

Equality Impact Analysis

This equality impact analysis establishes the likely effects both positive and negative and potential unintended consequences that decisions, policies, projects and practices can have on people at risk of discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The analysis considers documentary evidence, data and information from stakeholder engagement/consultation to manage risk and to understand the actual or potential effect of activity, including both positive and adverse impacts, on those affected by the activity being considered.

To support completion of this analysis tool, please refer to the equality impact analysis guidance.

Section 1 – Analysis Details (Page 5 of the guidance document)

Name of Policy/Project/Decision	Sponsorship Policy
Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)	Sam McVaigh
Department/Team	Corporate Core – HR
Proposed Implementation Date	4 th February 2025
Author of the EqIA	Jess Hall
Date of the EqIA	23/01/25

1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?

The purpose of this policy is to set out the approach and criteria that will determine when sponsorship is appropriate to enable consistent and fair decision making across the Council. This policy will help facilitate the safe recruitment of international workers particularly in areas that there are real difficulties in recruiting such as social care.

Section 2 – Impact Assessment (Pages 6 to 10 of the guidance document)

2.1 Who could the proposed policy/project/decision likely have an impact on?

Employees: Yes

Community/Residents: Yes (prospective employees)

Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: **No – to support with recruitment for the Council** If the answer to all three questions is 'no' there is no need to continue with this analysis.



2.2 Evidence to support the analysis. Include documentary evidence, data and stakeholder information/consultation Documentary Evidence:



Data:

Successful sponsorship of 17 social workers currently in Childrens

Stakeholder information/consultation:

2.3 Consider the following questions in terms of who the policy/project/decision could potentially have an impact on. Detail these in the impact assessment table (2.4) and the potential impact this could have.

- Could the proposal prevent the promotion of equality of opportunity or good relations between different equality groups?
- Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic?
- Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic?
- Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal?
- Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?
- Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)?
- Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council?

2.4 Characteristic	Potential Impacts	Evidence (from 2.2) to demonstrate this impact	Mitigations to reduce negative impact	Impact level with mitigations Positive, Neutral, Negative
Age	No			
Disability	No			
Gender Reassignment	No			



			Council
Marriage and Civil	No		
Partnership			
Pregnancy and	No		
Maternity			
Race	Yes – it will allow us to	17 social workers have been successfully	Positive
	widen our talent	sponsored. 15 of these	
	pools in the	have been workers who	
	current labour	have relocated from South	
	market	Africa	
Religion and Belief	No		
Sex	No		
Sexual Orientation	No		
Carers	No		
Looked After Children	No		
and Care Leavers			
Socio-economically	No		
vulnerable			
Veterans	No		

Actions required to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts or to complete the analysis

2.5 Characteristics	Action	Action Owner	Completion Date

Section 3 - Impact Risk



Establish the level of risk to people and organisations arising from identified impacts, with additional actions completed to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts.

3.1 Identifying risk level (Pages 10 - 12 of the guidance document)

Impact x Likelihood = Score			Likelihood			
		1	2	3	4	
		Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very likely	
	4	Very High	4	8	12	16
t	3	High	3	6	9	12
Impact	2	Medium	2	4	6	8
_	1	Low	1	2	3	4
	0	Positive / No impact	0	0	0	0

Risk Level	No Risk = 0	Low Risk = 1 - 4	Medium Risk = 5 - 7	High Risk = 8 - 16
3.2 Level of risk identified	No risk			
3.3 Reasons for risk level	This policy has a posi	tive impact		
calculation				

Section 4 - Analysis Decision (Page 11 of the guidance document)

4.1 Analysis Decision	X	Reasons for This Decision
There is no negative impact therefore the activity will proceed	Χ	Positive impact
There are low impacts or risks identified which can be mitigated or		
managed to reduce the risks and activity will proceed		



There are medium to high risks identified which cannot be mitigated	
following careful and thorough consideration. The activity will proceed	
with caution and this risk recorded on the risk register, ensuring	
continual review	

Section 5 – Sign Off and Revisions (Page 11 of the guidance document)

5.1 Sign Off	Name	Date	Comments
Lead Officer/SRO/Project Manager	Sam McVaigh	24/01/25	
EDI	Lee Cawley	24/01/25	QA Complete. The policy relates only to the sponsorship of non UK citizens to work in the UK and therefore has a positive impact for race. The policy links with wider recruitment policy and practice all of which has been impact assessed to consider impacts for all other characteristics

EqIA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details