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1. Introduction

The Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body (SPCB) has a range of duties relating to employment matters placed on it by the following equal opportunities Acts and Regulations:

- The Equal Pay Act 1970
- The Sex Discrimination Act 1975
- The Race Relations Act 1976 (as amended by the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000)
- The Disability Discrimination Act 1995
- The Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation) Regulations 2003
- The Employment Equality (Religion and Belief) Regulations 2003
- The Part-time Workers (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2000

This equal opportunities staff audit provides the SPCB with information about the extent to which it is complying fully with the employment provisions of these Acts and Regulations. The statutory Codes of Practice issued by organisations such as the Equal Opportunities Commission, the Commission for Racial Equality and the Disability Rights Commission state that employers must monitor and report on the effectiveness of their equal opportunities policies. In additions, some legislation places clear duties on a wide range of public bodies, including the SPCB, to carry out ethnic monitoring and publish the findings. This audit was designed as an effective response from the SPCB to all of these requirements.

The purpose of this audit was to:

- collect monitoring data about the composition of the SPCB’s workforce and highlight whether any particular groups of people are under-represented within this workforce;
- Identify any gaps between the SPCB’s employment policies and how these are put into practice;
- Collect views from staff on the implementation of the SPCB’s equal opportunities policies; and
- Provide information which will be used to shape the SPCB’s future development of its employment policies and practices.

To achieve this purpose the audit report seeks to:

- Present the results of the Equal Opportunities Audit Questionnaire and to compare with Census data for Scotland where applicable.
- To compare the data with the 2003 Equal Opportunities Staff Audit Report data where applicable.
- To analyse that data in more detail by cross referencing selected items.

2. Methodology

A questionnaire was provided to every member of staff including temporary agency staff and staff who were seconded to the SPCB from other organisations. Staff were asked to complete the questionnaire (See Appendix 2) and to return it directly to Challenge Consultancy. In total 520
questionnaire’s were issued to staff and 472 completed questionnaires were received by Challenge. The response rate was therefore 90.8% an increase of 3.8% on the 2003 Audit.

The audit questionnaire was developed internally by parliamentary staff; however, the analysis of the results was carried out by Challenge Consultancy Limited. The questionnaires were strictly anonymous and confidential to encourage people to respond honestly and openly. Procedures were also put in place to ensure that no member of staff within the Parliament, including the Parliament’s Personnel Office, Equalities Manager or Equalities Adviser, had access to any of the completed questionnaires.

To facilitate a comparison with the 2003 audit report this report adopts a similar structure to the 2003 report.

**Abbreviations and terminology used in this report**

The following is an alphabetical list of abbreviations commonly used in this report;

- **2003 Audit** 2003 Equal Opportunities Staff Audit Report
- **EO** Equal Opportunities
- **DAW** Dignity at Work
- **LGB** Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual
- **MSP** Member of Scottish Parliament
- **PNTA** Prefer not to Answer
- **SE** Scottish Executive
- **SP** Scottish Parliament
- **SPCB** Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body
- **SPEIR** Scottish Parliament Electronic Information Resource
- **TU** Trade Union

Several questions in the audit also asked whether respondents thought that any of their “personal characteristics” impacted on particular aspects of their experience at the Parliament. For example, members of staff who had been refused permission to attend a training course were asked if they felt that any of their “personal characteristics” played a part in leading their manager to make this decision. The term “personal characteristics” could refer to a staff member’s:

- gender,
- gender identity,
- sexual orientation,
- racial group (which would include the staff member’s race, colour, ethnic origins, national origins, and/or nationality),
- religion, religious belief or similar philosophical belief (or lack of any of these)
- age,
- any disability the staff member might have,
- marital or family status,
- part-time or fixed-term contract status, or
- trade union membership/non-membership or trade union activities.

**The use and accuracy of the audit data**
The response rate to this audit, although very high (90.8% of all staff), was not 100%. Therefore, whilst the sample was certainly large enough to provide reliable information about the SPCB’s workforce in pure statistical terms the sample rates are quite small (e.g. in relation to minority groups). This means a degree of caution needs to be exercised when analysing trends.

It should be noted that all percentages have been rounded up or down to one point.

Furthermore, a degree of uncertainty or margin of error is also unavoidably built into these sorts of audits because of the way in which people are asked to classify themselves in response to monitoring questions. For example, when answering the question on disability, respondents were asked to decide themselves whether or not they considered that they were disabled.

It should be noted that this audit was carried out in the summer of 2005 and it therefore reflects the views of staff and the composition of the workforce at that time.
3. Executive summary

Whilst the general composition of the staff of the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body (SPCB) remains much the same as 2003 for some groups there have been improvements in representation: "Other ethnic" (up from 0.9% to 1.5%), Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual (LGB) (up from 4.4% to 6.1%), gender (Men 53.8% to 51% and Women 43.1% to 45%). Unchanged groups include part time or full time, religion, disabled, partnered or single, carers and trade union membership status. There has however been a change in the age profile of the SPCB with a fall in younger staff (16-25 yr olds) down from 9% to 4.7%. There are currently no staff under 20.

The responses received to most of the key monitoring questions indicate steady progress has been made since 2003. In particular, there has been an increase in those who would recommend the SPCB as an employer (up from 83% to 90%). There has also been an encouraging fall in the numbers who felt: their career progress was effected by their personal characteristic (down from 4.5% to 2.1%); their managers had refused training (down from 8.4% to 4.9%); their appraisal was effected by their personal characteristic (down from 2.3% to 2.1%); experience of harassment and bullying (down from 13.2% to 10.6%); the persons causing bullying or harassment had management authority over them (down from 57.9% to 48%); they had been discriminated against in other ways (down from 10.9% to 6.8%) and Parliament was not doing everything it reasonably could to implement its Equal Opportunities (EO) policies (down from 19.5% to 13%).

However, a few responses to the key monitoring questions indicate no progress. There has been an increase in respondents who felt: they have not received sufficient training (up from 10.7% to 17.2%); they have suffered discrimination or harassment due to Trade Union membership/non membership (up from 1.2% to 2%); and those who felt that significant progress had been made by the SPCB in the last year in relation to implementing its equal opportunities policies was down from 68.7% in 2003 to 66%.

