

# Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)

## *Community Benefits Group Funding Process*

### Details of requester

Name	[REDACTED]
Section/Project	Community Benefits Group
<b>Details of accountable Director</b>	
Director name	Kenny Crawford

### Document control (to be completed at each iteration)

Date	Author	Notes	Version number
08/03/2023	[REDACTED]	Initial draft	V0.1
14/03/2023	[REDACTED] and [REDACTED]	Section 1 and 2 reviewed	V0.2
24/04/2023	[REDACTED]	Draft completed	V0.3
10/05/2023	[REDACTED]	Update following EDI Forum feedback.	V0.4
17/05/2023	[REDACTED]	Minor amendment to proposal outline following Director review	V0.5

## Contents

Summary .....	2
Section 1: Framing .....	4
Section 2: Impacts Identification and Evidence .....	5
Section 3: Impact Assessment and Actions .....	9

## Summary

<b>Date</b>	10/05/2023	
<b>IG Casework ref</b>	CW-2023-050	
<b>Summary</b>		
<p>This EQIA relates to the Community Benefits Group (CBG) responsible for decisions regarding provision of funding to community groups and projects from an annual budget. When the CBG was established, funding was only available for community groups associated with a RoS colleague. The funding criteria for applicants has recently been extended to also include applications from external community groups.</p> <p>Potential negative impacts have been identified in relation to the protected characteristics of age, disability and religion/belief. These impacts are mitigated by the recommended actions outlined below.</p> <p>Extending the criteria for funding could also have a potentially positive impact across several of the protected characteristics, as it allows the funding opportunity to be accessed more widely, broadening the number and range of local community groups that can apply.</p>		
<b>Impact summary</b>		
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Recommended Actions</b>	
<b>Potential positive</b> – across several protected characteristics	Promote funding opportunity widely to increase the likelihood of applications from a range of community groups.	
<b>Potential negative</b> - age	Provide assistance during the application process if required and communicate about funding opportunity in a variety of locations.	
<b>Potential negative</b> – disability	Have a flexible approach to submissions and consider accessibility of application process.	
<b>Potential negative</b> – religion or belief	Investigate and expand on Annex B in the 'Guidance for applications' document to set out more clearly the types of religious groups that would not be eligible for CBG funding.	
<b>Review date</b>		<b>December 2023</b>

## Comments

*Comments from teams should be entered in the table below as relevant*

<b>EDI Group</b>	<b>Name: EDI Colleague Forum Date: April 2023</b>
<p>EDI Colleague Forum noted the importance of including evidence to support conclusions about the potential impact on the protected characteristics to avoid making assumptions. Section 2 was updated to reflect this feedback.</p> <p>No further potential impacts to any of the protected characteristics were identified.</p>	

## Senior staff approval or oversight required

*Specify which senior colleagues should have sight of the EQIA and who should approve*

<b>Role</b>	<b>Approval/oversight/none</b>
Keeper	
Accountable Officer	
Director - Registration	
Director – Business Development	Approval
Director - Corporate	
Other (specify)	

## Section 1: Framing

### 1. Proposal Outline

What is the scope of this Equality Impact Assessment (change phases/stages)?

Brief background information can be included if this is necessary to frame the proposal

The Community Benefits Group (CBG) was set up in 2012 by the then Keeper and is granted an annual budget to provide funding to community groups and projects that have been nominated by RoS colleagues. The CBG aims to support a variety of groups that align with RoS Corporate Social Responsibilities, such as sports clubs, community gardens and other non-charitable groups. Initially only groups associated with RoS colleagues could apply for funding, but the scope has now been extended to include applications from other community groups. The CBG have developed the following criteria for assessing applications for funding:

Ranking Criteria:

1. Does it meet the Terms and Conditions?
2. Does it fit within the CSR focused areas of Economic, Cultural and Social and Environmental? Do we have good balance of these? We will track these.
3. Does it come from a RoS Employee? These would be prioritised assuming other criteria is met.
4. Have we supported the group before and how recently?
5. Have we funded a similar group recently – ensuring a range of projects and groups are supported.
6. Geographical consideration – make sure there is a balance of locations.

What are the aims or purpose and anticipated outcomes of the change (such as a new policy, decision, procedure or relevant practice)?

Changing the scope of funding applications to include groups that are not associated with a RoS colleague aims to expand the funding opportunity as widely as possible, broadening the number and range of local community groups that can apply.

The development of a criteria to assess applications will help the CBG to ensure that a range of projects and groups are supported.

Please indicate who is most likely to be affected by the change?

*For example: Employees, visitors, contractors, women, men, young people, older people, people with disabilities etc.*

Community groups and CBG members who make the decisions about funding applications.

Which aspects of the change are particularly relevant to any element of the general equality duty?

Extending the eligibility criteria for funding can contribute positively to promoting good relations and advancing equality of opportunity.

## Section 2: Impacts Identification and Evidence

Does evidence suggest any potential contribution of the change against the needs of the general equality duty? Consider each aspect in the table below.

Public sector equality duty	Aspects of change which contributes to or influence duty	Explanation/evidence of contribution or influence
<b>Eliminating unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation</b>	Extending funding opportunities to external community groups that are not connected with RoS colleagues.	Expanding the criteria for funding applications increases the scope of community groups that can apply for funding. Applications that meet the criteria for funding but are unsuccessful are eligible to reapply for funding in the next financial year. There is also no limit on the number of times a community group can apply for funding.
<b>Advancing equality of opportunity</b>		
<b>Promoting good relations</b>		

Does evidence suggest any potential for impacts on the following groups? Consider each characteristic in the table below.

