Integrated Equality Impact Assessment (IEIA)

Equality Impact Assessment, Island Community Impact Assessment and Children's Rights and Wellbeing Impact Assessment

Prior to starting the Integrated Equality Impact Assessment (IEIA) we highly recommend that you complete (or review) the Integrated Equality Impact Assessment learning on the Academy. This provides a general overview of the IEIA process, as well as important information regarding our responsibilities regarding the completion and publication of IEIAs.

Other sources of guidance, general evidence, support and learning are available on the **Equality Evidence Hub** on Connect, which includes the Equality Evidence Review created by Evaluation and Research. This also includes a Frequently Asked Questions, which addresses initial questions about the IEIA. If something is underlined, but not a link, you can hover over the wording for a definition or additional information.

Please note, that while the IEIA form is long, it does include three previously separate impact assessments and significantly more guidance. You may not need to complete every impact assessment within the IEIA. If you have any questions, please email **ieia@sds.co.uk**.

More detailed external guidance for each of the individual impact assessments can be found below:

[Equality and Human Rights Commission Guidance for Equality Impact Assessments in Scotland](#)

[Scottish Government Guidance for Children's Rights and Wellbeing Impact Assessments](#)

[Scottish Government Guidance for Island Community Impact Assessments](#)

1.0 Project Overview

This document uses the term 'project' to describe the full range of our policies, provisions, projects, functions, practices and activities including the delivery of services – essentially everything we do that affects people.

Title of Impact Assessment

Migration to local employability hubs

Name of Senior Responsible Officer

Neville Prentice

Does this project relate to any other published EQIAs or ICIAs?

Additional guidance

My World of Work EQIA
Interim Hybrid Working Approach EQIA
Scotland's Career Review EQIA
HR Employee relations – Policy development and review EQIA

Please provide an overview of your project including the names of any external partners and whether it is a new project. Consider the key objectives of the project.

Background
The project was initiated due to a high number of lease events taking place over the course of 2023/24 and beyond that has enabled the opportunity for taking a programme management approach that ensures the appropriate structures, processes, resources and governance are in place to manage this.

This approach promotes effective stewardship of public funds, ensuring the greatest return on our investment. With the level of scrutiny and pressure on public sector funding, this approach will also enable us to identify opportunities for reducing the cost to serve our customers.

Over the course of the last 3 years, we have evidence of changing patterns of customer preferences and behaviours in the way that they engage with our career information, advice and guidance services.

Our interim hybrid working approach implemented post-covid restrictions has also demonstrated more flexible and hybrid approaches to where our employees carry out their work.

The independent Career Review programme published a range of recommendations in March 2022 relating to how career services in Scotland should be improved. Recommendation 5 – Community based services stated *'Career services should be delivered within communities in a way that is aligned to social justice values and provides access to consistent national services.'* The identified equity impact statement from the EQIA of that programme sets out that; 'All communities, their needs and values are appreciated, understood and accepted, so there will be fair and equitable career services'.
This project is an enhancement on existing practices for reviewing SDS estates and lease management. The project has been redefined to accommodate the volume of lease events as well as considering external factors relating to budgets and reform of the skills landscape.

The primary outcome for decision making ensures there is no detriment to customers in accessing services.

Service Offers

SDS CIAG services are all-age with existing and potential customers able to access services through a multi-channel approach. The impact on our school age customers of this project is low. Almost all school customers are served within the school establishment and school settings are not part of this review.

A small number of school customers may be non-attenders where contact and engagement with these customers can be outside of the school establishment to overcome any barriers that exist from going into the school premises. Any activity like this is negotiated and agreed with school teams and the customer and adheres to SDS policies and practices relating to protecting vulnerable groups.

For post school customers, services are either targeted for specific cohorts of individuals or universal and demand-led for others.

Targeted services for 16-19 year olds operate under the Scottish Government Opportunities for All policy that sets out that *'all 16-19 year olds are supported towards participation'.* Participation is defined as being engaged in learning, training or work and includes activities such as volunteering. This is a partnership response through collaborative groups such as Opportunities for All groups and Local Employability partnerships. The SDS targeted service offer uses the 16+ Data Hub shared data set information to identify those who are not participating and SDS proactively contacts these individuals to offer support, understand their needs and delivers support directly, or through referral to other partners, in line with those needs.

Next Steps is the name given to the SDS service offer to unemployed seeking young people aged 15 - 18.5 years (15 - 25 inclusive for Care Experienced Customers). All unemployed young people, including those who are care experienced, in this age group seeking employment are offered the Next Steps service.

Young people should be aware of the Next Steps service offer before leaving school through School Leaver Transition Support. School Careers Advisers and 16+/Opportunities for All and Pastoral Care Staff identify leavers likely to leave school without an opportunity, who may become part of the Next Steps service offer. School Leaver Transition Support is designed to offer a bridge between leaving school and engaging with the local CIAG Post School Services.

Targeted services for Apprentices who are made redundant is all age. Using the shared data set to identify any apprentices who are at risk of, or made redundant, leads to proactive contact from SDS to offer support, understand their needs and deliver support directly, or through referral partners, to progress them into another apprenticeship or other participation outcomes.

Proactive contact is made using the contact information the customer has provided and is in line with their privacy and data protection preferences. This can be through email, text messaging or phone calls. Once these channels are exhausted, the partnership groups will use the shared data set information to case manage customer cohorts together and identify if other services are already supporting these individuals.

For all other customers, universal services are demand-led meaning customers access the support when they need it. Promotion and awareness of the services and support available, and the channels to access these, is supported through a structured national and local marketing and communications strategy.

Customers can access services through a range of channels in line with their needs, identified as a blended service offer.

Digital access is through My World of Work, SDS's career information and advice service. This is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and has a range of support, tools and resources that help individuals develop their career management skills that lead to informed career decisions.

CIAG Helpline access available 9-5 Monday to Friday for 1-2-1 support.

Face to face service delivery in public access centres, co-located delivery hubs and community outreach sites.

College students are served in each of the college establishments in line with the current service offer. While this is for service delivery only, the programme is exploring a physical presence in colleges where accessibility to all college students would be available and not just those in the SDS/College service offer cohort.

SDS do not deliver services in universities as they have their own careers service.

Process/Scope

The process for reviewing individual properties involves multiple consultations with staff, both within a group and individual setting with the opportunity for staff to make suggestions and raise concerns unique to the site. The site coordinators and management team are required to gather customer data on the site being reviewed, including footfall and a range of equality data to ensure that customers remain at the heart of decision making and suffer no detriment. At various stages of the process accessibility needs (staff and customers) are considered, including the pre-decision checklist, community venue rationale and staff consultation form. Staff concerns and needs are identified through group and individual consultations, enabling their concerns to be fed into the final business case, along with the previous data and evidence gathered regarding customers and service provision. The business case is then taken to an Migration to Local Employability Hubs Programme Board for final decisions regarding the future of the property and local service provision.