Care must be taken when attempting to interpret some of these figures since in many cases the numbers concerned, for example the LGB group, are so small that even one individuals perceptions/experience has the ability to significantly skew the percentage findings.

More detailed analysis of the audit data showed mixed progress including:

- The correlations between those reporting being harassed and bullied against personal characteristics in the 2003 Audit and the results of this audit indicate a higher likelihood of harassment of LGB staff but lower likelihood of harassment on race and disability.

- The correlation between those who had had training requests refused against personal characteristics showed more variation than 2003 when there was little correlation. We found more likelihood of training refusal with LGB, part timers and older staff but a clear improvement for disabled and "other ethnic" staff.

- The correlations between those reporting they had applied for career progression against personal characteristics exhibited a similar pattern to 2003 though in some groups the correlations were greater e.g. 26-30 yr olds (+4.4% to +21.8%); LGB (+8.7% to +16.2%); full time (+7.1% to +26.6%) showing a greater likelihood in these groups to apply for career progression.
When we investigated the Directorates to see where EO issues were arising more frequently, most of the Directorates were very similar. On average there is a satisfaction rate of about 94% and a dissatisfaction rate of about 6%. One Directorate, Clerking and Reporting, had the least dissatisfaction with a rate of 3.3%. These dissatisfaction rates were generally lower than 2003.

Comparing the number of exceptional performers across the groups we found weighted average percentage was 16.21%. Groups with slightly lower percentages of exceptional performance in their appraisals were 16-25 year olds, “white other British” and "other white".
4. Audit findings: the composition of the SPCB’s workforce

4.1 Grade

The graph below provides an analysis by grade of the staff responding to the audit.
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4.2 Working Hours

When respondents were asked are you full time or part time over 92% of staff said they worked full time and 6% said they worked part time, 2% of staff preferred not to answer this question. The overwhelming majority of SPCB staff therefore work full time. These percentages are exactly the same as the 2003 Audit.

4.3 Contract status

When respondents were asked what type of contract they had, four fifths (80.5%) of staff said they were on a permanent contract. Over 6.5% of respondents were employed on a fixed term contract and 5.5% were employed on a temporary basis through an agency. Just under 4% of respondents categorised themselves as “other”. Note that all respondents categorised as “other” were on secondment. The remainder (3.5%) of respondents preferred not to answer. This indicates that since the 2003 Audit there has been a slight increase in permanent staff (from 78.89% in 2003) a small reduction in fixed term contract staff (from 8.35% in 2003) and an increase in the use of temporary agency staff (2.08% in 2003).
4.4 Directorate

Respondents came from a good cross section of all 6 Directorates with the largest number of respondents stating that they worked in the Access and Information Directorate (33.5%) and the Clerking and Reporting Directorate (25.4%).

4.5 Sex

Of those members of staff who answered this question just over half were male (51%) and just under half were female (45%). According to the 2001 Census, in Scotland 46.5% of the economically active population is made up of women and 53.5% are men. These audit results indicate that, across the organisation as a whole, the proportion of women employed by the SPCB continues to be representative of the economically active population of Scotland with these figures having improved since the 2003 Audit (Men 53.9% and Women 43.1%).
4.6 Transgender

In response to the question whether any respondent considered themselves to be transgender the majority of respondents said no, a very small number of respondents said they did consider themselves transgender. As the number of respondents saying yes was so small, no particular meaning can be drawn from them. Significance may only become apparent in comparison with the results from subsequent audits.

4.7 Relationship status

Two thirds of respondents (67%) said they had a partner (whether married or not) with under a quarter (23%) who said they were single. 10% of respondents preferred not to answer this question. In the 2003 Audit these figures were similar at 66% partnered and 27% single.

4.8 Caring responsibilities

26.9% of respondents have caring responsibilities with just under two thirds of respondents not having caring responsibilities (64.4%). The clear majority of carers look after children (83%).

As a percentage of all respondents 22.2% look after children and 4.7% have caring responsibilities other than to children. Of those who do care for children there is a fairly equal distribution across the age ranges of the children cared for. These figures are very close to the answers received in the 2003 Audit where 24.1% said they looked after children and 4.1% had caring responsibilities other than to children.

According to the census data 26.4% of Scottish Households have dependent children. This figure is close to the percentage of respondents with dependent children.

4.9 Sexual orientation
Of those respondents who answered this question 87.71% described their sexuality as heterosexual with 6.14% of respondents describing themselves as lesbian, gay or bisexual and 6.14% preferred not to answer. The number of respondents describing themselves as lesbian, gay or bisexual has increased since the 2003 audit (4.4%).

Of the lesbian, gay or bisexual respondents 62% were gay men. In the 2003 Audit there were no respondents describing themselves as bisexual men whereas in this audit there were.

81% of respondents who said they were lesbian, gay or bisexual thought that they were comfortable being out at the Scottish Parliament. This is virtually the same as in the 2003 Audit (80%). Of the 19% who felt uncomfortable being out these comprised a mixture of lesbians, gay men and bisexuals.

4.10 Ethnic Group

Over three quarters of respondents identified themselves as “white Scottish” and 15.7% of respondents identified themselves as “other white British”. 95.1% of respondents were white and just under 1.5% of respondents were non-white, which represents an increase from the 2003 Audit when non-white respondents were 0.9%. The questionnaire allowed respondents to say they preferred not to answer the question and 3.39% of respondents preferred not to do so.
If we compare the ethnic composition in the Parliament with the Census data for the economically active population for Scotland we find that generally there is close representation to the Census figures in relation to those defining themselves as Other White and Mixed and Other Ethnic. In particular in 2003 the Mixed and Other Ethnic composition was 1% and this is now 1.5% which is exactly the same composition as for the economically active population of Scotland. In contrast “white other British” (16.23% of respondents who answered) were over represented by 7.63%. This is a slight fall since 2003 (17%). Those defining themselves as Scottish comprise 78.51% of the workforce (up from 76.9% in 2003) also appear to remain under represented if compared to the economically active population of Scotland. The racial composition of the SPCB has moved closer to the composition of the economically active population since 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>2001 Census data for economically active population (%)</th>
<th>Result of SPCB 2005 Audit (% who answered)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>87.10%</td>
<td>78.51%</td>
<td>8.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other British</td>
<td>8.60%</td>
<td>16.23%</td>
<td>-7.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>-0.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed &amp; Other Ethnic</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>-0.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: In presenting these data, we have factored out the people who chose not to answer this question in the SPCB staff audit, since it was compulsory for people to respond to the question on ethnicity in the Census.

