

## Equality Impact Assessment Guidance and Template and prompts/potential considerations for Résumé for Researchers (R4R)-like Narrative CV Applicant Guidance

### Purpose

This document provides guidance when completing an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) developed by UK Research and Innovation. In addition, an EIA template containing prompts/potential considerations for [Résumé for Researchers](#) (R4R)-like CV Applicant Guidance informed by members of the [Joint Funders Group](#) can be found at the end of this document (from page 4 of 7).

-----

The Research Councils are committed to promoting equality and participation in all their activities, whether this is related to the work we do with our external stakeholders or whether this is related to our responsibilities as an employer. As public authorities we are also required to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations when making decisions and developing policies. To do this, it is necessary to understand the potential impacts of the range of internal and external activities on different groups of people.

### What is an Equality Impact assessment (EIA) and why do we need to complete one?

An equality impact assessment (EIA) is an evidence-based approach designed to help organisations ensure that their policies, practices, events and decision-making processes are fair and do not present barriers to participation or disadvantage any protected groups from participation. This covers both strategic and operational activities.

The term 'policy', as used throughout this document, covers the range of functions, activities and decisions for which your organisation is responsible, including for example, strategic decision-making, arranging strategy & funding panels, conferences, training courses and employment policies.

The EIA will help to ensure that:

- we understand the potential effects of the policy by assessing the impacts on different groups both external and internal
- any adverse impacts are identified and actions identified to remove or mitigate them
- decisions are transparent and based on evidence with clear reasoning.

### When might I need to complete an EIA?

Whether an EIA is needed or not will depend on the likely impact that the policy may have and relevance of the activity to equality. The EIA should be done when the need for a new policy or practice is identified, or when an existing one is reviewed. Depending on the type of policy or activity advice can be sought from either your HR team, your Equality, Diversity and Inclusion team, your Peer Review Policy team or their equivalents.

**Ideally, an EIA should form part of any new policy, event or funding activity and be factored in as early as one would for other considerations such as risk, budget or health and safety.**

## **Who is responsible for completing and signing off the EIA?**

Depending on the nature of the policy, event or funding activity, the responsibility of who should complete the assessment, who should be consulted, and who should sign off the EIA will vary. Ultimate responsibility on whether an EIA is required and the evaluation decision(s) made after completing the EIA lies with the Senior Responsible Officer, budget holder, project board or the most relevant senior manager. Further advice is available from your Equality, Diversity & Inclusion contact.

## **What is discrimination?**

Discrimination is where someone is treated less favourably or put at a disadvantage because of their protected characteristic. The different groups covered by the Equality Act are referred to as protected characteristics: disability, gender reassignment, marriage or civil partnership status, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, sex (gender), and age.

Discrimination is usually unintended and can often remain undetected until there is a complaint. Improving or promoting equality is when you identify ways to remove barriers and improve participation for people or groups with a protected characteristic.

## **Building the evidence, making a judgement**

In cases of new policies or management decisions there may be little evidence of the potential effect on protected characteristic groups. In such cases you should make a judgement that is as reliable as possible. Consultation will strengthen these value judgements by building a consensus that can avoid obvious prejudices or assumptions.

## **Consultation**

Consultation can add evidence to the assessment. Consultation is very important and key to demonstrating that organisations are meeting the equality duties, but it also needs to be proportionate and relevant. Considering the degree and range of consultation will safeguard against 'groupthink' by involving a diverse range of consultees. These are the key considerations, to avoid over-consultation on a small policy or practice and under-consultation on a significant policy or an activity that has the potential to create barriers to participation.

## **Provisional Assessment**

At the initial stages, you may not have all the evidence you need so you can conduct a provisional assessment. Where a provisional assessment has been carried out, there must be plans to gather the required data so that a full assessment can be completed after a reasonable time. The scale of these plans should be proportionate to the activity at hand. When there is enough evidence a full impact assessment should be prepared. Only one EIA should be created for each policy, as more evidence becomes available the provisional assessment should be built upon.

## **Valuing Differences**

EIAs are about making comparisons between groups of employees, service users or stakeholders to identify differences in their needs and/or requirements. If the difference is disproportionate, then the policy may have a detrimental impact on some and not others.

***'You are looking for bias that can occur when there are significant differences (disproportionate difference) between groups of people in the way a policy or practice has impacted on them, asking the question "Why?" and investigating further'.<sup>1</sup>***

### **Evaluation Decision**

There are four options open to you:

1. No barriers or impact identified, therefore activity will **proceed**.
2. You can decide to **stop** the policy or practice at some point because the evidence shows bias towards one or more groups
3. You can **adapt or change** the policy in a way which you think will eliminate the bias, or
4. Barriers and impact identified, however having considered all available options carefully, there appear to be no other proportionate ways to achieve the aim of the policy or practice (e.g. in **extreme cases** or where **positive action** is taken). Therefore you are going to **proceed with caution** with this policy or practice knowing that it may favour some people less than others, providing justification for this decision.

In most cases, where disproportionate disadvantage is found by carrying out EIAs, policies **and practices are usually changed or adapted. In these cases, or when a change has been justified** you should consider making a record on the project risk register.

