

Appendix 1: Equality Impact Assessment Screening:

Funding and Study Leave Policy

1. Context:

This EIA screening is undertaken because the paper requires a decision in relation to:

- A Workforce policy approval

2. Relevance to the Public sector Equality Duty:

Consider each aim of the General Duty (outlined below), and explain which aspects of the paper are relevant:

In explicitly providing for the non-discriminatory application of clear and transparent decision-making rules in relation to funding and study leave requests, the policy has the potential to impact positively on the 3 aims of the General Duty in relation to employees. Positive impacts may also be realised for patients and service users as a result of the following aspects of the policy:

- It provides for the delivery of Induction and Stat/Mand training which, through specific modules, support the development of individual and organisational competencies around equality and diversity and the creation of a positive working environment for all protected groups
- It provides for additional, individual, learning and development requirements to be identified through the Personal Development and Review process: for several post holders, these requirements will be met through equality and diversity-related training, such as Equality Impact Assessment or disability awareness training
- The draft policy does not refer to the need for other Induction, Stat/Mand and essential course modules to address the equality and diversity aspects of their core learning aims.

1) Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010.

Dealing with funding and study leave requests involves some level of discretion to be applied by senior staff members within Bristol CCG. Any unfairness practiced, wittingly or unwittingly, at this individual level, could result in group-level unequal outcomes which amount to discrimination. There have been too few applications to date for any such group-level effects to be observable. However, the draft policy has been amended to address a few potential causes of discriminatory outcomes:

- The need for line managers to agree with staff going onto maternity leave, or on long term sick leave, whether/how they would like to be kept notified of any relevant learning and development opportunities which arise

- Where an academic institution refuses to hold a place open for an employee who becomes pregnant, the need for Bristol CCG to advocate, on behalf of such an employee, with the institution

2) Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

This policy has a small potential to support the CCG’s strategic aim of tackling discrimination and promoting equality in service delivery, employment and key decision-making (Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Strategy). This is partly to be achieved by building “a workforce which reflects the profile of our local population, including at senior levels and which is competent to commission fair and equitable services”. The draft policy has been revised so that funding and study leave decisions can be influenced by an understanding of this organisational requirement.

3) Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Having clear and transparent rules for decision making and resource allocation is likely to support good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. To enhance the likelihood of these rules being applied consistently, the draft policy has been revised to include a remedy for resolving any disputes about a decision taken.

3. Impact on Protected Groups:

Has the above identified that the paper has any relevance to any of the following protected characteristics?

Age.	No	Disability.	Yes	Sexual Orientation.	No
Race.	No	Sex.	No	Religion or Belief.	No
Gender Reassignment.	No	Pregnancy & Maternity.	Yes	Marriage or Civil Partnership Status	No

It will be difficult to monitor for differential/adverse impact, due to low numbers of applicants for funding and study leave and low numbers of refusals. However, the draft policy has been amended to state that applications and refusals will be analysed from an equality perspective periodically (eg twice a year), and any discrepancies further investigated.

4. Health Inequalities:

Does it relate to an area with known Health Inequalities? No

5. **Where it is considered that the paper has no relevance to the General Duty or Protected Groups, this should be recorded here with reasons along with any advice received:**

It has some relevance: considered to be fairly minor because it only affects a small number of people and we have tried to mitigate in the revised policy.

6. **Conclusion:**

Proceed to full EIA: No
Quality Assured by: David Harris, Senior Equality Advisor, SWCSU
Date: 26 February 2014