



# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EqIA)

## Summary results of the EqIA

**Title of policy/practice/process/service:**

Job evaluation and grading process.

**Is the policy new (proposed), a revision to an existing policy or a review of current policy?**

Revision of current policy.

**Key findings from this assessment (or reason why an EqIA is not required):**

By adhering to the principles of the EHRC toolkit and ACAS guidance, following a systematic approach, we have assurance that the process was not discriminatory.

Proceeding with a guiding principle of achieving least financial detriment for salary has reduced the potential for any disadvantage to accrue to equality groups from this process.

**Summary of actions taken because of this assessment:**

No major change required as both process and outcomes met the needs of the public sector equalities duties.

**Ongoing actions beyond implementation include:**

All new posts and significant changes to current posts will be required to follow the job evaluation process.

**Lead person(s) for this assessment (job title and department only):**

Head of People and Organisational Development, Director of Corporate Services and Accounts, Policy Projects Manager.

**Senior responsible owner agreement that the policy has been fully assessed against the needs of the general duty (job title only):**

Director of Corporate Services and Accounts.

**Publication date (for completion by Communications):**

03/10/2024.

## Document control

<b>Document control:</b>	JEG EqIA v0.4
<b>Date policy live from:</b>	1 April 2024
<b>Review cycle:</b>	Three years from last full review

## Document change log

<b>Version/Author</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comment</b>
V0.1/ John Osborne	December 2023	First draft for review by JEG team
V0.2/ John Osborne	January 2024	Second draft for review by JEG team
V0.3/ John Osborne	March 2024	Third draft for review by JEG team, including analysis of data on outcomes
V0.4/ John Osborne and Sarah Halliday	April 2024	Fourth draft incorporating comments from JEG team
V0.5/ John Osborne and Sarah Halliday	June 2024	Fifth draft for submission to CEO for sign off

## Step 1 - Framing the planned change

Discussing step 1 and step 2 with the Policy Officer (Equalities) at an early stage will help identify appropriate evidence. This may include support from the wider Policy and Development team.

1.1 Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/practice/process/service. You can use the information in your project specification, business case etc.

The job evaluation system is called [PILAT Gauge](#) which is used across the public sector. PILAT Gauge is a systematic analytical job evaluation approach. There are several steps in the job evaluation and grading (JEG) process.

Review system and Factors	Business Requirements	Evaluation	Grading Structure	Salary Benchmarking	SLAB Scheme
HR / Provider	Managers	HR/Managers	HR	HR / External	HR
Equal pay for equal value	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Job description	Against the scheme factors	Uses evaluation scores	External comparators	Within SG Pay Policy
Up to date	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Against Factors	Compare within SLAB	Groupings to give grades		Affordability
Equalities		"weight / complexity"	Assign salary		
Functionality					
Complete	By August	September		By September	

There is very little discretion in how the PILAT Gauge system approaches the initial three steps: 'Review system and Factors', 'Business Requirements', and 'Evaluation'.

In terms of the benchmarking of roles, this was externally contracted and based on job roles, with no opportunity for us to influence the output. We focus this equality impact assessment on the grading structure and SLAB Scheme steps, as this is where we have the most discretion and therefore opportunities to further the three needs of the Public Sector Equality Duty.

As outlined above we are following the PILAT Gauge process. We have used this system before and it has been equality assessed by PILAT to give assurance that there is no bias in the system. Some language in the questions have been updated to be more inclusive.

The process meets the [Equalities and Human Rights Commission \(EHRC\) criteria](#) in that it is analytical, thorough and impartial, gender neutral and reliable. In terms of job evaluators, all those involved had training on the job evaluation system, equality issues and the avoidance of bias, and were drawn from across the organisation as well as the People and Organisational Development team (P&OD). Whilst the job evaluation panel consists of two members and not three, the decision tree structure of the Pilat system provides a level of support that means a third member was not required.

In preparation for the job evaluation interviews, all job descriptions were reviewed and updated, in line with [EHRC guidance](#), to ensure a fair and transparent process.

Following evaluation interviews and scoring, there was moderation by an external expert consultant, who reviewed the outputs based on the shape of jobs (meaning the spread of scores across the factors). No equalities data was included in this assessment and so no bias was introduced. The PILAT Gauge system also meets [ACAS guidance](#).

The elements of the Job Evaluation and Grading project that are within our control, and which form the focus of this impact assessment, are: the construction of the grade boundaries and the salary bands mapped onto those, and considering additional actions to achieve equal pay, such as with market supplements.