Customer
- Gathering local data including footfall, participation, customer feedback, demographics, labour market intelligence
- Pre-Decision Checklist
- Community Venue Rationale for site selection
- Business Case

Colleague
- Gathering local data
- Consultation (Group and Individual) including identification of individuals needs/reasonable adjustments
- Pre-Decision Checklist
- Community Venue Rationale for site selection
- Business Case

2.0 Gathering Evidence and Assessing Impact

It is important to remember our responsibilities regarding the Public Sector Equality Duty when completing this section. The starting point for assessing impact is the three needs of the Public Sector Equality Duty: ensuring that the project does not discriminate unlawfully; considering how the project might better advance equality of opportunity; and considering whether the project will affect good relations between different groups.

Guidance for 2.0

In Gathering Evidence and Assessing Impact you need to go through each of the characteristics in turn and address the following points.

- **Provide Context – outlining how your project relates to this protected characteristic, such as population statistics. The Equality Evidence Hub is a good place to start looking for relevant evidence. The Equality Evidence Hub is a space on Connect to access relevant guidance for the IEIA and a range of equality evidence, both internal and external.**

- **Additional Questions- Some sections have additional questions, please ensure that you answer these appropriately. They are in reference to our reporting responsibilities for Children's Rights and Wellbeing and Island Communities.**

- **Impact– Outline the potential disadvantage or barriers, as well as positive impacts, faced by this equality group in relation to this project. Cite evidence sources used, including consultation. Where a gap in evidence is observed, please note within this section.**

- **Action– Outline what we have already done to address disadvantage or promote equality, as well as what we'll do to proactively promote equality and address any potential barriers raised in Evidence, including evidence gaps.**

Please note that consultation is a requirement of Island Communities Impact Assessment and considered good practice in relation to Equality and Children's Rights and Wellbeing Impact Assessments.

2.1 Age

Guidance for 2.1

Context:

The Project process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including protected characteristics) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

In 2023, participation in employment, education and training was highest amongst 16-year-olds (99.2%) and lowest amongst 19-year-olds (88.9%). The percentage of young adults participating in education decreased by 1.8 pp and decreased in each age category with 17-year-olds experiencing the largest decrease at 2.8 pp. The decrease in education was driven by a reduction of those reported as school pupils, a slight reduction in higher education and a slight rise in the proportion in further education. Most of those unemployed seeking were 19 years old (44.2%), followed by 18-year-olds (31.3%) (Annual Participation Measure 2023).

Children and young people usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services, and service are delivered using a needs-based approach. For secondary school pupils, a Needs Matrix is in place to help us identify those most in need of additional support.

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- Most college and university students are in the younger age groups. The likelihood of having a degree or higher qualification decreases with age.

- Those at the younger and older ends of the labour market tend to face the most labour market disadvantages and may be more likely to experience age-based discrimination at work.

- Young adults' experiences of employment have changed in recent years. Young people stay in education longer, start work later and early experiences of work are more likely to be characterised by short term contracts, low paid work, and precarious employment.

- Scotland has an ageing population and extending working lives is widely seen as an economic necessity.

Colleagues

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites and what, if any, reasonable adjustments would be required if the decision was to move out of our current estate. This influences the recommendation on the basis that, if those needs cannot be accommodated within the alternatives that have been explored, the recommendation is explicit about what actions can be taken.

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
Under CIAG Heading: Pre-decision site checklist lacks detail about customer groups to be included – *"Gather demographic information surrounding current footprint (SIMD levels, equalities groups)"* – which could lead to some groups being overlooked and specific impact not considered.	Pre-decision site checklist requires to be revised and explicit about groups with a protected characteristic. The data gathered around protected characteristic groups within the Pre-decision checklist should also be included within the business case with an explanation about how the data has informed decision making.

2.2 Children's Rights and Wellbeing

See guidance for 2.2

Context:

The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including children) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

Children and young people usually access SDS through school or our Next Steps service offer.

Children can also be impacted by this project through their relationship with customers and/or staff. As stated in the purpose of this project, "The primary outcome for decision making ensures there is no detriment to customers in accessing services." No customer, whether a child or the parent of a child should be negatively impacted by potential changes to delivery sites. Staff are fully consulted throughout the process of creating the business case for the future of any sites being reviewed, enabling them to highlight any issues that may impact on their personal caring responsibilities, including care for children.

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- Those at the younger and older ends of the labour market tend to face the most labour market disadvantages and may be more likely to experience age-based discrimination at work.

- Young adults' experiences of employment have changed in recent years. Young people stay in education longer, start work later and early experiences of work are more likely to be characterised by short term contracts, low paid work, and precarious employment.

Additional Questions:

Does this project impact on children and young people up to the age of 18?

☒ **Yes**   ☐ **No**   ☐ **Don't Know**

If you have answered no to the question above, you do not need to complete the Children's Rights and Wellbeing section of this form but please provide some justification for your decision below.

Which articles of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) does this project impact on? See further guidance for this question

1. Everyone under the Age of 18 has all of the rights in the Convention.
2. The Convention applies to every child.
3. Interests of the child must be a top priority.
4. Government must respect the rights of parents/carers.
5. Every child has the right to express their views.
6. Every child must be free to express their thoughts and opinions.
7. Every child has the right to privacy.
8. Right to reliable information from a variety of sources.
9. Both parents share responsibility.
10. Refuge and refugee status.
11. Disability.
12. Right to education.
13. Education must develop personality and talents.
14. Every child has the right to learn.
15. Governments must protect children from economic exploitation.
16. If laws go beyond, country must keep them.

17. Government must actively work to make sure people know about the UNCRC.

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
The current Community Venue Rationale for site selection document does not consider the needs of children explicitly within it.	The Community Venue Rationale for site selection should ask or reference: • if there is access to baby changing facilities for any children attending the site with their parents or carers. If there is not access within the proposed site, then staff should be familiar with appropriate services in the local area. • If it is an appropriate venue for children to attend with their parents/carers or as customers themselves. This will help ensure that new sites are child friendly.

2.3 Care Experience

Context:

The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including care experience) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

Children and young people usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer, which extends up to the age of 25 for care experienced customers. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services and a needs-based approach helps us identify those most in need of additional support. Those with care experience are a priority group in line with our Corporate Parenting responsibilities.

In 2018/19, 75% of Next Steps customers with known care experience received coaching guidance from SDS, with 65% respectively showing an improvement in their career management skills. In 2018/19, 75% of care experienced Next Steps customers progressed on to sustained learning, training or work (Corporate Parenting Plan 21-24).

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- Care experienced school leavers are less likely to go into positive destinations than school leavers in general – 86% compared with 95% of all pupils. The lower proportion of care experienced children going into positive destinations may be due to them leaving school at a younger age.

- Care experienced children obtain lower qualification levels on average than all school leavers, partly explained by the lower school leaving age. At higher level in 2020/21, only 15% of looked after school leavers obtained at least one qualification at level 6 or better, in comparison with 66% of all school leavers.