4.11 Religion
Over half of staff who responded stated that they belonged to no religious denomination (52.75%). Just over a quarter (25.64%) said they were Church of Scotland and about 6% were other Christian religions. 1.6% of respondents belonged to “Other Religions”. These figures are very similar to the responses received in the 2003 audit: 53% None, 22.75% Church of Scotland, 6.81% Other Christian and 1.62% Other religions.

Whilst questions on religion were included in the 2001 Census, a detailed analysis of the composition of the economically active population of Scotland by religion has not been made readily available. Therefore, we can only make a comparison between these audit results and the Census data on religion relating to the population at large.

If we compare the audit results with the Census results it is interesting to note that as in the 2003 Audit a much higher proportion of our respondents said they had no religion (53%) compared to 27.6% of the population at large. The Parliament has a much lower representation of Church of Scotland (25%) than the population at large (42%). All other religions seem to have a similar representation to the general population except Muslims who were slightly more highly represented amongst respondents than the overall population. In the final column below we have set out the 2003 figures which have not changed that much with the exception of the number of respondents identifying themselves as Catholic which has fallen significantly from 15.88% to 7.84% since 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Census %</th>
<th>Scottish Parliament %</th>
<th>% 2005 Difference</th>
<th>% 2003 Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>52.75</td>
<td>-25.2</td>
<td>-25.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>19.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNTA</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12 Age

Just over a fifth (20.8%) of respondents were 21-30 years old, a third (32.4%) are 31-40 years old, a fifth (19.1%) are 41-50 years old, 15.3% are 51-65 years old and 12.5% of respondents preferred not to answer. It should be noted that there are currently no staff under 20.
We have tried to compare these figures to the 2001 Census data showing the economically active population of Scotland by age. The age bands used by the Census were slightly different to the bands used in the Audit (less than 20 yrs /20-29/30-39/40-49/ 50-59 and 60+) but nonetheless we felt sufficiently close for comparative purposes. The table below shows that SPCB has under representation of Under 20’s, 41-50’s, 51-60’s and 61+ and over representation of 21-30 and 31-40 year old age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2001 Census data for economically active population (%)</th>
<th>Result of SPCB 2005 Audit (%)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>19.08%</td>
<td>23.73%</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>27.70%</td>
<td>37.05%</td>
<td>-9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>25.51%</td>
<td>21.79%</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>19.14%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13 Disability
The audit asked whether respondents considered themselves disabled under the definition of “disability” as used in the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. 5.9% of respondents said they did consider themselves disabled with 88% of respondents saying they did not consider themselves disabled. These figures are virtually the same as the 2003 Audit figures where 5.8% considered themselves disabled and 79.69% did not.

Those respondents who considered themselves disabled identified various disabilities in their responses including hearing, visual and mobility impairments, reduced physical capacity and physical co-ordination difficulties.

According to the 2001 Census data 6.69% of the economically active Scottish population say they have a limiting long term illness, health problem or disability. This is a very slightly higher percentage than the number of respondents reporting disability in the audit.

4.14 Trade Union activities

60.2% of respondents in this audit said they were a Trade Union member (active or otherwise) whilst under a third of respondents (28.4%) said they were not a Trade Union member. 11.4% of respondents preferred not to answer this question. In the 2003 audit 62.4% said they were a TU member (active or otherwise) and 31.4% said they were not. Whilst these figures remain very close to the 2003 Audit results there has been a slight increase in those reporting both TU membership and non membership.
5. Audit findings: the views and experiences of staff

5.1 Career Progression

93 respondents (19.7%) stated that they had applied for career progression within the last 12 months and of these 39 people (42%) reported that they were successful. Of those successful promotions 23 people (59%) were from within the same office. In the 2003 audit a slightly higher proportion of respondents advised that they had applied for promotion (109 people (23%)) but fewer stated they were successful (36 people (33%)) and a higher proportion of the successful promotions were from within the same office (96 people (88%)).

Reasons for unsuccessful applications were varied but included insufficient experience, other candidates being better qualified, poor interview preparation and/or performance or the post being withdrawn.

When asked if respondents thought career progression within the Parliament over the past twelve months was, or might have been, affected by any of the personal characteristics that fall within the scope of the SPCB’s Equality Framework, 2.1% thought that it had, 86% thought it had not and 11.86% preferred not to answer this question. The majority of those responding that they had thought a personal characteristic had or might have affected their career progression chose not to identify the personal characteristic.

In the 2003 Audit 4.5% of respondents thought their career progress had been affected by one of the personal characteristics, indicating a reduction in the 2005 audit of respondent’s perceptions that their career progression may have been effected by any of their personal characteristics.

![Pie chart showing career progression](image)

Correlation Coefficients – Career Progression
We investigated whether any particular groups were more or less likely to apply for promotion. We did this by cross referencing all those who said that they had applied for promotion in the last year against the categories of age, gender, race, partnership status, full or part time and sexuality. We have excluded transgendered from these categories given the small statistical sample.

We then calculated correlation coefficients which we have plotted on the graph below. The groups most likely to apply for promotion were full time workers (+26.6%), LGB (+16.2%) and 26-30 year olds (+21.8%). Conversely people aged 41-60 (between -10% and -13%), partnered staff (-9.4%), part timers (-7.9%), disabled (-5.7%) and “white Scottish” (-9.4%) were all slightly less likely to apply for promotion. For the groups which included men, women, heterosexuals, and “other ethnic” there was little or no correlation against the likelihood of applying for promotion.