## **1.2 Why is the change required? *Legislative, routine review etc.***

Routine review as part of our People Strategy programme.

## **1.3 Who is affected by this policy/practice/process/service? *Be clear about who the ‘customer’ is.***

SLAB staff across all directorates.

## **1.4 Policy/practice/process/service implementation date? *Project end date, date new legislation will take effect.***

01/04/2024.

- 1.5 What other SLAB policies or projects may be linked to or affected by changes to this policy/practice/process/service?  
*The EqIA for related policies might help you understand potential impacts, and/or your findings might be relevant to share.*

All other People policies.

## Step 2: Consider the available evidence and data relevant to your policy/practice/process/service

The information you gather in this section will:

- *help you to understand the importance of your policy/practice/process/service for different equality groups,*
- *inform the depth of equality impact assessment you need to do (this should be proportional to the potential impact on equality groups), and*
- *provide justification and an audit trail behind your decisions, including where it is agreed an equality impact assessment is not required.*

- 2.1 What information is available about the experience of each equality group in relation to this policy/practice/process/service?

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
All equality groups	1) <a href="#">How to implement equal pay, EHRC.</a> 2) <a href="#">Check for risky practices, EHRC.</a>	<p>The EHRC sets out that job evaluation is a major tool in achieving equal pay and sets out certain criteria that schemes can be reviewed against. The EHRC lists additional actions and monitoring that can assist in achieving equal pay. (1)</p> <p>In its Equal Pay Toolkit, EHRC sets out the common causes of pay discrimination, which can include out of date job evaluation, use of market supplements, managerial discretion over starting salaries and differences in non-basic pay like allowances and overtime. (2)</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
	<p>3) <a href="#">Employers pay and benefits, Close the Gap</a>.</p> <p>4) SLAB's staff survey 2023.</p> <p>5) SLAB proposals as submitted to Scottish Government.</p>	<p>In its guidance on pay and benefits, EHRC recommends avoiding unlawful discrimination by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensuring employers know why staff are paid differently,</li> <li>• checking that people who share a protected characteristic do not generally do worse than people who do not share it</li> <li>• using an equal pay audit to check the impact of decisions on pay and benefits</li> <li>• implementing a transparent, structured pay system based on a sound job evaluation scheme to eliminate biases linked to managerial discretion. (3)</li> </ul> <p>Positive staff sentiment was low for pay and benefits overall, with 31% agreeing with the statement “I am satisfied with the total benefits package”. This was a decrease of 17 percentage points since 2021. Similarly, the proportion agreeing with “Compared to people doing a similar job in other organisations I feel my pay is reasonable” was 21%, a decrease of 16 percentage points. (4)</p> <p>The outcome of the JEG process, in terms of proposals as submitted to Scottish Government (SG), show that fewer than 5% of staff would have a decrease in salary or grade, as compared to 40-45% with an increase and 55-60% experiencing no change. (5)</p>
Age	<p>1) <a href="#">Annual Report and Accounts 2022-23</a>.</p> <p>2) <a href="#">Equality monitoring of</a></p>	<p>The mean employee age is now 45 years, compared to 46 in the previous year. Our employees are clustered around the middle age ranges with fewer employees aged &lt;=24 years and 65+ years (both &lt;5%). Around a third of our employees are aged 45-54 years (30-35%). Proportionally, our age demographic has several similarities to the 2019 Scottish population in employment: the main difference is across the lower age ranges where &lt;5% of</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