- Care experienced students are underrepresented in higher education and face additional barriers to learning, including financial and housing problems.

- Care leavers are more likely to experience problems securing employment, as they often have poor support networks, mental ill-health, unstable living arrangements and may not be prepared for self-sufficient living. Institutional barriers such as welfare systems and poor transport also impact upon employment. Once they obtain a job, it is usually part-time, low-paid and low-skilled.

Colleagues

Care Experienced	Total Employees										pp change 2019-23
	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Yes	6	0.4	17	1.0	19	1.1	20	1.2	21	1.3	+0.9
No	655	40.6	1400	83.9	1414	85.2	1405	85.7	1398	86.6	+46.0
Prefer not to say	16	1.0	25	1.5	24	1.4	24	1.5	22	1.4	+0.4
No Response	936	58.0	227	13.6	203	12.2	191	11.6	173	10.7	-47.3
Total	1613		1669		1660		1640		1614		

The table above from SDS' Equality Mainstreaming report (2023) shows the percentage of SDS employees who have self-disclosed being care experienced across the organisation.

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites and what, if any, reasonable adjustments would be required if the decision was to move out of our current estate. This influences the recommendation on the basis that, if those needs cannot be accommodated within the alternatives that have been explored, the recommendation is explicit about what actions can be taken.

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)

Under CIAG Heading: Pre-decision checklist lacks detail about customer groups to be included – *"Gather demographic information surrounding current footprint (SIMD levels, equalities groups)"* – which could lead to some groups being overlooked and specific impact not considered.	Pre-decision site checklist requires to be revised and explicit about groups with a protected characteristic. The data gathered around protected characteristic groups within the Pre-decision checklist should also be included within the business case with an explanation about how the data has informed decision making.

2.4 Disability

See guidance for 2.4

Context:

The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including protected characteristics) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

Participation amongst those identified as disabled increased by 1.1 pp between 2022 and 2023 from 88.7% to 89.9%. This was mainly driven by increased participation in employment. However, the participation gap between those identified as disabled and not disabled has increased to 4.6 pp, an increase of 0.8 pp from 2022. The gap is at its highest level since 2019. (Annual Participation Measure 2023).

Children and Young People usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services, with a Needs Matrix in place to help us identify those most in need of additional support.

SDS supports the implementation of the [Principles of Good Transitions](#) which provides a framework to inform, structure and encourage the continual improvement of support for young people with additional needs between the ages of 14 and 25 who are making the transition to young adult life.

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- The number of children with additional support needs continues to increase. According to the EHRC (2018), boys, pupils from deprived areas, Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils and looked after children are most likely to be identified as having additional support needs (ASN).

- Pupils with ASN tend to have poorer educational attainment than those without ASN. For example, 47% of pupils with an ASN attained SCQF at level 6 or above compared with 77% of those with no ASN (Scottish Government, 2022). Pupils with an ASN are almost five times more likely to be excluded from school than pupils without a recorded ASN, negatively impacting on future educational attainment and career opportunities.

- College is a key destination for disabled school leavers in Scotland, with figures from 2020/21 post-school destinations showing that 39% of disabled people move onto FE compared to 23% of non-disabled people. The percentage of non-disabled students transitioning into higher education in 2020/21 was 46%, almost double that of disabled students (24%), with variations by specific disability (Scottish Government, 2022).

- Evidence continues to suggest that disabled people face multiple disadvantages in the labour market. Inclusion Scotland (2023) highlight that barriers for disabled people in getting in, staying in and getting on in the workplace are many and varied and may depend upon the type of disability. Attitudes, inaccessible workplaces and inflexible working practices along with a lack of support for disabled people can all hamper the recruitment, retention and progression of disabled workers.

Colleagues

Disability	Total Employees										pp change 2019-23
	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Yes	67	4.2	119	7.1	118	7.1	125	7.6	131	8.1	+3.9
No	1452	90.0	1487	89.1	1483	89.3	1446	88.2	1420	88.0	-2.0
Prefer not to say	17	1.1	32	1.9	32	1.9	33	2.0	31	1.9	+0.8
No Response	77	4.8	31	1.9	27	1.6	36	2.2	32	2.0	-2.8
Total	1613		1669		1660		1640		1614		

The table above from SDS' Equality Mainstreaming report (2023) shows the percentage of SDS employees who have self-disclosed having a disability across the organisation.

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites.

Personal safety

Several protected characteristic groups more likely than average to fall victim to hate crime and/or other types of intimidation or violence when out in public spaces (this includes both the site we deliver in as well as the public areas immediately around the site - parking areas and neighbouring parks/woodlands, etc). As part of the Project, we feel it is important to consider how safe customers may feel in spaces we are considering delivering services.

In 2022-23, 722 hate crime charges were reported with an aggravation of prejudice relating to disability (Crown Office & Procurator Fiscal Service).

According to the Scottish Government, in 2020/21, most of the disability aggravated hate crimes included a prejudice to those with a learning disability (73%). Just under one in six (15%) showed a prejudice to those with a physical disability.

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
Under CIAG Heading: Pre-decision site checklist lacks detail about customer groups to be included – *"Gather demographic information surrounding current footprint (SIMD levels, equalities groups)"* – which could lead to some groups being overlooked and specific impact not considered.	Pre-decision site checklist requires to be revised and explicit about groups with a protected characteristic. The data gathered around protected characteristic groups within the Pre-decision checklist should also be included within the business case with an explanation about how the data has informed decision making.
Under HR Heading: Pre-decision site guidance lacks detail about equality-specific data required for decision making, including anonymized / confidential personal data about reasonable adjustments required for each site.	Pre-decision site guidance requires to be revised and include detail on how site coordinators should use equality data to inform decision making.
Community Venue Rationale for Site selection proforma lacks detail about accessibility (e.g. fire safety for disabled customers / colleagues, access to toilets, car parking and setting down, etc.).	The Community Venue Rationale for Site Selection will include additional accessibility questions, along with additional guidance about next steps if accessibility questions cannot be fully or satisfactorily answered.
Community Venue Rationale do not explicitly ask about disabled toilet access.	The Community Venue Rationale for Site Selection will include additional accessibility questions, along with additional guidance about next steps if accessibility questions cannot be fully or satisfactorily answered.

2.5 Gender Reassignment

See guidance for 2.5

Context:

The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including protected characteristics) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

Children and Young People usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services, with a Needs Matrix in place to help us identify those most in need of additional support.

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- According to LGBT Youth Scotland (2018), trans young people are more likely to experience bullying and harassment at school, and this is likely to continue at further or higher education levels. These experiences have the potential to negatively impact their education.

- Trans people may experience specific barriers to finding and staying in work that differ from LGB workers' experiences. The CIPD (2021) found that trans workers report lower wellbeing at work, with 55% saying they had experienced conflict at work in the last 12 months and that 26% were not open about their gender identity at work. Stonewall (2020) found that trans workers are more likely to experience harassment and discrimination than the wider LGB population.