Protected Characteristic	Impact (positive or negative)	Explanation/evidence of impact	Proposed actions/modifications
<b>Age</b> (e.g. older people, children and young people)	Potential Negatives	The Scottish Household Survey (2021) highlighted that older people are less likely to use the internet than other demographics. 71% of those over 75 reported using the internet compared to 100% of those aged 16-24. Therefore, the use of an online application form may form a barrier for this age group. Similarly, knowledge of the funding	Ensure a flexible approach to application submissions and communication about funding. Provide assistance if required, for example, supplying and accepting a paper form instead of online application form.

	Potential Positive	<p>opportunity may not reach all age groups if only communicated in limited places, such as via email or other online platforms.</p> <p>Expanding the criteria for funding applications may make it more likely that groups related to the protected characteristics will be eligible to apply.</p>	Promote funding opportunity widely to increase the likelihood of applications from a range of community groups.
<b>Disability</b>	Potential Negative	<p>The Scottish Household Survey (2019) highlighted that disabled adults are less likely to use the internet, 71% in comparison to 94% of individuals without a disability. Therefore, the application process may form a barrier to submitting a request for funding.</p> <p>Expanding the criteria for funding applications may make it more likely that groups related to the protected characteristics will be eligible to apply.</p>	<p>Ensure a flexible approach to application submissions and communication about funding. Provide assistance if required and consider accessibility. For example, carrying out accessibility testing of the online application form and guidance documents.</p> <p>Promote funding opportunity widely to increase the likelihood of applications from a range of community groups.</p>
<b>Gender reassignment</b> (Where a person is living as the opposite gender to their birth)	No differential impact identified	CBG funding applications are open to all community groups that meet the criteria for funding.	N/A
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	No impact	CBG funding applications are open to all community groups that meet the criteria for funding.	N/A

		Applications can be submitted at any time and the CBG will meet at least quarterly to make decisions, so there is no disadvantage to individuals who may be absent due to this protected characteristic.	
<b>Race, ethnicity, colour, nationality or national origins</b> (including gypsies or travellers, refugees or asylum seekers)	Potential Positive	Expanding the criteria for funding applications may make it more likely that groups related to the protected characteristics will be eligible to apply.	Promote funding opportunity widely to increase the likelihood of applications from a range of community groups.
<b>Religion or belief</b> (including non-belief)	Potential Negative	The CBG 'Guidance for applications' document includes a list of organisations that would not be eligible to apply for funding, this includes religious groups. Annex B contains further information on organisations that are ineligible for funding but there is no further detail specifically on religious groups. There could be a perception that community groups associated with religion were being discriminated against if it is not clear why religious groups are excluded from the funding criteria and how religious groups are being defined for the purposes of the application process.	Investigate and expand on Annex B in the 'Guidance for applications' document to set out more clearly the types of religious groups that would not be eligible for CBG funding.
<b>Sex/gender</b>	No differential impact identified	CBG funding applications are open to all community groups that meet the criteria for funding.	N/A

<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	No differential impact identified	CBG funding applications are open to all community groups that meet the criteria for funding.	N/A
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	Potential Positive	Expanding the criteria for funding applications may make it more likely that groups related to the protected characteristics will be eligible to apply.	Promote funding opportunity widely to increase the likelihood of applications from a range of community groups.
<b>Other</b> (any other relevant group not covered above e.g. socio-economic)	N/A		

## 2.2 Evidence gaps

Are there any gaps in the evidence you currently hold?

Is any action planned to fill these gaps?

The CBG do not specifically ask which protected characteristics the group requesting funding are supporting. There are no plans at present to request this information.

To note, the CBG have approved all but one request for funding this year. The reason for the decline was due to the group being a registered charity which they are unable to support. A further review of the decision-making process for applications may be required in time to ensure that the criteria used is robust enough for the increased scope of applications.



## Section 3: Impact Assessment and Actions

Relevant protected characteristic	Impact	Mitigating actions included and required	Owner
1. Age, Disability, Race/ethnicity, sexual orientation	<p><b>Potential positive</b></p> <p>Expanding the criteria for funding applications to include community groups with no connection to RoS, may make it more likely that groups related to these protected characteristics will be eligible to apply.</p>	<p><b>Included:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Required:</b> Promote funding opportunity widely to increase the likelihood of applications from a range of community groups.</p>	CBG
2. Age	<p><b>Potential negative</b></p> <p>The use of an online application form may form a barrier for some age groups. This could create a disadvantage as they may not be able to apply for funding. Similarly, communication of the funding opportunity may not reach all age groups if only communicated in limited places, such as via email or other online platforms.</p>	<p><b>Included:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Required:</b> Ensure a flexible approach to application submissions and communication about funding. Provide assistance if required, for example, supplying and accepting a paper form instead of online application form.</p>	CBG
3. Disability	<p><b>Potential Negative</b></p> <p>The application process may form a barrier to submitting a request for funding. This could create a disadvantage as they may not be able to apply for funding.</p>	<p><b>Included:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Required:</b> Ensure a flexible approach to application submissions and communication about funding. Provide assistance if required and consider accessibility. For example, carrying out accessibility testing of the online application form and guidance documents.</p>	CBG

4. Religion or belief	<p><b>Potential Negative</b></p> <p>The CBG ‘Guidance for applications’ document includes a list of organisations that would not be eligible to apply for funding, this includes religious groups. Annex B contains further information on organisations that are ineligible for funding but there is no further detail specifically on religious groups. There could be a perception that community groups associated with religion were being discriminated against if it is not clear why religious groups are excluded from the funding criteria and how religious groups are being defined for the purposes of the application process.</p>	<p><b>Included:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Required:</b> Investigate and expand on Annex B in the ‘Guidance for applications’ document to set out more clearly the types of religious groups that would not be eligible for CBG funding.</p>	CBG

<b>Review date</b>	<b>December 2023</b>
--------------------	----------------------