

HR10 · STEP 0 · INTERIM

Policy / Handbook Update Drafts

Gap Analysis Report

Clause-level diagnosis of outdated, unclear, incomplete, or missing policy language, with section references and a short pattern summary.

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

This is a **sample** deliverable from the **Policy / Handbook Update Drafts** workflow (HR10) in AGASI AiOS. It shows the expected structure and tone. All names, numbers, and facts are **fictional**.

Gap Analysis Report — Policy Sections 2, 3, 5, 6

Prepared for: HR Director, People & Culture — Northbridge Advisory Partners Date: Current policy review cycle Scope: Sections 2 (Grievance), 3 (Performance Management), 5 (Workplace Conflict), 6 (Equal Pay & Compensation Equity) Classification: Internal Confidential

Gap Summary Table

Section/Clause	Issue Type	Explanation
S2.3 — Investigation Timeline	Incomplete	Policy states a 15-working-day window but does not address what happens when the timeline is exceeded. No requirement for employee notification of delays, no escalation trigger for overdue investigations. Case ER-2026-014 exceeded this window with no formal communication to the grievant.
S2.4 — Hearing and Outcome	Unclear	Policy does not specify the right to be accompanied at a grievance hearing, despite compliance reference notes confirming this as a requirement (Compliance Ref 1.2).
S3.2 — Performance Improvement Process	Incomplete	No minimum number of documented feedback conversations required before escalation to a PIP. The current wording ("informal conversation" and "reasonable period") provides no measurable threshold. Case ER-2026-019 demonstrated a manager initiating a PIP with zero documented prior conversations.
S3.4 — PIP Procedure	Outdated	PIP can be communicated "verbally or in writing" with no HR approval required. Compliance reference notes (Ref 2.2) state verbal-only PIP communication is insufficient and may be challenged. Case ER-2026-019 involved a PIP communicated via Teams message without Employee Relations Specialist approval.
S3.5 — Probation Reviews	Incomplete	No standardised format or documentation requirement for probation reviews. Manager discretion on format creates inconsistency across departments. Case ER-2026-014 involved a probation review that was never conducted; the current policy has no enforcement mechanism.
S5.2 — Informal Resolution	Unclear	The phrase "Managers should support informal resolution where appropriate" does not define the manager's obligation to act or the threshold for intervention. Compliance reference notes (Ref 4.1) confirm the manager's duty to intervene exists regardless of whether a formal complaint is filed.
S5.4 — Post-Acquisition Team Integration	Incomplete	The section acknowledges cultural sensitivity but mandates nothing: no protocol, no timeline, no documentation. The Meridian acquisition was completed over 12 months ago with no integration protocol. Case ER-2026-017 exposed the gap directly — workplace conflict between legacy and former Meridian employees with no framework to reference.
S5.5 — Escalation	Missing	Escalation process and criteria are explicitly undefined ("managers should use their judgement"). The firm's Escalation & Severity Criteria document exists separately but is not referenced in this policy section, creating a disconnect.
S6.3 — Acquired Employee Salary Protections	Incomplete	The policy acknowledges salary protections exist but documents no expiry procedure — no notification timeline, no transition methodology, no appeals process. The Meridian protection clause expires at the upcoming annual review cycle. Case ER-2026-021 revealed an 18% pay gap between same-grade employees caused by the protection arrangement.
S6.4 — Pay Equity Audits	Incomplete	Audit frequency, scope, and methodology are undefined. Compliance reference notes (Ref 3.3) confirm that employers must be able to demonstrate a review was conducted when a pay equity concern is raised. Case ER-2026-021 involved a pay equity grievance with no prior audit to reference.
Escalation & Severity Criteria (cross-section)	Unclear	The engagement survey correlation trigger added in a recent policy update has no formal policy status, no defined correlation threshold, and no documented action workflow. Three of four current cases have engagement flag correlations but the trigger has not been applied.

Critical Pattern Summary

The most critical pattern across these gaps is the absence of enforceable procedural requirements in Sections 3 and 6. Section 3 allows managers to initiate PIPs without documented conversations and without HR sign-off, directly enabling the procedural failure in case ER-2026-019. Section 6 acknowledges salary protections but provides no mechanism for transition, creating the structural inequity exposed in case ER-2026-021 with the Meridian acquisition salary protections expiring in the coming review window. A secondary pattern is the disconnect between the Escalation & Severity Criteria (updated in a recent policy cycle) and the policy sections they govern — Sections 2, 3, and 5 do not reference the escalation framework, meaning managers following these policy sections alone would miss escalation triggers that the firm has already adopted internally.