We recognise the above barriers that our customers may face, however the process of reviewing SDS estates is unlikely to impact this group.

Colleagues

	Total Employees										
	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		pp change 2019-23
Gender reassignment	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Yes	*	*	*	*	*	*	6	0.4	*	*	**
No	1379	85.5	1568	93.9	1569	94.5	1540	93.9	1525	94.5	+9.0
Prefer not to say	120	7.4	42	3.4	49	3.0	46	2.8	42	2.6	-4.8
No Response	**	**	**	**	**	**	48	2.9	**	**	**
Total	1613		1669		1660		1640		1614		

The table above from SDS' Equality Mainstreaming report (2023) shows the percentage of SDS employees who have self-disclosed being trans across the organisation.

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites.

Personal safety

Several protected characteristic groups more likely than average to fall victim to hate crime and/or other types of intimidation or violence when out in public spaces (this includes both the site we deliver in as well as the public areas immediately around the site- parking areas and neighbouring parks/woodlands, etc). As part of the Project, we feel it is important to consider how safe they may feel in spaces we are considering delivering services. In reference to Gender Reassignment, it is also to be aware of the increased potential for trans colleagues (and others) and customers to face workplace discrimination outwith our control while operating in non-SDS venues.

In 2022-23, 55 charges were reported with an aggravation of prejudice relating to transgender identity (Crown Office & Procurator Fiscal Service).

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
Community Venue Rationale do not explicitly ask about gender neutral toilet access.	The document should ask about access to gender neutral toilets. This will enable site coordinators to make informed decisions regarding site recommendations in the business case. Gender neutral toilets (ideally without shared sinks) should be the preference if all else is equal between two considered sites.
Community Venue Rationale do not explicitly ask about safety considerations outside of the building (i.e., is the site well-lit at night? Is it in a 'safe' area with many people around throughout working hours? Are there any other potential safety concerns for individuals inside or outside of the venue?).	The document should ask several prompt questions around personal safety risks both within and outside of the site during working hours and implement any mitigating measures. It should also include further guidance or questions around question 13 (SDS Values) ensuring that any Community Venue sites being considered uphold a wider range of values.

2.6 Marriage/Civil Partnership

See guidance for 2.6

Context:
No Impact

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)

2.7 Pregnancy and Maternity

See guidance for 2.7

Context:

The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including protected characteristics) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

Children and Young People usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services, with a Needs Matrix in place to help us identify those most in need of additional support.

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- Teenage pregnancy rates in Scotland are at their lowest since 1994 but the impact of pregnancy for school-aged girls remains far-reaching. Teenage mothers are less likely to finish their school education, with long-term implications for restricted education and career opportunities.

- Young parents are likely to face additional challenges in the further and higher education system. The dual status of being a parent and a learner can lead to health and wellbeing issues for some student parents.

- Pregnancy can have a negative impact on labour market participation in terms of discrimination, loss of pay, loss of status and a lack of career progression. Women with children are more likely to experience significant pay penalties; have their career progression halted; withdraw from full-time work to care for children; stay at the same level of job for several years; and choose more flexible working patterns (Government Equalities Office, 2019).

Colleagues

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites.

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
The Community Venue Rationale do not explicitly highlight that private rooms are also of value to breastfeeding women for breastfeeding/pumping.	The Community Venue Rationale or a newly created resource supporting that document should highlight this additional use for private rooms to inform decision making within the business case. If there is not access within the proposed site, then staff should be familiar with appropriate services in the local area.
The current Community Venue Rationale document does not consider the needs of children explicitly within it.	The Community Venue Rationale should ask or reference if there is access to baby changing facilities to inform decision making withing the business case.

2.8 Race

Context:

The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including protected characteristics) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

The participation rate amongst Minority Ethnic groups (96.8%) remained higher than for those from a White ethnic group (94.2%). This difference was driven by a higher rate of participation in education (88.2% versus 70.1%) (Annual Participation Measure 2023)

Children and Young People usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services, with a Needs Matrix in place to help us identify those most in need of additional support.

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- The Scottish Government Race Equality Framework states that despite high attainment at school and rates of entry into further and higher education after school, statistically, ethnic minority people are not receiving the labour market advantages which should be expected from their positive educational outcomes.

- Ethnic minority people are less likely to be in employment. The 2021/22 employment rate for Scotland is 74.4% while the rate for the BAME population is 65.4%.

- Recruitment processes can also make it harder for some ethnic minority people to enter the workplace as there may be an under-recognition among employers of ethnic minority employees' skills and experience, reducing their chances of employment or further progression when in work. Progression for ethnic minority people can be restricted if progression is through informal networks, if there is a lack of ethnic minority role models or mentors at higher levels within organisations who might provide support and advice, or if there is a gap between equality and diversity policies and practice in the workplace. Furthermore, Khan (2020) highlights research that found that people with Asian or African sounding names were less likely to get job interviews.

Colleagues

Ethnicity	Total Employees										pp change 2019-23
	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
White/Scottish/British/Irish	1436	89.0	1527	91.5	1521	91.6	1485	90.5	1464	90.7	+1.7
White Other	30	1.9	44	2.6	47	2.8	49	3.0	44	2.7	+0.8
Mixed or Multiple Ethnicity	*	*	*	*	*	*	6	0.4	9	0.6	**
Asian, Asian British/Scottish	6	0.4	15	0.9	15	0.9	16	1.0	18	1.1	+0.7
African, Caribbean, or Black	12	0.7	12	0.7	13	0.8	14	0.9	12	0.7	--
Other Ethnicity	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	**
Prefer not to say	59	3.7	38	2.3	34	2.0	35	2.1	32	2.0	-1.7
No Response	63	3.9	28	1.7	25	1.5	**	**	**	**	**
Total	1613		1669		1660		1640		1614		

Above is SDS's latest Equality Mainstreaming report on the percentage of different ethnicities across the organisation. While the data above is at a national level, SDS recognises that there are geographical variances in the concentration of certain ethnicities in both staff and customers.

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites.

Personal safety

Several protected characteristic groups more likely than average to fall victim to hate crime and/or other types of intimidation or violence when out in public spaces (this includes both the site we deliver in as well as the public areas immediately around the site- parking areas and neighbouring parks/woodlands, etc). As part of the Project, we feel it is important to consider how safe they may feel in spaces we are considering delivering services.

Racial crime remains the most commonly reported hate crime in Scotland. In total 3,145 charges relating to race crime were reported in 2022-23 (Crown Office & Procurator Fiscal Service, 2023).

According to the Scottish Government, in 2020/21 where information was available on the ethnicity of victims, almost two-thirds (or 64%) of race aggravated hate crimes had a victim from a visible minority ethnic (non-white) group. An estimated 18% of race aggravated hate crimes had a victim of African, Caribbean or Black ethnicity. This was followed by Polish or Other White and Pakistani, Pakistani British or Pakistani Scottish (with both groups accounting for 17% of cases each).