These correlations generally exhibit a very similar pattern to 2003 though in some groups the correlations were a lot more than in 2003. For example in the 26-30 age group (+4.4% to +21.8%), LGB (+8.7% to +16.2%) and full time (+7.1% to +26.6%). This indicates that since 2003 there is a much greater likelihood to apply for promotion in these groups.

5.2 Appraisal

When asked to indicate their most recent appraisal marking:-
• 65.7% of respondents stated that they “met their job requirements”;
• 3% of secondees stated that they were “effective” under the Scottish Executive appraisal system;
• 15.2% of respondents, including both SPCB staff and secondees, stated that their performance marking was “exceptional”. This is an increase from 2003 when 12.5% received the equivalent marking in the previous performance management systems.
• 1.9% of respondents stated their performance marking was “needs development”; and
• 0.2% of respondents stated their performance marking had been “unsatisfactory”.

A high proportion of respondents (14%) preferred not to answer. Please note that for staff on secondment to the Parliament from the Scottish Executive no respondents stated that they got “Partly effective” or “Satisfactory markings”.

The SPCB has informed us that both the SPCB’s and the Scottish Executive’s Performance Management systems have changed between the 2003 audit and this audit being undertaken. This means that comparison with the 2003 Audit is difficult as the performance markings do not directly correspond. In 2003 58% of respondents reported exceptional performance and 23% reported effective performance.

When asked if they thought their appraisal had been affected by any personal characteristic, 2.1% of respondents answered that they thought it had (2.3% in 2003). The majority of respondents did not identify any particular characteristic. However, gender; sexual orientation; being a part time worker and disability were identified by some respondents as being personal characteristics which affected their appraisal marking in the section available for comments.

Trends in appraisal markings
We investigated whether there were any trends in relation to appraisal markings between different groups. In particular to see whether between the various groups there were variations on the percentage numbers attaining particular markings. We calculated across all groups (including age, race, gender, sexuality, full or part time status and disability) the percentage of each group attaining a “meets requirements” marking (i.e. performing in accordance with the job requirement) and those with “exceptional” appraisals. The results have been plotted in the two graphs below.

From the first graph you can see that there is not a great deal of variation between groups reporting Average performance with the weighted average percentage across all groups being 69.12%. The exception are Other White (92.31%) who have much higher percentages of Average performance and 16-25 year olds and Other Ethnic who have much lower reporting of Average performance (43% and 50% respectively).

The second graph show Exceptional performance by group where there is much greater variation. The weighted average percentage of exceptional performers across all groups is 16.21%. Groups with lower percentages of exceptional performance in their appraisals were 16-25 year olds (4.55%) and those who identified themselves as “white other British” and “other white” (none reported). Part Timers and Other Ethnic both reported much higher percentages of exceptional performance (39% and 43% respectively).
5.3 Disciplinary Proceedings

The vast majority of respondents (97%) stated that they had not been the subject of an investigation under the SPCB’s disciplinary procedures in the last 12 months. Three respondents (0.6%) stated that they had been the subject of an investigation under the SPCB’s disciplinary procedures in the last 12 months. 2.4% of respondents chose not to answer this question.

5.4 Access to training and development opportunities

The vast majority of respondents (93.9%) said that they had not been refused training in the last 12 months, whilst 4.9% said that training had been refused with the remaining 1.2% choosing not to answer this question. Since the 2003 Audit there has been a fall in the number of respondents who have said training has been refused (previously 8.4%).

Of those who said training had been refused 83% thought that it was not due to a personal characteristic, 4% thought it was due to a personal characteristic and the balance preferred not to answer as to whether a personal characteristic had effected the decision.

Of the 83% of respondents who thought refusal was not due to a personal characteristic some of the reasons given included unsuitability of training, cost constraints and staffing shortages meaning staff members could not be released.
76.3% of respondents said they had received sufficient training in the last year. 17.2% of respondents thought that they had not (6.5% preferred not to answer). This is an increase on the 2003 Audit when 10.7% felt they had not received sufficient training. Respondents were invited to give further details of why they felt they had not received sufficient training. The most common reason was lack of time and/or work pressures.

From comments received it is clear that the consensus of respondents is that the sufficiency of training is not influenced by any personal characteristics. In only a single case did a respondent feel their personal characteristic was a factor in not receiving sufficient training.
We further analysed the responses from those who had had training requests refused (4.9%) in the last 12 months against the personal characteristics of: age, gender, race, sexuality, marital status, disability and part or full time status. We then calculated correlation coefficients and plotted the results on the chart below.

In the 2003 Audit we identified that disabled people and “other ethnic” staff were more likely to report such refusals (17.6% and 32.1% respectively) whereas this year the figures were 2.7% and 5.4% respectively indicating little or no relationship. The other change was this year we found was that part time staff were more likely to report training access refusal (11%) whereas in 2003 we found there was little or no correlation (-3.7%). The position of LGB staff has also changed with the likelihood of reporting training refusal increasing from 8.7% to 14.7%.

The results appear to indicate more likelihood of training refusal with lesbian, gay and bisexual staff, part timers and older staff but a clear improvement in respect of disabled and “other ethnic” staff.

5.5 Harassment and Bullying

The audit asked whether staff had experienced harassment or bullying at work at any time over the past 12 months. Definitions of both “bullying” and “harassment” were provided in the audit questionnaire as follows:

Harassment: Unwanted conduct which could be reasonably shown to have the purpose or effect of violating a person’s dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that person, and which is also linked to, or based on, one or more of a person’s personal characteristics (e.g. their racial group, sex, sexual orientation, disability status, religion, age, etc.)
Bullying:  *Inappropriate, malicious and unwelcome behaviour that is designed 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. (Bullying is not usually linked to a personal characteristic of a person, e.g. their race, sex, sexual orientation, disability, etc. If the behaviour is linked to a personal characteristic, then it would normally be classified as “Harassment” rather than “Bullying”.)*

10.6% of respondents said they had experienced harassment, bullying or both compared to 13.2% in the 2003 Audit. Of the 10.6% approximately 5.3% reported bullying only (down from 7.9% in 2003), 2.75% harassment only (down from 3.7% in 2003) and the remaining 2.75% both bullying and harassment (up from 1.6% in 2003).