	<p><a href="#">employee protected characteristics.</a></p> <p>3) <a href="#">The Five Career Stages.</a></p> <p>4) SLAB's staff survey 2023.</p> <p>5) SLAB proposals as submitted to Scottish Government.</p>	<p>our staff are aged &lt;=24 years and 10-15% are aged 25-34 years, compared to the 2019 Scottish population in employment, for which the figures are 11.9% aged &lt;=24 years and 23% aged 25-34 years. The percentage of our staff aged 45-54, in contrast, is higher than that in the 2019 Scotland population in employment (30-35%, compared to 20-25%). (1)</p> <p>As expected, due to normal career progression (3), older employees are over-represented at higher grades, compared to those in younger bands. (2)</p> <p>For the pay and benefits theme in the survey, the researchers found no significant variations by age. (4)</p> <p>The outcome of the JEG process, in terms of proposals as submitted to SG, shows a slightly higher proportion of staff aged 55-64 would have an increase compared to SLAB overall (50-55%), with fewer staff aged up to 34 having an increase (25-30%). However, there is no patterning by decrease. (5)</p>
<b>Disability</b>	<p>1) <a href="#">Annual Report and Accounts 2022-23.</a></p> <p>2) <a href="#">Equality monitoring of employee protected characteristics.</a></p>	<p>15-20% of employees who completed their equality record declared a disability or long-term health condition. This level remains higher than the 2019 Scottish population in employment figure of 13.7%, but lower than the 25.9% of people with a disability in the general population. (1)</p> <p>Staff declaring disabilities are over-represented at the higher and lower grades, under-represented in the middle. (2)</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
	3) SLAB’s staff survey 2023. 4) SLAB proposals as submitted to Scottish Government.	<p>For the pay and benefits theme in the survey, the data tables provided by the researchers show a close match on this theme between people with a disability and those who do not have a disability. (3)</p> <p>The outcome of the JEG process, in terms of proposals as submitted to SG, shows a slightly higher proportion of staff declaring a disability would have an increase compared to SLAB overall (50-55%), with fewer staff who do not have a disability having an increase (35-40%). However, there is no patterning by decrease. (4)</p>
Race	1) <a href="#">Annual Report and Accounts 2022-23</a> . 2) <a href="#">Equality monitoring of employee protected characteristics</a> . 3) SLAB’s staff survey 2023. 4) SLAB proposals as submitted to Scottish Government.	<p>Our data tells us that our employee ethnic origin demographic is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 85-90% White Scottish and other British</li> <li>• &lt;5% White minority</li> <li>• &lt;5% minority ethnic groups.</li> </ul> <p>5-10% selected prefer not to say. Our employee demographic is broadly comparable to the 2019 Scottish population, except in the ‘White - minority’ group, which is underrepresented compared to the Scottish in work population. Since the 2021-22 report, ‘white - minority’ has moved from 5-10% of our staff complement to &lt;5%. (1)</p> <p>The small number of staff in minority ethnic origin groups make it difficult to identify significant trends or contrasts with regards to representation at different grades. (2)</p> <p>For the pay and benefits theme in the survey, the data tables provided by the researchers show no clear differentiation on this theme between people with a white ethnic background and those from all other ethnic groups. (3)</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
		The outcome of the JEG process, in terms of proposals as submitted to the SG, shows no patterning by either nationality or ethnic origin. (4)
Sex	1) <a href="#">Annual Report and Accounts 2022-23</a> . 2) <a href="#">Equality monitoring of employee protected characteristics</a> . 3) SLAB's staff survey 2023. 4) SLAB salary and allowances analysis. 5) SLAB proposals as submitted to Scottish Government.	<p>We have a 65-70% female and 30-35% male breakdown. The 2019 population data shows that in the general population 52% were female and 48% were male and of those in employment, 48.5% were female and 51.5% were male. (1)</p> <p>Relative to the general employed population, women are over-represented at all grades in SLAB, but less markedly so at senior grades. (2)</p> <p>For the pay and benefits theme in the survey, the researchers found no significant variations by sex. (3)</p> <p>Our analysis of the previous pay and grading structure, including the distribution of allowances, suggested that there was a potential difference in experience by this protected characteristic. (4)</p> <p>The outcome of the JEG process, in terms of proposals as submitted to the SG, shows no patterning by the sex of staff. (5)</p>
Gender Reassignment	1) <a href="#">Annual Report and Accounts 2022-23</a> .	We monitor data in relation to gender reassignment but do not publish it due to the risk of disclosure and identifying individuals. (1)