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
Community Venue Rationale do not explicitly ask about safety considerations outside of the building (i.e., is the site well-lit at night? Is it in a 'safe' area with many people around throughout working hours? Are there any other potential safety concerns for individuals outside of the venue?).	The document should ask several prompt questions around personal safety risks both within and outside of the site during working hours and implement any mitigating measures. It should also include further guidance or questions around question 13 (SDS Values) ensuring that any Community Venue sites being considered uphold a wider range of values.
Under CIAG Heading: Pre-decision site checklist lacks detail about customer groups to be included – *"Gather demographic information surrounding current footprint (SIMD levels, equalities groups)"* – which could lead to some groups being overlooked and specific impact not considered.	Pre-decision site checklist requires to be revised and explicit about groups with a protected characteristic. The data gathered around protected characteristic groups within the Pre-decision checklist should also be included within the business case with an explanation about how the data has informed decision making.

2.9 Religion or Belief

Context:
The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including protected characteristics) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

Children and Young People usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services, with a Needs Matrix in place to help us identify those most in need of additional support.

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- Limited data exists in relation to experience in the education sector. Young Muslims encounter many barriers in the education system such as, stereotyping and having low expectations of them, lack of role models, and inadequate support for them in school (Social Mobility Commission, 2017).

- Research has found that HE tends to be seen as a non-Muslim experience, with the main issues being observing religion on campus, academic success and inclusion, and islamophobia (Akel, 2021).

- Limited evidence is available on the relationship between employment and religion or belief. However, evidence does suggest that Muslim workers are at a disadvantage. Muslim workers are more likely to have lower wages and be unemployed and this is particularly the case for Muslim women, who face a triple penalty – they are women, from a BAME background, and Muslim. This impacts greatly on their labour market outcomes (House of Commons Women and Equalities Committee, 2016).

Some customers may have particular days of the week or dates in the year that are important to them for religious reasons, e.g. Fridays tend to be an especially holy day for Muslims. However, customers are generally able to select dates to engage with SDS services that avoid any religiously significant days and times.

Colleagues

	Total Employees										pp change 2019-23
	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		
Religion or Belief	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Buddhist	5	0.3	5	0.3	5	0.3	5	0.3	5	0.3	--
Catholic	271	16.8	280	16.8	272	16.4	259	15.8	255	15.8	-1.0
Other Christian	87	5.4	106	6.4	112	6.8	109	6.6	106	6.6	+1.2
Church of Scotland	339	21.0	338	20.3	321	19.2	318	19.4	309	19.1	-1.9
Hindu	*	*	5	0.3	5	0.3	5	0.3	6	0.4	**
Jewish	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	**
Muslim	*	*	*	*	5	0.3	6	0.4	6	0.4	**
Sikh	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	**
Pagan	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	**
Another Religion or Belief	30	1.9	18	1.1	17	1.0	15	0.9	15	0.9	-1.0
None	572	35.5	698	41.8	720	43.7	707	43.1	713	44.2	+8.7
Prefer not to say	206	12.8	172	10.3	163	9.6	165	10.1	149	9.2	-3.6
No Response	91	5.6	38	2.3	34	2.0	45	2.7	43	2.7	-2.9
Total	1613		1669		1660		1640		1614		

The table above from SDS' Equality Mainstreaming report (2023) shows the percentage of SDS employees of different religious beliefs across the organisation.

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites.

Personal safety

Several protected characteristic groups more likely than average to fall victim to hate crime and/or other types of intimidation or violence when out in public spaces (this includes both the site we deliver in as well as the public areas immediately around the site- parking areas and neighbouring parks/woodlands, etc). As part of the Project, we feel it is important to consider how safe they may feel in spaces we are considering delivering services.

There were 576 charges with a religious aggravation reported in 2022-23, which is 8% more than in 2021-22 (Crown Office & Procurator Fiscal Service, 2023).

According to the Scottish Government, for 2020/21, in almost half of religion aggravated hate crimes the perpetrator showed prejudice towards the Catholic community (47%). The next largest groups were the Muslim and Protestant communities, both accounting for 16% of cases each.

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
The Community Venue Rationale do not explicitly highlight that private rooms are also of value for prayer.	The Community Venue Rationale or a newly created resource supporting that document could highlight this additional use for private rooms.
Community Venue Rationale do not explicitly ask about safety considerations outside of the building (ie is the site well-lit at night? Is it in a 'safe' area with many people around throughout working hours? Are there any other potential safety concerns for individuals outside of the venue?).	The document should ask several prompt questions around personal safety risks both within and outside of the site during working hours and implement any mitigating measures. It should also include further guidance or questions around question 13 (SDS Values) ensuring that any Community Venue sites being considered uphold a wider range of values.
Community Venue Rationale do not explicitly ask about private gender-neutral toilet (ie similar to disabled toilets with all facilities contained in a private room) access, which can also be useful for ablutions prior to prayer.	This should ask about access to private gender-neutral toilets, highlighting the additional use for ablutions prior to prayer.

2.10 Sex

See guidance for 2.10

Context:

The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including protected characteristics) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

Children and Young People usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services, with a Needs Matrix in place to help us identify those most in need of additional support.

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- Girls continue to outperform boys in qualification attainment and positive post-school destinations, but subject choice demonstrates segregation from an early age.

- SDS (2022) found that young women (16-19 years) were more likely to be taking part in education, training, or employment than young men (93.2% compared to 91.6%) and particularly more likely to be in education (78.3%) compared to young men (68.2%).

- More young women than young men go into further and higher education. Subject choice continues to be gender imbalanced post-school impacting upon future career opportunities.

- Women's experiences and participation in the labour market continues to differ from men's in terms of pay, progression, and conflicts between work and caring responsibilities. Occupational segregation of both men and women dominating in certain kinds of jobs and in different levels of employment remains a key labour market issue. Women tend to be disproportionately affected by occupational segregation. Stereotyping from childhood often funnels women into low-paid, low-skilled sectors, and as women are still traditionally viewed as primary carers, they are impacted by discrimination around pregnancy and maternity along with other negative impacts on career opportunities and progression surrounding caring responsibilities.

Colleagues

	Total Employees										pp change 2019-23
	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		
Sex	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Female	1162	72.0	1197	71.7	1183	71.3	1172	71.5	1155	71.6	-0.4
Male	451	28.0	472	28.3	477	28.7	468	28.5	459	28.4	+0.4
Total	1613		1669		1660		1640		1614		

The table above from SDS' Equality Mainstreaming report (2023) shows the percentage of SDS employees who are female and male having a disability across the organisation.

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites.

Personal safety

Several protected characteristic groups more likely than average to fall victim to hate crime and/or other types of intimidation or violence when out in public spaces (this includes both the site we deliver in as well as the public areas immediately around the site- parking areas and neighbouring parks/woodlands, etc). As part of the Project, we feel it is important to consider how safe they may feel in spaces we are considering delivering services.