It should be noted that the audit only provides a snapshot of whether staff members were experiencing such behaviour; it does not explore whether those staff members who reported experiencing bullying or harassment had experienced only one instance of this behaviour or whether this was part of any kind of pattern. These issues can only be properly examined through the monitoring of actual complaints made under the SPCB’s equal opportunities policies.

*Grounds on which harassment was based*

Only 7 of those respondents who said they had been bullied or harassed went on to provide further information. In relation to the responses from these people the reasons given included race, sexual orientation, age, religious belief and gender.

*Sources of bullying or harassment*

Those respondents (50) who had experienced bullying or harassment over the last 12 months were also asked if the person (or people) who were responsible for the bullying or harassment had management authority over them. Almost half (48%) of those who responded said that the person (or people) did have management authority over them. This is less than the 2003 Audit when the figure was 57.9%. 10% said the person (or people) responsible for the behaviour were
at a higher grade but did not have management authority over them and 30% said the person or people responsible for the behaviour were at the same or lower grade. 12% of respondents said that bullying and harassment was experienced from those who did not form part of their staff structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, higher grade but no management authority</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not part of staff structure</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, same or lower grade than me</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, management authority over me</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who had suffered bullying or harassment (50 respondents) were also asked if they had made a formal or informal complaint 34% said they had, whilst 60% said they had not made a complaint. Results were mixed for those who had complained with some respondents saying that matters were resolved successfully; whilst others felt that the complaint procedure had not resolved matters to their satisfaction.

On balance respondents who had suffered harassment or bullying said they found it difficult or were reluctant to complain about their treatment. There were also, however, those who simply preferred to handle the matter themselves.

**Trends in reporting of bullying and harassment**

We then carried out further analysis to see whether any particular groups had reported proportionately more bullying than other groups. The personal characteristics that we looked at were gender, age, sexuality, race, disability and marital status. We calculated correlation coefficients to look for any correlation between those reporting being harassed and bullied against the chosen personal characteristics. The graph below shows that for disabled, men, woman, single people and those aged 41-50. There is no or virtually no correlation between these groups and the likelihood of reporting bullying and harassment. For lesbian, gay and bi-sexual staff there is slight correlation (5.3%) of being more likely to report such behaviour and 26-30 year olds are 7% more likely to report such behaviour.

Conversely those not disabled, partnered, heterosexual, those aged 16-25, those aged 31-40 and those partnered are slightly less likely to report bullying.
In relation to race the results show that people who identified themselves as “white Scottish” are 11% less likely to report bullying or harassment, whereas people who are “white other British” and “other ethnic origins” are 2.9% and 7% respectively more likely to report such behaviour. People who classified themselves “other white” are 6.7% more likely to report such behaviour. The “white Scottish” figure remains unchanged from the 2003 Audit whilst the other figures are all lower than previously reported.

We then analysed those respondents who said they had brought a complaint of being bullied to see if any particular groups complained more or less about bullying than other groups. We also looked at the differences between those who just reported bullying in this audit as opposed to those who said they made an actual complaint about it. Again the personal characteristics that we looked at were gender, age, sexuality, race, disability and marital status.

As the graph below shows a higher percentage of complaints were brought by disabled people, people who identified themselves as “other ethnic”, single people and 51-60 year olds. 41-50 year olds, people who identified themselves as “other whites” and those not disabled were far less likely to complain about harassment than other groups. In 2003 we found similar groups had high percentages of those bringing complaints though in this audit additionally there was a significant increase in lesbian, gay and bisexual complaints (from 0% to over 50%). A much higher percentage of “other ethnic” staff also brought a complaint.

However, it should be noted in relation to the number of people involved in the cases of those identifying themselves as lesbian, gay or bisexual and “other ethnic” the percentages can be skewed due to the very small numbers. Caution should therefore be used when interpreting this data.
5.6 Trade Union Membership and Activities

94.7% of respondents said that they had not suffered discrimination or harassment due to TU membership, whilst just over 1.9% thought they had suffered some sort of discrimination due to their TU membership, non-membership or union activity. This is compared to 1% in 2003 indicating an increase in such complaints. 3.4% of respondents preferred not to answer this question.

Of those who thought they had suffered some sort of discrimination 1.06% said it was due to their non-membership, 0.64% due to their membership and 0.21% due to their TU activity.

Of the people suffering discrimination due to TU membership or TU non-membership 55.6% said the person doing it had management authority over them whereas 44.4% said they did not. None however made a formal or informal complaint.

Of those complaining of non TU membership discrimination one respondent complained that Trade Unions were consulted by the Parliament on many issues but members of staff who were not members of the Union were not. Another respondent felt pressured into joining a Union whilst another felt pressured into attending meetings when strike action was proposed.
Have you suffered discrimination due to TU membership?

- No: 94.70%
- Yes as TU member: 3.39%
- Yes as involved in TU activity: 1.91%
- Yes as not TU member: 1.06%
- PNTA: 0.64%
- Other: 0.21%

Trends in Trade Union membership/non membership

The structure of Trade Union membership and non membership was investigated in more detail to see if there were any significant trends in relation to its composition. We wanted to see if any groups had greater or lesser percentage of TU membership, active TU membership and non membership. From each of the various groups including gender, age, race, sexuality, partnership status, full or part time status we cross referenced the data against Trade Union membership. The results are plotted on the three graphs below.

Across all groups the weighted average percentage of non members of Trade Unions was 29.21% which was slightly less than the 31.98% figure in 2003. Young people (16-25 year olds and 25-30 year olds), “other ethnic” and part timers had a much higher percentage of non-members. 51-60 year olds and disabled had lower than average TU non members suggesting these groups are more involved with Trade Unions. These findings are very similar to the 2003 Audit indicating little change since 2003.

Across all groups the weighted average percentage of TU members was 53.88% again slightly less than the 2003 figure of 55.28%. We again calculated across all groups the percentage number who said they were Trade Union members. Groups with proportionately higher numbers of TU members included women, 41-65 year olds, and disabled. Groups with below average TU membership were young people (16-25 and 25-30 year olds), part timers and those identifying themselves as “white Irish” and “other ethnic”.