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
	2) SLAB proposals as submitted to Scottish Government.	The outcome of the JEG process, in terms of proposals as submitted to the SG, is based on very small numbers for this characteristic and therefore no pattern is identifiable. (2)
Sexual orientation	1) <a href="#">Annual Report and Accounts 2022-23</a> . 2) <a href="#">Equality monitoring of employee protected characteristics</a> . 3) SLAB's staff survey 2023. 4) SLAB proposals as submitted to Scottish Government.	<p>&lt;5% of employees identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or other/unsure. LGB and 'Other' representation appears comparable to the 2019 general Scottish population (2.9%) and the population of people who are in employment (3.2%). Whilst 10-15% of staff continue to answer 'prefer not to say' the specific percentage has decreased slightly since last year. (1)</p> <p>The small number of staff identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or other/unsure make it difficult to identify significant trends or contrasts with regards to representation at different grades. (2)</p> <p>For the pay and benefits theme in the survey, straight/heterosexual people are more likely to agree with the statements "I am satisfied with the total benefits package" and "Compared to people doing a similar job in other organisations I feel my pay is reasonable" as compared to those with another sexual orientation. This has not been subject to statistical significance testing. (3)</p> <p>The outcome of the JEG process, in terms of proposals as submitted to SG, is based on very small numbers to allow comparisons for groups within this characteristic, aside from heterosexual/straight. For the heterosexual/straight group the proportions experiencing</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
		increase, decrease or no change are in line with the SLAB overall proportion. For other groups no pattern is identifiable. (4)
Religion or Belief	<p>1) <a href="#">Annual Report and Accounts 2022-23</a>.</p> <p>2) Internal data on equality monitoring of employee protected characteristics.</p> <p>3) <a href="#">Scotland's census analysis</a>.</p> <p>4) SLAB's staff survey 2023.</p> <p>5) SLAB proposals as submitted to Scottish Government.</p>	<p>The number of employees identifying as Christian (30-35%) is lower than that reported for the 2019 Scottish population (42.5%) but broadly comparable to those in employment (36.4%). The percentage of employees declaring no religion (50-55%) is in line with the 2019 Scottish population (53.7%) but significantly lower than those in employment (60%). This is the same position as previous years. The number of employees identifying with other religions (collating Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, and others, for example Jewish) is &lt;5%, in line with both the 2019 national profile and for those in employment (3.1%). Our 'prefer not to say' figure remains relatively high at 10-15%, though again, this figure has reduced slightly since we last reported. (1)</p> <p>Those identifying as Christian are over-represented at higher grades (50-55% at 7+) as compared to the overall proportions. (2)</p> <p>This may be expected since older people, who usually make up the population of more senior grades, are more likely to identify as Christian than other age groups. (3)</p> <p>For the pay and benefits theme in the survey, the data tables provided by the researchers show no clear pattern by religion or belief. (4)</p> <p>The outcome of the JEG process, in terms of proposals as submitted to SG, shows no pattern by decrease in grade or salary for equality groups. A slightly higher proportion of those with no religion have no change to grade or salary (60-65%) compared to SLAB overall</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
		(55-60%), with those declaring a Christian religion having a slightly lower proportional “no change” (50-55%). (5)
Pregnancy or maternity	1) <a href="#">Annual Report and Accounts 2022-23</a> .	In 2022-23, 100% of maternity leavers returned to work. Of these, 60% (20% more than the year prior) requested a variation to their contractual hours on return to work and all were approved on a permanent basis. SLAB does not gather information on absence rates among this protected characteristic group. (1)
Marriage/civil partnership	1) Internal data on equality monitoring of employee protected characteristics. 2) SLAB proposals as submitted to Scottish Government.	The proportion of employees providing data for this protected characteristic is 59%, lower than for other protected characteristics. Of those providing a response, more than the Scottish average are married or in a civil partnership (55-60% as compared to 46%). We have a lower proportion of staff who are single (15-20%) as compared to the average of 36%. This may be explained by our older age demographic. (1)  The outcome of the JEG process, in terms of proposals as submitted to the Scottish Government (SG), shows no clear pattern by decrease in grade or salary for equality groups. The incomplete nature of the data makes further analysis difficult to undertake with no clear pattern discernible. (2)
Care Experienced ( <i>corporate parenting duty</i> )	(1) Staff demographics. 2) SLAB proposals as submitted to	5-10% of all staff members declare they are care-experienced, 80-85% are not and 10-15% prefer not to say. (1)  The outcome of the JEG process for people declaring they are care experienced, in terms of proposals as submitted to SG, suggests a higher proportion of this group would have an

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy/practice/process/service? <i>Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/need for consultation (step 3).</i>
	Scottish Government.	increase (55-60%) compared to SLAB average (40-45%). Although this is based on very small numbers. (2)

**2.2 Using the information above and your knowledge of the policy/practice/process/service, summarise your overall assessment of how important and relevant the policy/practice/process/service is likely to be for equality groups.**

The evidence shows that the distribution of employees by grades is patterned by equality groups. There is therefore difference in experience and potential difference in impact to be explored. The wider guidance from ACAS and EHRC also indicates that equality issues are important to grading processes.

The high level outcomes of the JEG process are not highly patterned in terms of the impact on equality groups. The impact section will set out how the construction of the grade boundaries and mapping of salary bands achieved this. The data indicates impact at a high level, but the evidence suggests we should consider any additional actions to achieve equal pay, such as by reviewing the position with market supplements and non-basic pay (like allowances and overtime).