---

<sup>1</sup>[http://www.acas.org.uk/media/pdf/s/n/Acas\\_managers\\_guide\\_to\\_equality\\_assessments.pdf](http://www.acas.org.uk/media/pdf/s/n/Acas_managers_guide_to_equality_assessments.pdf)

## Equality Impact Assessment prompts/potential considerations

Question	Response
<b>1. Name of policy/funding activity/event being assessed</b>	<a href="#">Résumé for Researchers</a> (R4R)-like CV Applicant Guidance
<b>2. Summary of aims and objectives of the policy/funding activity/event</b>	<p>Explain your organisation’s motivation and objectives for taking this approach, for example, aligning to the principles of <a href="#">DORA</a>; broadening the types of achievements that can be seen as relevant for the advancement of research and innovation; allowing an applicant to be more fairly evaluated on their vision, appropriate experience, and contributions to research, innovation, and society, instead of narrow set of criteria.</p>
<b>3. What involvement and consultation has been done in relation to this policy? (e.g. with relevant groups and stakeholders)</b>	<p>Involve relevant stakeholders in the guidance development to ensure its informed, such as, applicants, reviewers, call support staff, research support staff, EDI professional staff, organisation development staff, Human Resources staff, research centres etc.</p>
<b>4. Who is affected by the policy/funding activity/event?</b>	<p>Consider who will be affected, such as,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding Managers</li> <li>• Applicants</li> <li>• Professional services supporting applicants</li> <li>• Assessors - reviewers and panel/committee members, panel/committee Chairs</li> </ul>
<b>5. What are the arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the actual impact of the policy/funding activity/event?</b>	<p>It’s best practice to evaluate new interventions and processes to ensure they are not creating any unintended consequences. This is critical in culture change. It is strongly recommended that you build in an evaluation phase to your introduction/use of your guidance and funding management. This can cover many aspects of the documentation and process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider finding out what your applicants thought of your guidance. You might use the <a href="#">Shared Evaluation Framework</a> questions and then use the feedback to improve and enhance the guidance.</li> <li>• Share your anonymous evaluation findings with other funders via The Joint Funders Group to build the evidence base and help improve the research and innovation landscape.</li> </ul>

Protected Characteristic Group	Is there a potential for positive or negative impact?	Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used	Action to address negative impact (e.g. adjustment to the policy)
<b>General</b>	Potential for positive or negative impact	- Applicant has flexibility to disclose protected characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider if any information will be blinded for reviewers and inform the applicant of this prior to their completion of the CV</li> <li>- Consider appropriate guidance for applicants on how information/data is processed and stored. Including how information may be redacted, removed or the R4R-like CV returned for amendment</li> <li>- Consider permitting applicants to include ORCID which will contain all outputs under all names</li> <li>- Make it clear to the applicant how and when career break information this will be taken account during in the assessment process, including with regard to eligibility compliance checks by the funder</li> <li>- Consider different ways to provide the guidance to applicants, for example videos, training sessions, or briefings</li> </ul>
<b>Disability</b>	Potential for positive impact	- Consider if your grants management system will enable the R4R-like CV, applicant guidance and associated training to be e-reader enabled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It's best for guidance to be written in an accessible and structured way, using clear and concise language.</li> <li>- Guidance should be accessible for neurodiversity and immersive readers.</li> </ul>
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	Potential for positive impact	- The R4R-like CV template enables less focus on outputs which require author name	
<b>Marriage or civil partnership</b>	Potential for positive impact	- The R4R-like CV template enables less focus on outputs which require author name	

<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	Potential for positive impact	- The additions section can enable applicants a better opportunity to describe the impact of a career break than a traditional CV, or the option to not declare a break at all as they will not be required to include a chronological list.	
<b>Race</b>	No known potential impact*		
<b>Religion or belief</b>	No known potential impact*		
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	No known potential impact*		
<b>Sex (gender)</b>	No known potential impact*		
<b>Age</b>	No known potential impact*		

\*There is an aspiration for the [Joint Funders Group](#) to revisit the EIA prompts/potential considerations with updated information in light of reviews and evaluations to better understand any possible impacts.

Version Control

<u>Version Number</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Revision Date</u>	<u>Author(s)</u>	<u>Summary of Changes</u>
1.0	Complete	March 2022	Joint Funders Group	New resource created

**Evaluation:**

Question	Explanation / justification	
Is it possible the proposed policy or activity or change in policy or activity could discriminate or unfairly disadvantage people?		
Final Decision:	Tick the relevant box	Include any explanation / justification required
1. No barriers identified, therefore activity will <b>proceed</b> .		
2. You can decide to <b>stop</b> the policy or practice at some point because the data shows bias towards one or more groups		
3. You can <b>adapt or change</b> the policy in a way which you think will eliminate the bias		
4. Barriers and impact identified, however having considered all available options carefully, there appear to be no other proportionate ways to achieve the aim of the policy or practice (e.g. in extreme cases or where positive action is taken). Therefore you are going to <b>proceed with caution</b> with this policy or practice knowing that it may favour some people less than others, providing justification for this decision.		

<b>Will this EIA be published* Yes/Not required</b> (*EIA's should be published alongside relevant funding activities e.g. calls and events:	
<b>Date completed:</b>	
<b>Review date</b> (if applicable):	

**Change log**

Name	Date	Version	Change
	When published	1	