We then carried out the same exercise for active TU membership where the weighted average percentage of active TU members was 6.94% compared to 7.78% in 2003. People who identified themselves as “white Irish”, LGB, disabled, “other ethnic” and 51-65 year olds stand out as groups with significantly above average TU active membership. Men, singles and 41-50 year olds all have a relatively low proportionate numbers of active union members.
Percentage TU Non Members by Group

Percentage TU Members by Group

CHALLENGE
6. Audit findings: the SPCB’s performance on equality issues

6.1 Other Discrimination

The respondents were asked apart from matters already discussed whether they believed that they had been discriminated against whilst working at the Parliament in any other way or ways. 90.2% said they had not whereas 6.8% said that they had been discriminated against. 3% chose not to answer this question. These figures suggest a reduction in those feeling that they had been discriminated against in other ways from the 2003 Audit when 10.9% of respondents thought they had suffered discrimination. Of those respondents who thought they had been discriminated against various reasons were given. These included lack of encouragement for older staff, women and those perceived as doing lowly jobs to reach their potential and work/life balance.

6.2 Implementation of the SPCB’s Equal Opportunities policies

When asked if respondents felt the Parliament was doing everything it reasonably could to implement its equal opportunities policies 80.3% thought it was and 13.1% thought it was not. 6.1% chose not to answer and 0.5% did not know whether the Parliament was doing everything it reasonably could to implement its EO policies. Those who responded that the Parliament was doing everything it reasonably could to implement its equal opportunities policies has increased from the 2003 Audit when 73% of respondents thought the Parliament was doing everything it reasonably could.

In this section many constructive comments were received from respondents as to how implementation of the Parliament’s Equal Opportunities policies could be improved and these will be addressed when considering future policies and any action points arising from this report.

6.3 Progress over the last year in relation to implementing the SPCB’s Equal Opportunities policies

66% of respondents thought significant progress had been made by the SPCB in the last 12 months, slightly less than in the 2003 Audit (68.7%) whilst 15.08% thought it had not. 16.24% of respondents preferred not to answer this question. Many of the positive comments received welcomed “Dignity at Work” training which respondents felt demonstrated progress being made by the Parliament. Others were pleased to see that there had been follow up training on the SPCB’s EO policies.

6.4 Network of Dignity at Work Contacts

The audit asked whether staff had used the Dignity at Work Network. Of those who responded 3.6% said they had used the DAW Network, with 92.16% of respondents not having used the network. 4.24% of respondents did not answer. Comments received about the DAW contact network were generally very positive although evidence supports the need to further publicise the availability and purpose of the network.
6.5 Recommending the SPCB as an employer

Just over 90% of respondents said when asked that they would recommend the SPCB as an employer to others, with 4.7% saying that they would not. 4.9% of respondents preferred not to answer this question and 0.4% did not know whether they would recommend the SPCB as an employer to others or not. Since the 2003 Audit a greater number of respondents say they would recommend the SPCB as an employer to others (previously 83%). This suggests an extremely high level of satisfaction amongst staff.

Of those who would not recommend the SPCB as an employer (4.7%) none of the reasons stated related to an equalities issue.

We finally investigated whether any particular group was more or less likely to recommend the SPCB as an employer. General satisfaction ratings are extremely high across all staff and the weighted average percentage across all groups was almost 92% which was higher than the 2003 Audit figure of 86%. The majority of groups were within just a few percent of this average. The groups which appeared less likely to recommend the SPCB were disabled people, “other white”, “other ethnic” and non-child carers which were the same groups as in the 2003 Audit. The groups which appeared more likely to recommend the SPCB were “white Irish” and 60-65 year olds which were both 100% likely to recommend the SPCB as an employer. This is different to 2003 when LGB, “white Irish” and “other ethnic” were more likely to recommend the SPCB as an employer.
% Who would recommend the SPBC by Group

Clive Sanders
Challenge Consultancy
March 2006
Appendix 1: Technical Notes

1. Gender – Throughout this report where we have carried out cross referencing exercises against gender we have referred only to Male and Female Genders. There are Transgender people in the Parliament; however the statistical sample is too small.

Correlation Coefficient Formula

The correlation coefficient (phi) is calculated using the following formula:

\[
\phi = \frac{AD - BC}{\sqrt{(A + B)(C + D)(A + C)(B + D)}}
\]

Where:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In group</th>
<th>Not in group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Characteristic</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Characteristic</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = A + C \quad B + D \quad A + B + C + D

And

A is the number of people in the group exhibiting the characteristic
B is the number of people not in the group exhibiting the characteristic
C is the number of people in the group not exhibiting the characteristic
D is the number of people not in the group not exhibiting the characteristic

The coefficient is a number between -1 and +1. A correlation of 1 indicates a direct relationship between belonging to the group and exhibiting the characteristic (i.e. all members of the group exhibit the characteristic and no-one not in the group does.) A correlation of -1 indicates a perfect negative relationship between belonging to the group and exhibiting the characteristic (i.e. none of the group exhibit the characteristic, but everyone else does.) A correlation of 0 means that there is no relationship between belonging to the group and exhibiting the characteristic (i.e. the proportion of the group exhibiting the characteristic is the same as the proportion of those not in the group exhibiting the characteristic.) For clarity, the correlation coefficient has been expressed as a percentage value from -100% to + 100% (i.e. \( \phi \times 100 \% \)). Caution therefore does need to be exercised when interpreting the correlation graphs. In our view correlations of less than 10% should be viewed as a slight correlation and correlations of less than 3% should be treated as being no or virtually no correlation.
Appendix 2

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES STAFF AUDIT QUESTIONNAIRE

IN CONFIDENCE

Please read this before completing this form

All members of staff must complete and return this form. 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 relation to equal opportunities issues. No member of staff at the Parliament will have access to this form once you have completed it. The Equalities Adviser or members of staff in the Personnel Office will not have access to these completed forms. An external organisation, Challenge Consultancy Limited, will collate the information from the forms and produce a report about the 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 similar philosophical belief (or lack of any of these); disability; age; trade union membership status/activities; marital or family status, and part-time or fixed-term contract status.