**2.3 Outcome of step 2 and next steps. Complete the table below to inform the next stage of the EqIA process.**

*Consult with the project group and/or Corporate Policy Officer (Equalities) on completing this section.*

Outcome of Step 2 following initial evidence gathering and relevance to equality characteristics	Yes/ No (Y or N)	Next steps
There is no relevance to equality or our corporate parenting duties		Proceed to Step 5: agree with decision makers that no EqIA is required based on current evidence
There is relevance to some or all of the equality groups and/or our corporate parenting duties	Y	Proceed to Step 3: complete full EqIA

It is unclear if there is relevance to some or all the equality groups and/or our corporate parenting duties		Proceed to Step 3: complete full EqIA
--	--	---------------------------------------

**Step 3 - stakeholder involvement and consultation**

*This step will help you to address any gaps in evidence identified in Step 2. Speaking to people who will be affected by your policy/practice/process/service can help clarify the impact it will have on different equality groups.*

***Remember that sufficient evidence is required for you to show ‘due regard’ to the likely or actual impact of your policy/practice/process/service on equality groups. An inadequate analysis in an assessment may mean failure to meet the general duty.***

*The Policy and Development team can help to identify appropriate ways to engage with external groups or to undertake research to fill evidence gaps.*

**3.1 Do you/did you have any consultation or involvement planned for this policy/practice/process service?**

Yes.

Staff have been kept regularly informed through internal communications and the People & OD team have been open to questions from individuals. These questions have formed the basis for FAQs for all staff. All staff were involved in developing job descriptions and answering pre-evaluation questionnaires. There is a transparent appeals process.

**3.2 List all the stakeholder groups that you will talk to about this policy/practice/process/service.**

All staff and the GMB trade union.

**3.3 What did you learn from the consultation/involvement? Remember to record relevant actions in the assessment action log.**

From the consultation we identified the need to train GMB reps to allow them to have greater understanding of the system to support staff. The other consultation helped us to develop our communication strategies.

## Step 4 - Impact on equality groups and steps to address these

*You must consider the three aims of the general duty for each protected characteristic. The following questions will help:*

- **Is there potential for discrimination, victimisation, harassment or other unlawful conduct that is prohibited under the Equality Act 2010? How will this be mitigated?**
- **Is there potential to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a characteristic and those who do not? How can this be achieved?**
- **Is there potential for developing good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not? How can this be achieved?**

### 4.1 Does the policy/practice/process/service have any impacts (whether intended or unintended, positive or negative) on any of the equality characteristics?

*In the tables below, record the impact the policy/practice/process/service might have on each equality characteristic, as it is planned or as it operates, and describe what changes in policy/practice process/service or actions will be required to mitigate that impact. Copy any actions across to the project action log.*

The construction of grade boundaries and the mapping of salaries onto those was undertaken with a guiding principle of achieving least financial detriment.

In creating the grading structure, we identified the clustering of scores created by the evaluation. Each grade was given a score band, which ensured that those roles that have similar levels of responsibility were placed within the same grade. From this work we identified that there was a need to create a new grade.

We then used benchmarking evidence gathered to identify what salaries should be attributed to each grade. Benchmarking was carried out by an independent organisation that surveyed several other public bodies and compared data from Croner database.

The surveying was based on a summary of roles and not job titles to achieve a more accurate comparison. From the benchmark evidence we were able to identify more junior grades compared favourably to benchmark organisations, however those at middle management grades had drifted from comparator organisations particularly Scottish Government.

We sought removal of temporary market allowances, in line with the EHRC Equal Pay toolkit. This was also considered when reflecting on the benchmarking comparisons and setting the salary levels for grades. This meant that the detrimental impact of removing allowances was minimised.

All protected characteristics	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. For example, to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
	Positive impacts	Negative impacts	No impact	
potential for discrimination	X			By adhering to the principles of the EHRC toolkit and ACAS guidance, following a systematic approach, we have assurance that the process was not discriminatory. Removing allowances reduces the risk of differences emerging in reward package between different equality groups, reducing the risk of discrimination. Reviewing all roles in the JEG process reduces the risk that some roles or significant changes in jobs were inaccurately graded and influenced by unconscious bias.
potential for developing good relations	X			Evaluating all roles and removing allowances promotes understanding that certain jobs are of equal value, where previously there may have been differentials patterned by equality groups.
potential to advance equality of opportunity	X			Evaluating all roles and removing allowances provides assurance that no disadvantage or barrier to take up of roles will affect different equality groups. Proceeding with a guiding principle of achieving least financial detriment for salary has reduced the potential for any disadvantage to accrue to equality groups from this process.

