

Equality Impact Assessment

Stage 1

Screen the policy to determine its relevance to the various equalities issues. This will indicate whether or not a full EIA is required and which issues should be considered.

The following should be considered in the screening:

- Race
- Gender
- Gender identity
- Disability
- Religion or belief
- Sexual orientation
- Age (both younger and older applicants)
- Human Rights
- Socio-economic

What are the aims of the policy?

Work based learning (WBL) is a process designed to enable more transparent and rigorous assessment of applications made by Graduate members of the Chartered Institute of Legal Executives for Fellowship.

Currently, the application procedure requires applicants complete an application form to enable IPS to determine whether they have met the requirements for qualifying employment for the requisite period of time. WBL retains the requirement that applicants satisfy the requirements for qualifying employment, but also requires the applicant to provide a portfolio of supporting evidence

which demonstrates that they can meet the competencies which have been identified as the minimum necessary for a Day One Competent Fellow.

Checklist

Characteristic	Negative Impact	Positive Impact	Rationale	Post pilot findings
Race	No	No		There was some weak evidence that the application procedure may disadvantage applicants from a Black/Asian background. The evidence is weak as the number of applicants was relatively small.
Gender	Yes	No	Statistics indicate that more women are in part time employment than are men, as such stipulating that work should be 'wholly or principally of a legal nature' may prove indirectly discriminatory if applied as a percentage of full time work	A specific question was asked of part-time applicants who applied through the WBL process. Applicants considered that the scheme did not disadvantage them. The Equality and Diversity statistics collected did not indicate a difference in success of applications as between men and women.
Gender identity	No	No		No impact identified

Disability	No	No		No applicants participating in the pilot declared a disability and therefore this has not been tested. A reasonable adjustments policy has been adopted to mitigate any differential impact the scheme may have.
Religion or belief	No	No		No impact identified
Sexual orientation	No	No		No impact identified
Age (young)	No	No		No impact identified
Age (old)	No	No		No impact identified
Human rights	No	No		No impact identified
Socio-economic	No	No		No impact identified

Full Impact Assessment (completed after pilot data analysis)

Could the policy have a differential impact on members, on the basis of any of the equality strands/protected characteristics?

What are the issues? (eligibility criteria, physical access etc. Does the evidence show different outcomes?)

Prior to the pilot, the greatest identified risk was that the scheme would indirectly discriminate on gender, as it may impact disproportionately on part-time workers, more of which are female. This was not borne out by the data collected by the pilot.

However, the operation of the pilot provided weak evidence that the scheme operated to disproportionately reject Black and Asian applicants. The data was weak owing to the small number of applications received from these applicants.

What issues arose from the consultations? (have they been analysed by equality profile? Is an additional consultation required?)

WBL has been the subject of 2 consultations and a 6 month pilot of the scheme. There were no concerns raised regarding the operation of WBL in respect of Black/Asian applicants as against other candidates.

It is not considered necessary to consult further on the matter, however it is recommended that the issue be kept under review.

Is there evidence of indirect discrimination? (Where the requirements of a policy mean that it can be met by considerably fewer people from a particular section of the community, to the disadvantage of that group and that cannot be justified by the aims and importance of the policy)

All applications were considered by the Admissions and Licensing Committee. They were considered without the equality and diversity data. As a result there was no direct discrimination.

Of the applications from Black and Asian applicants, most were rejected on the basis of their qualifying employment which is an element which also exists under the current scheme. As a result their applications would have been unsuccessful regardless of the process by which the applications for Fellowship were submitted. IPS is unable to influence the career opportunities available to applicants and it is not considered that the change to WBL has operated to indirectly discriminate against Black and Asian

applicants. It is recommended that statistics in this area continue to be monitored and a periodic review of the operation of the scheme be incorporated. This will enable a larger set of data to be collected and analysed.

How are the issues taken into account? (What improvements can be made to address or reduce the adverse impact?)

The place of work of applicants is beyond the control of IPS. However, IPS will continue to monitor the equality and diversity data of applicants and undertake periodic reviews of this data.

Actions (What needs to be done, by whom and when)

An equality and diversity monitoring form will be included in the application forms and used to collect data on applicants for Fellowship. A periodic review of the data will be conducted in order to determine any trends.

The outcomes should be published