ONS data on perceptions of personal safety and harassment data highlights that women are more likely than men to feel unsafe and experience harassment in a public place. Across all public settings after dark, a higher proportion of women reported feeling very or fairly unsafe compared with men. The disparity was greatest "in a park or other open space", where 82% of women reported feeling very or fairly unsafe, compared with 42% of men. One in two women aged between 16 and 34 years experienced one form of harassment in the previous 12 months, with 38% of 16–34-year-old females having experienced catcalls, whistles, unwanted sexual comments or jokes from a stranger, compared to 3% of 16–34-year-old males (ONS, 2022).

In 2020-2021, there were 65,251 domestic abuse incidents recorded by Police Scotland. Around four out of every five of these incidents (80%) had a female victim and a male accused (Zero Tolerance). It is estimated that at least one in five women in Scotland will experience domestic abuse in her lifetime (Engender).

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
Community Venue Rationale do not explicitly ask about safety considerations outside of the building (ie is the site well-lit at night? Is it in a 'safe' area with many people around throughout working hours? Are there any other potential safety concerns for individuals outside of the venue?).	The document should ask several prompt questions around personal safety risks both within and outside of the site during working hours and implement any mitigating measures. It should also include further guidance or questions around question 13 (SDS Values) ensuring that any Community Venue sites being considered uphold a wider range of values.

2.11 Sexual Orientation

Context:

The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including protected characteristics) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

Children and Young People usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services, with a Needs Matrix in place to help us identify those most in need of additional support.

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- Stonewall (2020) found that many LGBT young people encountered challenges in school which led to them being unable to engage in education. These included: homophobic and biphobic bullying, feelings of isolation and fears surrounding the exploration of their identity and coming out.

- LGBT+ workers can face challenges in the workforce such as, experiences of anti-LGBT+ abuse and language, gendered workplaces that are not LGBT+ inclusive, and poor mental health support.

Colleagues

	Total Employees										pp change 2019-23
	2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		
Sexual Orientation	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Heterosexual/Straight	1351	83.8	1472	88.2	1467	88.4	1448	88.3	1429	88.5	+4.7
Lesbian/Gay/ Bisexual/Other	38	2.4	62	3.7	69	4.3	65	4.0	69	4.3	+1.9
Prefer not to say	161	10.0	106	6.4	99	5.8	93	5.7	83	5.1	-4.9
No Response	63	3.9	29	1.7	25	1.5	34	2.1	33	2.0	-1.9
Total	1613		1669		1660		1640		1614		

The table above from SDS' Equality Mainstreaming report (2023) shows the percentage of SDS employees with different sexual orientations across the organisation.

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites.

Personal safety

Several protected characteristic groups more likely than average to fall victim to hate crime and/or other types of intimidation or violence when out in public spaces (this includes both the site we deliver in as well as the public areas immediately around the site- parking areas and neighbouring parks/woodlands, etc). As part of the Project, we feel it is important to consider how safe they may feel in spaces we are considering delivering services.

In 2022-23, 1,884 charges were reported with an aggravation of prejudice relating to sexual orientation, 2% more than in 2021-22. The number of charges reported has increased each year since 2014-15 (Crown Office & Procurator Fiscal Service, 2023).

The number of lesbian, gay and bi people in Scotland who have experienced hate crime has increased by 89% in five years, from 9% in 2013 to 17% in 2017. A quarter of LGBT people (26 per cent) avoid certain streets because they do not feel safe there as an LGBT person (Stonewall 2017).

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
Community Venue Rationale do not explicitly ask about safety considerations outside of the building (ie is the site well-lit at night? Is it in a 'safe' area with many people around throughout working hours? Are there any other potential safety concerns for individuals outside of the venue?).	The document should ask several prompt questions around personal safety risks both within and outside of the site during working hours and implement any mitigating measures. It should also include further guidance or questions around question 13 (SDS Values) ensuring that any Community Venue sites being considered uphold a wider range of values.

2.12 Poverty

See guidance for 2.12

Context:

The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including poverty) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

Children and Young People usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services, with a Needs Matrix in place to help us identify those most in need of additional support.

Customers

The SDS Equality Evidence Review (2023) states the following:

- Pupils from the most deprived areas consistently have lower levels of attainment than those in the least deprived areas (Scottish Government, 2020). In 2020/21, the gap was 18.2 percentage points between pupils from the most and least deprived areas, achieving at least one or more passes at SCQF Level 5 (Scottish Government, 2022). This means that positive leaver destination options are more restricted for those from deprived areas.

- Those living in the most deprived areas are less likely to be participating in learning, training, and work (87.4%), compared to of those living in the least deprived areas (96.7%).

- Poverty impacts on participation and attainment in further and higher education. Young people from deprived areas experience inequalities in leaver destination outcomes and are consistently underrepresented within higher education. Those from the most deprived areas are more likely to attend college.

- Those living in the most deprived areas are less likely to be in employment. Most individuals that are in poverty are within working households and are experiencing 'in-work' poverty.

- Poverty interacts with other protected characteristics to produce the greatest inequalities.

Colleagues

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites and what, if any, reasonable adjustments would be required if the decision was to move out of our current estate. This influences the recommendation on the basis that, if those needs cannot be accommodated within the alternatives that have been explored, the recommendation is explicit about what actions can be taken.

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
Under CIAG Heading: Pre-decision site checklist lacks detail about customer groups to be included – *"Gather demographic information surrounding current footprint (SIMD levels, equalities groups)"* – which could lead to some groups being overlooked and specific impact not considered.	Pre-decision site checklist requires to be revised and explicit about groups with a protected characteristic. The data gathered around protected characteristic groups within the Pre-decision checklist should also be included within the business case with an explanation about how the data has informed decision making.

2.13 Island Communities

Context:
The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including those in island communities) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

SDS CIAG services are delivered across the whole of Scotland, including island communities. Seven island sites are up for review as part of the Estates programme.

Customers

The Islands Growth Deal highlights that the three Island Councils are the smallest in Scotland with a combined population of around 72,000 (1.3% of Scotland's population) and their communities are some of the remotest from the main population centres of Scotland and the UK. With other island communities also comprising of small populations and remote access.
HIE's My Life Survey highlights that access to local services can be more complex for those living in the Islands (and Highlands) with most people having to use a car to access services.

HIE's My Life Survey highlights that 47% of young people aged 16-29 say that they plan to stay in their local are for 5 years or less, compared to 14% of residents overall. SDS's Regional Skills Assessment (RSA) Islands Growth Deal also highlights a similar issue within island communities, namely an aging population. By 2043 the Island Growth Deal region is expected to have roughly 77 people of non-working age for every hundred. This compares to 60 across Scotland.

The RSA Islands Growth Deal also highlights that Island residents often face a wide range of complex challenges which can contribute to depopulation, such as a higher cost-of-living (fuel, transport and food), transport and digital infrastructure and availability of affordable, quality and energy efficient housing.

