etc) and also tell us how you think that this characteristic has affected your prospects of promotion.

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________
6. APPRAISAL

This section of the report relates only to those employed by the SPCB and secondees, therefore if you are an agency worker please do not complete this question and go to section 8.

6a Please tick one of the boxes below to indicate your overall appraisal marking in your most recent ‘end of year’ staff appraisal?

- Clearly exceeding the requirements of the role [1]
- Fully demonstrating the requirements of the role [2]
- Demonstrating most of the requirements of the role [3]
- Unsatisfactory Performance [4]

Categories for staff employed by the SPCB:

Categories for staff seconded to the Parliament:

- Exceptional [1]
- Effective [2]
- Partly Effective [3]
- Unsatisfactory [4]
- Other (please state)………………………………………………………[5]

6b Do you consider that any of your “personal characteristics that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework” affected, or might have affected, your most recent ‘end of year’ appraisal marking?


If ‘No’ or ‘Don’t Know’, please go to question 7.

If ‘Yes’, you are welcome to provide more information if you wish to. (If you do provide more information, it would be helpful if you would refer to the particular personal characteristic or characteristics that you think were relevant.)

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
This section of the report relates only to those employed by the SPCB, therefore if you are not directly employed by the SPCB please do not complete this question and go to section 8.

7a Have you been the subject of an investigation under the SPCB’s disciplinary procedures during the last twelve months?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □ If ‘No’, please go to question 8

7b If your answer to 7a is ‘Yes’, were disciplinary allegations made against you after the investigation?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □ If ‘No’, please go to question 7e

7c If your answer to 7b is ‘Yes’, were you required to attend a disciplinary hearing to answer any allegations?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □ If ‘No’, please go to question 7e

7d If your answer to 7c is ‘Yes’, please specify what type of disciplinary penalty, if any, was applied to you (e.g. written warning).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7e If you were the subject of an investigation, hearing or penalty under the SPCB’s disciplinary procedures during the past twelve months, do you believe that the way in which you were treated was affected by any of your “personal characteristics that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework”?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □ If ‘No’, please go to question 8
8. GENERAL REVIEW

This section should be completed by all respondents to the survey.

8a Apart from matters that you have already discussed on this form so far, do you believe that you have been discriminated against whilst working at the Parliament?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □  If ‘No’, please go to question 8b

If ‘Yes’, you are welcome to provide more information about this if you wish to.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

8b Do you believe that the SPCB is doing all that it reasonably can do as an employer to implement its equal opportunities policies?

Yes [1] □ No [2] □
8c If you answered ‘No’ to question 8b, what other sorts of things could, or should, we do?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

8d Do you believe that significant progress has been made over the last twelve months in relation to implementing the SPCB’s equal opportunities policies?

Yes [1] ☐ No [2] ☐

8e Whether you have answered ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ to question 8d, you are welcome to provide some comments (positive or negative) about our progress on equal opportunities issues.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
8f Have you used the network of Dignity at Work Contacts?
Yes [1] □ No [2] □

8g If you answered yes to question 8f, how would you rate the level of support provided by the contact?
- Very useful [1]
- Quite useful [2]
- Not very useful [3]
- Not useful at all [4]
- Don’t know [5]
- Prefer not to answer [6]

8h Whether or not you have used the network of Dignity at Work contacts you are welcome to provide some comments (positive or negative) on the network or the dignity at work policy.
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

8i In general (i.e. thinking beyond equal opportunities issues), would you recommend the SPCB as an employer to other people?
Yes [1] □ No [2] □

8j If ‘No’, you are welcome to provide more information about why you would not recommend the SPCB as an employer if you wish to.
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
Please use the space below to provide any other comments or ideas which would assist us in implementing the SPCB’s equal opportunities policies? Please bear in mind that it would be helpful for us to know if you think we are getting things right in any particular respect, as well as knowing how you think we can improve on our performance.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
SECTION 9: PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. GRADE

What is your current grade?