**4.2 Describe how the assessment so far might affect other areas of this policy/practice/process/service and/or project timeline?**

No change in timeline is envisaged. The decision rests with Scottish Government.

**4.3 Having considered the potential or actual impacts of your policy/practice/process/service on equality groups, you should now record the outcome of this assessment below.**

*Choose from one of the following (mark with an X or delete as appropriate):*

Please select (X)	Implications for the policy/practice/process/service
X	<p><b>No major change</b> Your assessment demonstrates that the policy/practice/process/service is robust. The evidence shows no potential for unlawful discrimination and that you have taken all opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations, subject to continuing monitoring and review.</p>
	<p><b>Adjust the policy/practice/process/service</b> You need to take steps to remove any barriers, to better advance equality of to foster good relations. You have set actions to address this and have clear ways of monitoring the impact of the policy/practice/process/service when implemented.</p>
	<p><b>Continue the policy/practice/process/service with adverse impact</b> The policy/practice/process/service will continue despite the potential for adverse impact. You have justified this with this assessment and shown how this decision is compatible with our obligations under the public sector equality duty. When you believe any discrimination can be objectively justified you must record in this assessment what this is and how the decision was reached.</p>
	<p><b>Stop and remove the policy/practice/process/service</b> The policy/practice/process/service will not be implemented due to adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated.</p>

## Step 5 - Discuss and review the assessment with decision makers and governance structures

*You must discuss the findings of this assessment with senior decision makers during the lifetime of the project/review and before you finalise the assessment. Relevant groups include, but are not limited to, a Project Board, Executive Team or Board members. EqIA should be on every project board agenda therefore only note dates where key decisions have been made (for example draft EqIA sign off, discussion about consultation response).*

### 5.1 Record details of the groups you report to about this policy/practice/process/service and impact assessment. Include the date you presented progress to each group and an extract from the minutes to reflect the discussion.

The equality impact assessment was developed and reviewed as part of the development of grading and salary structure attached to that. Review of the equality impact assessment was carried out by the Head of People and Organisational Development, as well as the Director of Corporate Services and Accounts. Job evaluation is a major tool in achieving equal pay and therefore has equalities at its heart. The Project Board, comprising the Head of People and Organisational Development, the Director of Corporate Services and Accounts and the Director of Operations met 10 times between 18 July 2023 and 19 April 2024. Given the significance of the project, the Executive Team received regular updates and discussed progress. The specific details of benchmarking and allocating salary values was discussed in detail with the Chief Executive.

## Step 6 - Post-implementation actions and monitoring impact

*There may be further actions or changes planned after the policy/practice/process/service is implemented and this assessment is signed off. It is important to continue to monitor the impact of your policy/practice/process/service on equality groups to ensure that your actual or likely impacts are those you recorded. This will also highlight any unforeseen impacts.*

### 6.1 Record any ongoing actions below.

*This can be copied from the project action log or elsewhere in this assessment and should include timescales and person/team responsible. If there are no outstanding items, please make this clear.*

All new posts and significant changes to current posts will be required to follow the job evaluation process to ensure coherence of the organisation's scheme.

**6.2** Note here how you intend to monitor the impact of this policy/practice/process/service on equality groups. *In the table below you should:*

- *list the relevant measures,*
- *identify who or which team is responsible for implementing or monitoring any changes,*
- *identify where the measure will be reported to ensure any issues can be acted on as appropriate.*

Measure	Lead department/ individual	Reporting (where/ frequency)
Pay gaps by sex, disability and ethnicity	People & OD	In line with statutory reporting requirements
Employee protected characteristics analysis	People & OD	Annually

**6.3** **EqlA review date.**

*This EqlA should be reviewed as part of the post-implementation review of the policy/practice/process/service. The date should not exceed three years from the policy/practice/process/service implementation date.*

01/04/2027.

**Step 7 - Assessment sign off and approval**

*Once final consultation has been undertaken with Corporate Policy Officer (Equalities), all equality impact assessments must be signed off by the relevant Director or Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), even where an EqlA is not required. The Chief Executive must approve all equality impact assessments. Note the relevant dates here:*

**Director/SRO sign off:** 18/06/2024.

**Chief Executive approval:** 18/06/2024.

*All full equality impact assessments must be published on SLAB’s website as early as possible after the decision is made to implement the policy, practice, process or service.*