Labour shortages are already a dominant concern for islands, according to the RSA Island Growth Deal.

SDS has an important role to play within Island communities by working in partnership across the local communities to provide careers advice and guidance and support employability services across their communities. SDS' site in Orkney currently serves as a local Employability Hub, which is available for all members of the Local Employability Partnership (LEP) to use. This allows customers to access a range of services in a single site. Importantly members of the public were actively involved in the creation of this Hub, ensuring that the customers voice was at the centre of its design. The SDS Site in Stornoway, Comhairle nan Eilean Siar (CnES), was recently developed into a careers and employability hub between SDS and the Local Authority and this was an action in the formal Island Charter agreement between SDS and CnES.

Colleagues

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites and what, if any, reasonable adjustments would be required if the decision was to move out of our current estate. This influences the recommendation on the basis that, if those needs cannot be accommodated within the alternatives that have been explored, the recommendation is explicit about what actions can be taken.

Additional Questions:

Does this project include, deliver or impact on Island Communities ?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Is this a project, which is likely to have an impact an island community which is significantly different from its effect on other communities (including other island communities) in the area?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Don't know

If you have answered no to the two questions above, you do not need to complete any further questions in the Island Communities section of this form but please provide some justification for your decision below.

What island community concerns are you already aware of?

The context section above shows our awareness of the complex issues facing islands. SDS CIAG services are ideally placed to support several strategic objectives within the National Islands Plan, including population levels, sustainable economic development, empowered island communities and strong local partnerships.
SDS plans and delivers on its contribution to the National Islands Plan through a range of strategic, regional and local relationships and partnerships. This includes senior leader representation on Community Planning Partnership Boards, the Northern Alliance Regional Improvement Collaborative, Regional Economic Partnerships, the Convention of the Highlands and Islands, our Gaelic Language Plan and working through the Gaelic: A Faster Rate of Progress partnership and formal partnership agreements/actions with each Island Authority.

Does the existing data for Island Communities differ between islands?

For the purposes of this IEIA, the data between different island communities would be consider as part of the individual review for a site- not within the scope this IEIA which is reference to the process. SDS recognises the differences between island communities and the process for reviewing Estates has been set up in such a way to enable community needs to be considered. As mentioned in the project overview, data around local demographics are an integral part of the business case for each site.

Are there any existing design features or mitigations in place? If yes, please describe.

The existing design features heavily focus on taking a local focus to decision making. The customer remains at the heart of decision making. The site coordinator and management team are selected from the local management. Local staff are consulted with and data is gathered from the local community. This enables island needs to be at the forefront of any decision making for islands.

If you are consulting, is your consultation robust, meaningful, and demonstrating that SDS has regard for island communities when carrying out its functions?

Staff are consulted in both group and individual consultations, providing them with multiple opportunities to raise any concerns or ideas based on their own needs, as well as those of the wider community. As the site co-ordinator explores options for colocation, they will consult with the local LEP to get advice on potential locations. The consultation that takes place should be detailed as part of the business case.

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
The current process does not make specific reference to island needs with any of the existing documents, although it does actively encourage consideration of local need, data and intelligence.	Island Consultative Group to be consulted in relation to any proposed change in estates on island communities and their feedback considered carefully.
The final business cases do not have a consistent approach to utilising data relevant to those speaking Gaelic.	Business cases produced for the Highlands and Islands should include census data around Gaelic speakers in the local area.
Consultation with local partners is not currently required to be included within the business case.	Any consultation that has taken place as part of the decision-making process should be explicitly mentioned within the business case to ensure that decision makers are aware of who the consultees were.

Please complete the following questions after the impact assessment above.

Does the evidence show any different circumstances, expectations, needs, experiences or outcomes (such as levels of satisfaction or participation)?
☐ Yes   ☒ No

Are these different effects likely?
☐ Yes   ☒ No

Are these effects significantly different?
☐ Yes   ☒ No

Could the effect amount to disadvantage for an island community compared to the mainland or between other groups?
☐ Yes   ☒ No

If the answer is no to all of the above, please provide justification for not completing the full ICIA below.

The SDS Project has a robust process in place that enables local staff to create business cases grounded in robust data and consultation with staff. There is a commitment to no detriment to our customers, including those in island communities. When sites are reviewed in the islands, local staff are actively involved, ensuring that island concerns are taken into consideration within the business case. This ensures that the Migration to Local Employability Hub Programme Board have a holistic view of the local situation and a recommendation clearly based on evidence and data prior to making a decision.

If the answer is yes to any of the above, complete the Full Island Community Impact Assessment below before submitting the form for publication.

Full Island Community Impact Assessment

Assess the extent to which you consider that the project can be developed or delivered in such a manner as to improve or mitigate any resulting outcomes for island communities.

Consider alternative delivery mechanisms and whether further consultation is required.

Describe how these delivery mechanisms will improve/mitigate outcomes for island communities?

Identify resources required to improve/mitigate outcomes for island communities.

Should delivery mechanisms/mitigations vary in different communities?

Do you need to consult with island communities in respect of mechanisms or mitigations?

Have island circumstances been factored into the evaluation process?

Have any island-specific indicators/targets been identified that require monitoring?

How will outcomes be measured on the islands?

How has the project affected island communities?

How will lessons learned in this ICIA inform future project making and service delivery?

2.14 Rural Communities

Context:
The Projects' process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including those in rural communities) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

Over half of the sites still to be reviewed as part of the Project are in rural locations according to the Scottish Government's Rural and Environment Science and Analytical Services (RESAS) classification of rural areas.

Customers

Scottish Government's Rural Scotland Key Facts 2021 highlights that over 5.46 million people live in Scotland, with over 930,000 of them living in rural areas. Rural Scotland accounts for 17% of the total population in Scotland and has consistently done so since 2011. Rural communities in Scotland face many of the same barriers to accessing services as island communities (which are included within the definition of a rural community). The evidence in the Island Communities section from HIE's My Life Survey also applies to rural communities.

Colleagues

All staff involved within the review of a site are given the opportunity for both group and individual consultations. This enables all staff, regardless of their lived experience, the opportunity to raise any concerns they have regarding the current site or potential future sites.

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)

2.15 Other

Context:

The Project process has been created to ensure that there is no detriment to customers. Customer (and staff) needs are variable depending on a range of circumstances (including those with interrupted learning) and the process has been created to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to enable the site co-ordinator to address these needs. The process encourages the gathering of local data and staff insight through consultation. This enables the site co-ordinator to use both qualitative and quantitative evidence, as well as local knowledge to create a recommendation that suits local need within the business case.

There are additional customer groups who are at risk of experiencing interrupted learning, e.g. due to moving home or school frequently, being out of formal education for a period of time, and wellbeing issues. This would potentially impact on educational attainment, post-school destinations and transitions. This applies to children and young people in military families, criminal justice experienced young people, and young carers.