COMPLETING AND RETURNING THIS FORM

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

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

Step 3: Fill in your details on the enclosed compliment slip.

Step 4: Return the compliment slip to the Equalities Adviser in the enclosed envelope (via the Parliament’s internal mail system), in order to confirm that you have completed and sent off 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.
1. **GRADE**

   **What is your current grade?**
   
   - [ ] Grade 1
   - [ ] Grade 2
   - [ ] Grade 3
   - [ ] Grade 4
   - [ ] Grade 5
   - [ ] Grade 6
   - [ ] Grade 7
   - [ ] Grade 8/Director
   - [ ] I prefer not to answer this question

2. **HOURS**

   **Are you currently contracted to work at the Parliament on a full-time or part-time basis?**
   
   - [ ] Full-time
   - [ ] Part-time
   - [ ] I prefer not to answer this question

3. **TYPE OF CONTRACT**

   **What type of contract do you currently have with the Parliament?**
   
   - [ ] A permanent contract
   - [ ] A fixed-term contract *(for how many months or years? ________)*
   - [ ] I am an agency worker
   - [ ] Other - *Please specify* ____________________________
   - [ ] I prefer not to answer this question
4. **OFFICE**

**In which office do you currently work?**

- [ ] Allowances Office
- [ ] Broadcasting
- [ ] Business Information Technology
- [ ] Chamber Office
- [ ] Clerk/Chief Executive’s Office
- [ ] Committee Office
- [ ] Corporate Policy Unit
- [ ] Corporate Publications
- [ ] External Liaison Unit
- [ ] Facilities Management Office
- [ ] Finance Office
- [ ] Holyrood Project Team
- [ ] Internal Audit
- [ ] Legal Services
- [ ] Media Relations Office
- [ ] Official Report
- [ ] Personnel Office
- [ ] Presiding Officer’s Office
- [ ] Procurement Services
- [ ] Public Information
- [ ] Research Services
- [ ] Security Office
- [ ] SPICe
- [ ] Visitor & Outreach Services
- [ ] I work in one of the Directorate’s listed in question 5, but my post does not fall within any of the above offices.
- [ ] I prefer not to answer this question

5. **DIRECTORATE**

**In which Directorate do you currently work?**

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

How would you describe your gender?

☐ Female
☐ Male
☐ Other - Please specify __________________________
☐ I prefer not to answer this question

Would you consider yourself to be transgender?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I prefer not to answer this question

7. RELATIONSHIP STATUS

Do you have a partner or are you single?

☐ I have a partner
☐ I am single
☐ I prefer not to answer this question

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 aged ____________________ (please state ages of child/children)
☐ Yes, I have caring responsibilities for someone other than children/a child
☐ No, I do not have any caring responsibilities
☐ I prefer not to answer this question

9. SEXUAL ORIENTATION

How would you describe your sexual orientation?

☐ A Heterosexual  (If you have ticked ‘A’, please go to question 11)
☐ B Lesbian
☐ C Gay Man
☐ D Bisexual Woman
☐ E Bisexual Man
☐ F Other - Please specify ______________________
☐ G I prefer not to answer this question
10. SEXUAL ORIENTATION (continued)

If you ticked B, C, D, E or F for question 9, do you feel able to be “out” to other people working at the Parliament?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I prefer not to answer this question

11. ETHNIC GROUP

What is your ethnic group? For this question, you should choose one section from A to E and then tick the appropriate box in that section to indicate your ethnic group. If you prefer not to answer this question, please tick the box in section F.

A. White

☐ Scottish
☐ Other British
☐ Irish
☐ Any other White background - Please specify _________________________

B. Mixed

☐ Any mixed background - Please specify _________________________

C. Asian, Asian Scottish or Asian British

☐ Indian
☐ Pakistani
☐ Bangladeshi
☐ Chinese
☐ Other Asian background - Please specify _________________________

D. Black, Black Scottish or Black British

☐ Caribbean
☐ African
☐ Other Black background - Please specify _________________________

E. Other ethnic background

☐ Any other ethnic background - Please specify _________________________

F. ☐ I prefer not to answer this question

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
- □ Church of Scotland
- □ Roman Catholic
- □ Other Christian - Please specify ______________________
- □ Buddhist
- □ Hindu
- □ Jewish
- □ Muslim
- □ Sikh
- □ Other religion - Please specify ______________________
- □ I prefer not to answer this question

13. AGE

What is your age?

Please specify age (in years) ______________________

- □ I prefer not to answer this question

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 16)
- □ No
- □ I prefer not to answer this question (If you have ticked ‘No’ or ‘I prefer not to answer this question’, please go to question 17)

Please remember that the SPCB is committed to meeting the needs of employees with disabilities 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.
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
- Visual

*impairment (not corrected by spectacles or contact lenses)*

- Speech impairment
- Mobility impairment
  - Physical co-ordination difficulties *(includes problems of manual dexterity and of muscular control, e.g. incontinence, epilepsy)*
  - Reduced physical capacity *(includes debilitating pain and lack of strength, breath, energy or stamina e.g. from asthma, angina or diabetes)*
- Severe disfigurement
  - Learning disabilities
  - Mental illness *(i.e. substantial and long-lasting conditions – lasting more than a year)*
- Other (please tell us about this) ..........................................................

.......................................................... ..........................................................

..........................................................
........................................................................................................
..........................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

☐ I prefer not to answer this question

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, a Personnel Officer or the Equalities Adviser.

16. TRADE UNION ACTIVITIES

**Which of these questions best describes your trade union activities?**

- I am a member of a trade union
  - I am a member of a trade union and I get involved in trade union activities within this workplace
- I am not a member of a trade union
- I prefer not to answer this question
Please read this before answering the questions in Section 2

Some of the questions in Section 2 of this 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 racial 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,
- 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. CAREER PROGRESSION / INTERNAL PROMOTION

1a Have you applied for career progression (i.e. an internal promotion in the Parliament) within the last twelve months (i.e. from 1 July 2004 to 30 June 2005)?

Yes ☐ No ☐ If ‘No’, please go to question 1e
1b  If you did apply for career progression in the last twelve months, were you successful?

