

Equality analysis form

1. Name of the activity (strategy, policy or practice etc)

Personal relationships at work policy

2. What is the aim of the activity (objective or purpose)?

This policy sets out UWE Bristol's expectations and requirements regarding close personal relationships. The policy covers relationships between members of staff and staff and students. The policy outlines action to be taken by staff if a conflict of interest arises and guidance for managers on dealing with situations appropriately in the interests of protecting the parties concerned.

3. If amending a current activity, what changes are proposed?

Revision of the existing Personal relationships policy and equality analysis in light of recommendations in the NUS/1752 report; Power in the academy: staff sexual misconduct in UK higher education and the Independent Review into The University of Sussex's Response to Domestic Violence.

The policy includes clearer guidance for managers on action they should take on disclosure.

4. Who is responsible for developing and delivering the activity?

Policy developed by Louise Davis, Employee Relations and Reward Adviser in consultation with HR, Student Services and the trade unions.

The policy will be delivered by HR, line managers and senior managers (where appropriate).

5. What measures will be used to assess whether the activity is successful?

Monitoring of dignity at work matters – recorded by Dignity at Work Advisers.
Monitoring of complaints relating to working relationships.

6. Does the activity have a potentially adverse impact on equality groups, in terms of employment issues and/or service delivery for students and/or staff? In the table below, please give evidence to support your yes or no answers. If the answer is not known, indicate how you will source evidence.

Meeting the public sector equality duty

Please also use the table below to demonstrate whether the activity has the potential to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations. Please use the 'no' column to highlight your responses.

	Yes	No	Not known
All groups	<p>The power dynamic in family ties may be influenced by any protected characteristic (age, disability, gender, gender identity, pregnancy or maternity, marriage or civil partnership, race, religion and belief or sexual orientation). The policy will flag this possibility and ask relevant staff to be mindful of these power dynamics in responding to conflicts of interest.</p>		
Women and men	<p>Power dynamics are present in our social context: men are often perceived to be a more powerful group than women.</p> <p>Personal relationships between students and staff, and between staff of different grades have an inherent power dynamic. Women make up the majority of the student body, and lower grade staff positions, while men make up the majority of senior roles. This means the power dynamic in personal relationships may mirror and exacerbate the power dynamic seen in the broader social context.</p> <p>The university's response to a close personal relationship with a conflict of interest should be mindful of these dynamics, particularly where staff may be subject to redeployment to avoid</p>		

	<p>conflicts of interest.</p> <p>The policy will flag this possibility and ask relevant staff to be mindful of this gender power dynamic in responding to conflicts of interest.</p>		
Trans people	<p>Possibility of trans staff not being comfortable disclosing personal relationship due to lack of awareness of their situation in the workplace.</p> <p>The policy will instruct all records concerning close personal relationships to be kept strictly confidential</p>		
Black and minority ethnic groups	<p>Possible language barrier for staff (both visible BME and white non-UK) that do not have English as their first language. Possibility of increased misunderstandings in communications and cultural differences between staff.</p> <p>Policy and communications will be written in plain language, to help support those whose first language is not English.</p> <p>Power dynamics are present in our social context: white people are often perceived to be a more powerful group than BME people.</p> <p>Personal relationships between students and staff, and between staff of different grades have an inherent power dynamic. There are more BME people in the student body and in lower grade staff roles, than in higher grade staff roles. This means the power dynamic in personal relationships may mirror and exacerbate the power dynamic seen in the broader social context.</p> <p>The university's response to a close personal relationship with</p>		