☐ Grade 1 [1]
☐ Grade 2 [2]
☐ Grade 3 [3]
☐ Grade 4 [4]
☐ Grade 5 [5]
☐ Grade 6 [6]
☐ Grade 7 [7]
☐ Grade 8/ Chief Executive [8]
☐ I prefer not to answer this question [9]

2. HOURS

Are you currently contracted to work at the Parliament on a full-time or part-time basis?

☐ Full-time [1]
☐ Part-time [2]
☐ I prefer not to answer this question [3]

3. TYPE OF CONTRACT

What type of contract do you currently have with the Parliament?

☐ A permanent contract [1]
☐ A fixed-term contract (for how many months or years? _________ )[2]
☐ I am an agency worker [3]
☐ I am currently seconded to the Parliament [4]
☐ Other - Please specify ______________________________ [5]
☐ I prefer not to answer this question [6]
4. OFFICE

In which office do you currently work?

☐ Allowances Office [1]
☐ Broadcasting [2]
☐ Business Information Technology [3]
☐ Chamber Office [4]
☐ Clerk/Chief Executive’s Office [5]
☐ Committee Office [6]
☐ Corporate Policy Unit [7]
☐ Corporate Publications [8]
☐ External Liaison Unit [9]
☐ Facilities Management Office [10]
☐ Finance Office [11]
☐ Holyrood Project Team [12]
☐ Internal Audit [13]
☐ Legal Services [14]
☐ Media Relations Office [15]
☐ Official Report [16]
☐ Personnel Office [17]
☐ Presiding Officer’s Office [18]
☐ Procurement Services [19]
☐ Public Information [20]
☐ Security Office [21]
☐ SPICe [22]
☐ Visitor & Outreach Services [23]
☐ I work in one of the directorate’s listed in question 5, but my post does not fall within any of the above offices. [24]
☐ I prefer not to answer this question. [25]

5. DIRECTORATE

In which directorate do you currently work?

☐ Access and Information Directorate [1]
☐ Clerk/Chief Executive’s Group [2]
☐ Directorate of Clerking and Reporting [3]
☐ Directorate of Legal Services [4]
☐ Directorate of Resources and Governance [5]
☐ Technology and Facilities Management Directorate [6]
☐ I prefer not to answer this question [7]
6. GENDER IDENTITY

6a How would you describe your gender?

- [ ] Female [1]
- [ ] Male [2]
- [ ] Other [3]
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question [4]

6b Have you ever identified as transgender?

- [ ] Yes [1]
- [ ] No [2]
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question [3]

7. RELATIONSHIP STATUS

7a Do you have a partner or are you single?

- [ ] I have a partner [1]
- [ ] I am single [2]
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question [3]

7b If you have ticked “partner” does any of the following apply to you

- [ ] I am married [1]
- [ ] I am registered in a civil partnership [2]
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question [3]

8. CARING RESPONSIBILITIES

Do you have caring responsibilities for a child or children or for anyone else (e.g. a family member, a friend, a neighbour, etc)? (Please tick all that apply)

- [ ] Yes, I have caring/parental responsibilities for a child/children [1]
- [ ] Yes, I have caring responsibilities for someone other than children/a child [2]
- [ ] No, I do not have any caring responsibilities [3]
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question [4]
9. SEXUAL ORIENTATION

How would you describe your sexual orientation?

- [ ] A Heterosexual *(If you have ticked ‘A’, please go to question 11)* [1]
- [ ] B Lesbian [2]
- [ ] C Gay Man [3]
- [ ] D Bisexual Woman [4]
- [ ] E Bisexual Man [5]
- [ ] F Other - *Please specify* __________________________ [6]
- [ ] G I prefer not to answer this question [7]

10. SEXUAL ORIENTATION (continued)

10a If you ticked B, C, D, E or F for question 9, do you feel able to be open about your sexual orientation with other people working at the Parliament?

- [ ] Yes [1]
- [ ] No [2]
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question [3]

10b If you ticked no, is this to do with your working environment?

- [ ] Yes [1]
- [ ] No [2]
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question [3]
11. NATIONALITY

11a. How would you describe your nationality? For this question, you should tick the appropriate box below to indicate your nationality. If you prefer not to answer this question, please tick the box provided.