Yes ☐  No ☐  If ‘No’, please go to question 1d

1c  If you were successful in applying for career progression within the last twelve months, was your progression within the office where you already worked?

Yes ☐  No ☐  Now please go to question 1e

1d  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.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

1e  Do you think that your career progression 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 2 for a list of these characteristics.)

Yes ☐  No ☐

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 sex, your race, your sexual orientation, etc) and also tell us how you think that this characteristic has affected your career progression.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
2. **APPRAISAL**

2a Please tick one of the boxes below to indicate your overall appraisal marking in your most recent ‘end of year’ staff appraisal?

**Categories for staff employed by the SPCB:**

- ☐ Exceptional
- ☐ Meets Requirements
- ☐ Development Needs
- ☐ Unsatisfactory Performance

**Categories for staff employed by the Scottish Executive and seconded to the Parliament:**

- ☐ Exceptional
- ☐ Effective
- ☐ Partly Effective
- ☐ Unsatisfactory

☐ If you have not yet had an ‘end of year’ appraisal marking at the Parliament, please tick here

☐ If you are seconded to the Parliament from an organisation other than the Scottish Executive, please tick one of the above boxes if it accurately describes your most recent ‘end of year’ appraisal marking. Otherwise, please tick here and describe your appraisal marking below:
2b 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?

Yes ☐   No ☐   If ‘No’, please go to question 3

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.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

3a Have you been the subject of an investigation under the SPCB’s disciplinary policy during the last twelve months?

Yes ☐   No ☐   If ‘No’, please go to question 4

3b If your answer to 3a is ‘Yes’, were disciplinary allegations made against you after the investigation?

Yes ☐   No ☐   If ‘No’, please go to question 3e

3c If your answer to 3b is ‘Yes’, were you required to attend a disciplinary hearing to answer any allegations?

Yes ☐   No ☐   If ‘No’, please go to question 3e
3d If your answer to 3c is ‘Yes’, please specify what type of disciplinary penalty, if any, was applied to you (e.g. written warning).

________________________
________________________

3e If you were the subject of an investigation, hearing or penalty under the SPCB’s disciplinary policy 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 □ No □ If ‘No’, please go to question 4

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.)

________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________

4. ACCESS TO TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

4a Has your manager refused to allow you to attend a training course within the last twelve months?

Yes □ No □ If ‘No’, please go to question 4c

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

________________________
4b If your answer to 4a 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, this decision not to allow you to attend this training course?

Yes ☐ No ☐  If ‘No’, please go to question 4c

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.)

________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________

4c 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 ☐ No ☐

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.)

________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
5. **HARRASSMENT & BULLYING**

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

**Harassment:** Unwanted conduct which could be reasonably shown to have the purpose or effect of violating a person’s dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that person, and which is also linked to, or based on, one or more of a person’s personal characteristics (e.g. their racial group, sex, sexual orientation, disability status, religion, age, etc.)

**Bullying:** Inappropriate, malicious and unwelcome behaviour that is designed 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. (Bullying is not usually linked to a personal characteristic of a person, e.g. their race, sex, sexual orientation, disability, etc. If the behaviour is linked to a personal characteristic, then it would normally be classified as “Harassment” rather than “Bullying”.)

5a 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 6.

If you have ticked either of the above boxes, you are welcome to provide more information about the treatment you experienced if you wish to. If you have ticked ‘Harassment’, it would also be helpful if you tell us which of your personal characteristics (e.g. your race, your sexual orientation, etc) you believe to be linked to this behaviour.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
5b If you ticked either of the two boxes in question 5a, did the person or people who behaved towards you in this way have management authority over you?

☐ Yes, they had management authority over me
☐ No, they were in a higher grade than me within the organisation but they did not have management authority over me
☐ No, they were at the same grade as me, or at a lower grade than me, within the organisation
☐ No, they were not part of the staff structure (e.g., they were an MSP, a member of staff employed by an MSP, a member of the public, etc). In this case, without naming the individual(s), please specify what their role is:

5c If you ticked either of the two boxes in question 5a, did you get in touch with a Dignity at Work Contact for information and/or support?

☐ Yes, I contacted a dignity at work contact for information and/or support.
☐ No, I have not contacted a dignity at work contact because I was unaware of the existence of the network of dignity at work contacts or who to contact.
☐ No, I am aware of the dignity at work network but did not feel I needed their advice or support

5d If you ticked either of the two boxes in question 5a, did you make an informal or formal complaint about this treatment?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Whether you ticked ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ to this question, 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? If you did make a complaint, was your complaint handled properly and sensitively?

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________
6. TRADE UNION MEMBERSHIP AND ACTIVITIES

6a 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 ☐ No ☐ If ‘No’, please go to question 7

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.

________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________
________________________ ________________________________________

6b If your answer to 6a is ‘Yes’, please confirm the reason for which you believe you were treated in this way? (Please tick one box as appropriate)

☐ Because you were a member of a trade union
☐ Because you were a trade union member and involved in trade union activities
☐ Because you were not a member of a trade union

6c If your answer to 6a is ‘Yes’, was it someone who had management authority over you who acted in this manner?

Yes ☐ No ☐
6d  If your answer to 6a is ‘Yes’, did you make a formal or informal complaint about the behaviour?

Yes ☐  No ☐

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?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

7.  GENERAL REVIEW

7a  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 in any other way or ways?

Yes ☐  No ☐

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

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

If ‘No’, please go to question 7b
7b  Do you believe that the SPCB is doing all that it reasonably can do as an employer to implement its equal opportunities policies?

Yes ☐  No ☐

If ‘No’, what other sorts of things could, or should, we do?

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

7c  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 ☐  No ☐

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

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

7d  Have you have used the network of Dignity at Work Contacts?

Yes ☐  No ☐
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.


In general (i.e. thinking beyond equal opportunities issues), would you recommend the SPCB as an employer to other people?

Yes □ No □

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.
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 postage-paid 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 Consultancy Limited, please complete the compliment slip that is also enclosed with this form and return this slip to me (at Room Q3.06, Queensberry House) to confirm that you have returned the audit form.

Thanks again for your help.

Mairi Pearson
Equalities Adviser