	<p>a conflict of interest should be mindful of these dynamics, particularly where staff may be subject to redeployment to avoid conflicts of interest.</p> <p>The policy will flag this possibility and ask relevant staff to be mindful of this ethnicity power dynamic in responding to conflicts of interest.</p>		
Disabled people			<p>Certain groups of disabled staff (i.e. blind, dyslexic) could experience problems accessing policy on web. Adjustments may be required for accessing information in different formats.</p>
Younger or older people	<p>Power dynamics are present in our social context: older people are often perceived to be a more powerful group than younger people.</p> <p>Personal relationships between students and staff, and between staff of different grades have an inherent power dynamic. There are more younger people in the student body and in lower grade staff roles, than in higher grade staff roles. This means the power dynamic in personal relationships may mirror and exacerbate the power dynamic seen in the broader social context.</p> <p>The university's response to a close personal relationship with a conflict of interest should be mindful of these dynamics, particularly where staff may be subject to redeployment to avoid conflicts of interest.</p> <p>The policy will flag this possibility and ask relevant staff to be mindful of this age-related power dynamic in responding to conflicts of interest.</p>		

People of different religion and beliefs	Staff from different religious backgrounds may have different cultural and communication norms.		
Lesbian, gay, bisexual people	<p>Power dynamics are present in our social context: straight or heterosexual people are often perceived to be a more powerful group than LGB people.</p> <p>Personal relationships between students and staff, and between staff of different grades have an inherent power dynamic. There are more out LGB people in the student body and in lower grade staff roles, than in higher grade staff roles. This means the power dynamic in personal relationships – for example between a straight member of staff and a lower grade bi-sexual member of staff or student- may mirror and exacerbate the power dynamic seen in the broader social context.</p>		<p>Possibility of LGB staff not being comfortable disclosing personal relationship due to lack of awareness of their situation in the workplace.</p> <p>The policy will instruct all records concerning close personal relationships to be kept strictly confidential.</p>
Marriage and civil partnership	<p>There is a risk that new or short term relationships may be more subject to 'gossip', and may be more likely to be viewed as presenting a conflict of interest, compared to a long term or pre-existing marriage or civil partnership.</p> <p>The policy makes clear that all close personal relationships, whether characterised as family ties, long term, or one-off, should be declared on an equal basis and treated appropriately, while acknowledging the possibility of accusations coming from one or other party if the relationship has ended.</p>		
Pregnancy and maternity		None	

7. Please give evidence of how you have engaged equality groups in the equality analysis process. Is further engagement required?

3 week consultation for equality groups – ended 30 October 2018

8. What action can be taken to mitigate any potential negative impacts or address different needs? Please comment and then complete an action plan (see appendix 1).

See Action Plan.

9. Please indicate the level of equality relevance:

High

Medium

Low

10. Equality analysis completed by:

Name	LOUISE DAVIS
Post title	Employee Relations and Reward Adviser
Faculty / service	Human Resources
Date	31.10.2018

Please return this form to the Equality and Diversity Unit for feedback and publication.

Equality analysis - action plan

Appendix 1

Name of activity: Personal relationships at work policy

Plan completed by: Louise Davis

Service / faculty: Human Resources

Issues	Actions required	Responsible Person	Resources required	Target date	Success Indicators	What progress has been made?
Information/data required						
Consultation	<p>Consultation with different equality groups to collate views.</p> <p>Consultation with trade unions.</p>	<p>Louise Davis/ E&D team</p> <p>Louise Davis</p>	Support from E&D team	30 Oct 2018	Stakeholders fully consulted on new policy	Feedback received and incorporated into EA and policy
Publication	Publication of policy on HR intranet.	Louise Davis	Support from Strategic Communications and Engagement team	Nov 2018	Staff awareness of policy and associated support	
Communication	Communication of policy to staff and managers via Weekly News.	Louise Davis	Support from Strategic Communications and Engagement team	Nov 2018	Staff awareness of policy and associated support	
Monitoring	Monitoring of	ER&R team	Support from	Ongoing	Appropriate	Ongoing

	policy via ongoing feedback from individual employees on the support they have received from the University and the effectiveness of the measures outlined in the policy	/HR Advice team	HR Advice team, individuals and line managers		support in place for staff	
Review arrangements	Review of policy every 3 years.	ER&R team	Support from all stakeholders	2021	Up-to-date policy in place	Review scheduled

Please return form to the Equality and Diversity Unit

Signed on behalf of Debbie England HR and OD Director

Melissa Hayward
Employee Relations and Reward Advisor
30 January 2019