

# Equality Impact Assessment Form

Please ensure you have read the EIA Policy and Guidance document before completing this form. If you need assistance, please contact the EDU. Please return the completed form to the EDU.

## STEP 1 – Define policy/practice

i. Name of policy/practice/significant change

### Work Load Model (WLM) Policy

ii. Owner of policy/practice (College, School/Research Institute or Service)

Adam Smith Business School

iii. Date of policy/practice approved

April 2025, Reviewed June/July 2025

iv. Approved by? (Committee, College, School or Service)

Committee (Staffing) and School (Senior Leadership Team, SLT)

## STEP 2 – Description of policy/practice

i. What are the aims?

The purpose of the workload model is to distribute work in a fair and transparent manner:

- To support School strategic intent.
- To do so by fair, equitable and transparent workloads, reflecting College and University norms.
- To encompass normal workload expectations and do so in an efficient and reasonable manner.
- To support, promote and foster career development.
- To allow managerial judgement in response to anomalies or disruptions.
- To ensure teaching and assessment workloads are transparent and fairly and equitably allocated.

ii. Who does it cover?

All Research and Teaching, and all Learning and Teaching faculty.

iii. How often is this policy/practice reviewed?

Periodically, however, major reviews (such as this one) every three years, or so.

## STEP 3 – Could there be any implications for a protected characteristic group (as defined by the Equality Act 2010) in this (or the development of) policy/practice?

### STEP 3a – Yes, there is a potential implication or barrier for a protected characteristic group.

Please tick all that are relevant

Protected Characteristics	Tick ✓	Notes
Age	✓	
Disability (including BSL users)	✓	
Gender Reassignment (including Gender Neutral Language)	✓	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	✓	
Pregnancy and Maternity	✓	
Race	✓	
Religion or Belief	✓	
Sex	✓	
Sexual Orientation	✓	

If any of the above have been ticked - Go to Step 4

### STEP 3b – No, there are no potential implication or barrier for a protected characteristic group.

Go to Step 8

## STEP 4 – What evidence do you have for this conclusion (potential implication for a protected characteristic group)?

Briefly explain:

The WLM policy applies to all Research and Teaching (R&T) and Learning and Teaching (L&T) academics within the Business School and therefore there could be implications for all protected characteristic groups, and it can be reasonably assumed that staff will have different experiences or needs based on their protected characteristics.

**Particular areas identified are:**

- Age in terms of seniority, for example younger staff are more likely to be on ECDP.
- Pregnancy and Maternity, again linked to ECDP by age.
- Sex, aware of instances where pastoral or teaching roles have been questioned in terms of gender balance.

**STEP 4a – Does the evidence show a positive impact?**

Please provide an example and attach evidence:

Various positive impacts have been identified and considered within the WLM policy such as:

- The policy applies consistently to all R&T and L&T staff and commits to equitable, reasonable and fair allocation of workload and responsibilities across academic staff within these groups.
- The policy recognises that workload modelling is not an exact science and there is built in mechanisms for managerial discretion to be utilised for individual cases, anomalies or disruptions.
- Age: There is built-in workload reductions for career development and ECDP staff in their first two years of PGCAP.
- Sex: Allocation of workload hours to the Athena Swan Lead reflects the Business School's strong commitment to gender equality.
- Disability & Pregnancy/Maternity: Managerial discretion allows for adjustments to accommodate individual circumstances such as reasonable adjustments and flexible working.

**Go to Step 5**

**STEP 4b – Does the evidence show a negative impact?**

You need to consult with relevant stakeholders – the EDU will assist with this process.

Provide brief details and attach evidence:

Potential negative impacts could include:

- Disability & Pregnancy/Maternity: Prescriptive workloads could disproportionately impact employees within these groups and those with health-related conditions. To mitigate, as above, the WLM is flexible and managerial discretion is built in to allow for adjustments to allocations.
- Sex: Data on gender distribution between L&T staff and R&T staff may suggest that women are underrepresented in scholarship/research time than male counterparts. Workload pressures for female staff may limit opportunities for personal academic growth and promotion. Mitigation is evident through the School's strong commitment to gender equality as shown by the recent Athena Swan Silver award and commitment to review scholarship hours for LTS staff, who are predominantly female.
- Sex: Anecdotally, citizenship and collegiality roles can often disproportionately be taken up by women and therefore they may be overly represented in such roles within the WLM. Mitigation can be evidenced via footnote 3 and continual review of such roles to ensure fairness and equity across all protected characteristics.

**Go to Step 6**

**STEP 4c – Does the evidence show NO impact?**

Attach evidence:

**Go to Step 8**

**STEP 5 – Continue to promote good opportunity for all people**

Promote and implement as exemplar policy/practice

N/A

**Go to Step 8**

**STEP 6 – Involve and consult stakeholders to address any negative impacts?**

EDU will assist with this process. Provide brief details of involvement and consultations:

**Consultations took place with several individuals/initiatives, primarily through the Staffing Committee, which has primary responsibility for the WLM Policy. Regarding this policy the Athena Swan Champion and team reviewed the policy, as did the ECDP champion and team, the leadership of both sit on the Staffing Committee. In addition, Subject Leadership and Directorate Leadership (Research and Teaching), as well as College HR, also sit on Staffing. All reviewed the policy as it developed and were charged with consulting with their relevant constituents. Feedback was incorporated into the policy as it developed, over a 4 to 6 month period.**

**Impacted academic staff were given the opportunity to comment post initial launch in May (the policy drives the School wise staffing model, it must run in May to generate workloads for 2025/26). Staff comments were gathered and then scrutinised and responded to by the Deputy Head of School, supported by both Assistant Heads of School (Learning and Teaching and Culture), with inputs from relevant parties including the Subjects, Work Load Planners and the Head of School. Deliberations are documented and attached. This resulted in the post review policy which is attached.**

**Go to Step 7**

**STEP 7 – Outline any changes made to the policy/practice as a result of the consultation**

Provide details of changes:

Please see above.

**Go to Step 8**

**STEP 8 – Publish results (as required by law)**

Return this form, once completed, along with copy of amended policy or practice and any relevant information, to the EDU for annual reporting and for inclusion on the University website.

Please note items sent to EDU here:

- **The post review policy.**
- **Communication post review to staff.**
- **The feedback review document detailing the response and rational to staff.**
- **Emails to the Staffing Committee in relation to the workload model.**


**Go to Step 9**

**STEP 9 – Regular review**

Regular reviews ensure that policy and practice is kept up to date and meets the requirements of current equality legislation. Where a negative impact has been identified and remedial actions are being implemented, the policy owner should define a timescale for review.

Please give details of review process:

**Staffing Committee on an ongoing basis has responsibility for the model. Post July launch of the staff informed policy there will be a further 6-month review. The policy is reviewed on an annual basis by the Staffing Committee.**

SIGN OFF PROCESS	
Name of EIA Owner	Robert Paton
Signature	
College/School/RI/Service	Adam Smith Business School
Date of Completion	11 July 2025
Date received by EDU	11 July 2025
Approved in Principle?	YES NO
Any actions required? Please specify	None
Signed on behalf of EDU	Equality & Diversity Unit
Date	31/07/2025