Children and Young People usually access SDS through in school services or our Next Steps service offer. Customers aged 19+ have access to universal adult CIAG services.

All people in Scotland can access SDS' services, with a Needs Matrix in place to help us identify those most in need of additional support.

Impact (Does this project have a negative, positive or no impact? Please include the evidence of why that is, citing appropriate sources)	Action (What activity have you done already and what was the impact? What do you need to do to address the evidence?)
Under CIAG Heading: Pre-decision site checklist lacks detail about customer groups to be included – *"Gather demographic information surrounding current footprint (SIMD levels, equalities groups)"* – which could lead to some groups being overlooked and specific impact not considered.	Pre-decision site checklist requires to be revised and explicit about groups with a protected characteristic. The data gathered around protected characteristic groups within the Pre-decision checklist should also be included within the business case with an explanation about how the data has informed decision making.

2.16 Consultation Recording

Consultation is an excellent source of evidence and can offer insight that cannot be gathered in any other way. It is important to be well prepared when consulting with partners, ensuring you do not take too much of their time and that you efficiently gather the information you need. However, it is also easy to over consult with our partners, so sharing key learning is important to mitigate that risk. It is also important to inform your consultees about changes that have been made (or not made) based on their input. Please use this space to share key learning from your consultations and how you have fed back to the consultees.

Further information on our National Approach to Equality Stakeholders can be found here.

Focal Point Groups can also be useful for consultations, further information can be found here.

Stakeholder(s) consulted	Key feedback from stakeholder(s)	What changes were made based on the feedback? (if none, explain why)	How was this fed back to stakeholders? (including date provided)

3.0 Action Plan

A key part of every impact assessment is the action plan. This is where you state the actions that you will take in response to the impact assessment you have completed. The actions should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timebound (SMART).

Once the IEIA has been signed off by the SRO, actions within the Action Plan should be added to the relevant team's Continuous Improvement Action Plan.

<div style="background-color:#cc0000; color:white; font-weight:bold; padding:4px;">See guidance for 3.0</div>

What is the action you will take in response to the impact assessment?	Which characteristics/groups does it apply to?	What is the intended impact?	When will this be completed?
Pre-decision Site Checklist 1. The Pre-decision checklist should explicitly list the data that site coordinators should be considering when drafting the business case. The data required could include the following: • PAC footfall data broken down by equality characteristics. • Census data on local demographics. • SIMD Data (potentially including an overlay on the existing mapping exercise). • Other appropriate regularly available data suitable for supporting decision making. • Gaelic language data for the Highlands and Islands. 2. The Pre-decision guidance should be more explicit about how equality data is used for decision making, including anonymized / confidential personal data about reasonable adjustments required for each site.	All	1. Greater consistency in the consideration of the needs of equality groups by ensuring that each business case is drafted considering comparable data. The data gathered around protected characteristic groups within the Pre-decision checklist should also be included within the business case with an explanation about how the data has informed decision making. 2. It also provides a further opportunity to expand access. If a particular group has a large local demographic, but relatively small representation in footfall there would be an opportunity to conduct consultation to see how SDS might better reach that demographic through site location (and other means).	31 January 2024
Community Venue Rationale: Inclusivity There are a range of questions that the Community Venue Rationale could include to ensure that sites are not just accessible but also as inclusive as possible. These could include the following: • Are their baby-changing facilities? • Is the venue child-friendly? • Does the site have gender neutral toilets, preferably with contained handwashing facilities? • Does the proposed venue have values that align with SDS's? Are they subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty? Do they have an equality policy? Is it a space where all equality groups will feel safe? How do we know this? • Is the wider area around the venue safe? Are there areas nearby which may make customers or colleagues feel unsafe- such as woodlands, unlit paths to public transport, etc? • Does the venue have private space for prayer and/or breastfeeding? Where proposed sites do not contain inclusive facilities, site coordinators should consider if such facilities are available locally for customers to use.	All	The addition of these questions ensures that SDS site coordinators have the information they need to check the inclusivity of sites when reviewing options prior to drafting the business case.	31 January 2024
Community Venue Rationale: Accessibility There are a range of questions that the Community Venue Rationale could include to ensure that sites are as accessible as possible, in line with the Equality Act 2010 and Building Regulations 2010 requirements. The alternative action could be to create a detailed accessibility checklist for all Estates decision making. These should include the following questions: • How is fire safety managed for disabled customers and colleagues? • Is there access to disabled toilets? • Are there disabled car parking spaces and/or space for setting down? • Is there a detailed accessibility check in place for the site? This should be confirmed either though written confirmation from the site or having been seen by the Site Coordinator. Guidance should be updated within the Rationale for Site Selection to address next steps if the questions above are not confirmed or responded to satisfactorily. This includes consideration of local alternative sites, escalation to local management or no longer progressing with the site.	Disability	SDS has an obligation to ensure that any sites used to delivery service are accessible to people with disabilities. The addition of these questions helps to ensure that SDS is meeting its duties in line with the Equality Act 2010 and Building Regulations 2010.	31 January 2024

The Rational for Site Selection will also be submitted as part of the Business Case.			
Customer Voice 1. Customer voice should be included in the decision-making process and gathered as part of a review of the move to new premise. 2. The SDS Island Consultative Group should be consulted as part of any decision to change sites within any Island community. 3. The business case should include reference to what customer groups, partners and/or community groups have been consulted as part of the decision-making process.	All, Island Communities	1. Site Coordinators should utilise existing customer voice within decision making and be explicit about how it has been used within the business case. Customer voice should continue to be gathered through any review of the move into new premise. 2. This supports the sharing of good practice and information across the Islands and ensures that inhabitants of islands are included in making decisions on Island issues. 3. This ensures that SDS has a record of who has been consulted as part of the process and encourages site coordinators to conduct consultation as part of the process.	31 January 2024
While it is not expected that any new sites will have requirements for SDS to configure the building, if it were to happen then a documented approach to accessibility would be taken.	All	SDS has an obligation to ensure that any sites used to delivery service are accessible to people with disabilities. The addition of these questions helps to ensure that SDS is meeting its duties in line with the Equality Act 2010 and Building Regulations 2010.	30 March 2024/ongoing

4.0 Approval and Publication

- **Will you be making this IEIA available in different formats/languages?**

Guidance

We will consult with staff and partners about the appropriateness of publishing in those formats following publication.

SRO (Print)	SRO Signature	Date	Review Date
Neville Prentice	*[signature]*	23rd November 2023	29th March 2024

5.0 Review (To be completed at the review date, not at the same time it is submitted)

This section should be completed as part of the review on the date listed above under the sign off.

Guidance for 5.0

Were the actions taken completed? If not, why not?

Did the actions achieve what they intended? If not, why not?

What actions would you continue/stop or reconsider for future projects?

Has any evidence been identified that may be useful for similar future projects?

If this is a review for an ongoing project, are there any additional actions to add to the project going forward?