- [ ] Scottish [1]
- [ ] English [2]
- [ ] Irish [3]
- [ ] Northern Irish [4]
- [ ] Welsh [5]
- [ ] Other European – please specify [6]
- [ ] Other – please specify [7]
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question [8]

11b. How would you describe your ethnic background? For this question, you should tick the appropriate box below to indicate your ethnic background. If you prefer not to answer this question, please tick the box provided.

- [ ] White [1]
- [ ] Any mixed background - please specify [2]
- [ ] Indian [3]
- [ ] Pakistani [4]
- [ ] Bangladeshi [5]
- [ ] Chinese [6]
- [ ] Other Asian background - Please specify [7]
- [ ] Caribbean [8]
- [ ] African [9]
- [ ] Other Black background - Please specify [10]
- [ ] Any other ethnic background - Please specify [11]
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question [12]

12. RELIGION

Which of the following religions, religious denominations or bodies do you currently belong to? If you do not belong to any of these, please tick “None”.

- [ ] None [1]
- [ ] Church of Scotland [2]
- [ ] Roman Catholic [3]
- [ ] Other Christian - Please specify [4]
- [ ] Buddhist [5]
- [ ] Hindu [6]
- [ ] Jewish [7]
- [ ] Muslim [8]
- [ ] Sikh [9]
- [ ] Other religion - Please specify [10]
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question [11]
13. AGE

Which of these age bands do you fit into?

☐ 16 – 20 [1]
☐ 21 – 30 [2]
☐ 31 – 40 [3]
☐ 41 – 50 [4]
☐ 51 – 60 [5]
☐ 61 – 70 [6]
☐ 70 plus [7]
☐ I prefer not to answer this question [8]

14. DISABILITY

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 defines disability 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”.

Do you consider that you have a disability?

☐ Yes (If you have ticked ‘Yes’, please go to question 15) [1]
☐ No [2]
☐ I prefer not to answer this question [3]

(If you have ticked ‘No’ or ‘I prefer not to answer this question’, please go to question 16)
15. DISABILITY

If you have ticked ‘Yes’ to question 14, please answer this question.

Please tell us which of these bests describes your disability:

- Hearing impairment [1]
- Visual impairment (not corrected by spectacles or contact lenses) [2]
- Speech impairment [3]
- Mobility impairment [4]
- Physical co-ordination difficulties (includes problems of manual dexterity and of muscular control, e.g. incontinence, epilepsy) [5]
- Reduced physical capacity (includes debilitating pain and lack of strength, breath, energy or stamina e.g. from asthma, angina or diabetes) [6]
- Severe disfigurement [7]
- Progressive condition such as cancer, HIV, multiple sclerosis [8]
- Learning disabilities [9]
- Mental health condition (i.e. substantial and long-lasting conditions – lasting more than a year) [10]
- Other (please tell us about this) .........................................................[11]
- I prefer not to answer this question [12]

Please remember that the SPCB is committed to meeting the needs of disabled employees in line with equal opportunities legislation and good practice. You are always welcome to discuss any adjustments that you may require with your line manager, the Personnel Office or the Equalities Adviser.

16. TRADE UNION ACTIVITIES

Which of these statements best describes your trade union activities?

- I am a member of a trade union [1]
- I am a member of a trade union and I get involved in trade union activities within this workplace [2]
- I am not a member of a trade union [3]
- I prefer not to answer this question [4]
Thank you very much for completing this form. Your co-operation is very much appreciated.

Please return this completed form to Challenge Consultancy Limited in the large addressed envelope marked “Private and Confidential”. If this envelope is not enclosed, please send this form, by external post, to:

Challenge Consultancy Limited
11 Oxford House
49a Oxford Road
London
N4 3EY

After you have sent this form to Challenge please send an email advising that you have returned your audit form to: equalities.manager@scottish.parliament.uk.

This email account will be checked regularly and a list of those returning their forms maintained. Anyone who has not sent an email will be contacted about returning the audit form.

Thanks again for your help.

Aneela McKenna
Equalities Manager