

**Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) Recording Form**

Please refer to the notes and examples in the EIA Guidelines to help complete this record

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title of Activity/Proposal/Policy/Practice | Proposed change of signage for accessible and gender neutral toilets | | EIA Team and Lead Member of Staff | Susan Inglis - Equalities  Dave Keen - Facilities  June Horne – Access & Inclusion  Stuart Daly, Health and Safety manager  Sara Taylor - Equalities  Anita Baggs – Access & Continuing Education  Catherine McCormack – Student Support  Hazel Hume – Student Support  Caitlyn McFarlane - ECSA | Date | 1st meeting 28th April (SI and SD)  2nd meeting 4th May (SI, DK, JH, ST) |
| Type of Policy/Practice/ (tick box) | New |  |
| Existing |  |
| Revised |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Step 1 – Considering the aims of the policy/proposal and evidence of how it affects different groups** | |
| What are the aims and purposes of the activity/ decision/ new or revised policy or procedure?  See Note 1 | We know from student feedback and advice from LGBT Youth Scotland and other agencies that our current approach to gender neutral toilets can be a barrier for transitioning and non-binary people.   * Some students perceive the accessible toilets with the wheelchair symbol as for disabled people only * The male/female sign doesn’t include non-binary people.   The advice we have been given is that gender neutral toilet signage should consist of a simple toilet image, and wording “Toilet” or “Accessible toilet” or “All gender toilet” |
| Who will be affected?  See Note 2 | Students and staff |
| Who will be consulted?  See Note 3 | | Students and staff, including EIS and Unison via the Health and Safety committee. |
| What evidence is available of how the policy/decision, etc. affects, or may affect, protected groups?  Evidence could be quantitative, qualitative or anecdotal.  Do we have enough evidence to judge what the impact may be?  See note 4 | | * Student feedback/LGBT Youth Scotland Advice that a change to practice would be beneficial for transitioning and non-binary students. * JH & DK provided information on the accessible toilets in some campuses that have equipment that is needed by specific students i.e. track hoists/beds. The intention is to have radar key locks on these toilets to keep them available for students with additional needs (and prevent other students abusing them by sleeping on the beds). * JH - As these students with additional needs don’t generally focus as much on signage, more on the route and being told where toilets are, so the simple toilet imaging and signage would not necessarily be deemed a problem, as long as there was a tour on induction. * DK – information about the single accessible toilets around all campus that currently have the wheelchair symbol signage. These toilets are accessible to many different groups as well as wheelchair users, including people with hidden disabilities, people with children, older people or those with a temporary health problem/injury. JH – provided anecdotal evidence that students tend to view these toilets as ‘the disabled toilet’ meaning that the signage may be limiting the use of the single toilets by people who may benefit from their accessibility. |

**Step 2 – Assessing the impact**

This involves:

* Considering relevant evidence relating to people who share a protected characteristic
* Assessing the impact of applying a decision of a new or revised policy or practice against the needs of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and each protected characteristic.

The Public Sector Equality Duty:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation** | **Advancing equality-**   * **Removing disadvantage** * **Meeting different needs** * **Encouraging participation** | **Fostering good relations**   * **Tackling prejudice** * **Promoting understanding** |

See Note 5

Key Questions to ask:

1. What potential positive/neutral/negative impacts can be identified?
2. What does evidence demonstrate about positive/neutral/negative impacts for different protected characteristic groups? E.g. statistics on participation, progression or outcomes, feedback or complaints
3. Does the policy/procedure/practice/decision take account of the needs of people with different protected characteristics? How is this demonstrated?
4. Does it affect some groups differently? Is this proportionate?

See Note 6

| Protected characteristic | Potential  Positive Impact Y/N | Details of Expected Positive Impact | Potential Negative Impact Y/N | Details of Expected Negative Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age | Y | Older people may feel more comfortable about using the single accessible toilets if the signage is changed. |  |  |
| Disability | Y | Good relations may be fostered by including learning disabled students in the decision-making process. People with hidden disabilities, those who are diabetic, or have other health needs may feel more able to use the single accessible toilets if the signage is changed. | **Y** | The disability symbol is well recognised and respected through custom and practice, removal may be confusing for some people especially people with learning disabilities. |
| Gender reassignment | Y | The needs of people who are transitioning or are non-binary will be catered for and recognised, which may help make this group feel more included and comfortable in college. |  |  |
| Marriage/civil partnership (relevant in employment law) |  |  |  |  |
| Pregnancy and Maternity | Y | Pregnant women/those with babies or toddlers may feel more able to use the single accessible toilets, and see them as family friendly. |  |  |
| Race |  |  | **Y** | People for whom English is a second language may understand a pictorial symbol better than textual signage. |
| Religion or belief |  |  |  |  |
| Sex | y | There is potential for positive impact if people are clearer about everyone being able to use the “accessible” toilet. A better understanding of the barriers experienced by trans people will help foster good relations. | **y** | There could be confusion if the proposed changes are not communicated clearly. |
| Sexual orientation |  |  |  |  |
| Social deprivation\*  See Note 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Care leavers/looked after young people\* |  |  |  |  |
| People with caring responsibilities\* | Y | Carers and families with young children may feel more comfortable about using the single accessible toilets. |  |  |

**Step 3 – Acting on the results of the assessment.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What actions can be taken or amendments made to policy to reduce the negative impact?  See note 8 | * Consulting with students and staff with a number of different options for signage. For example, the use of colours to denote different types of toilets will be shared with students in JH’s area for feedback and to ensure that other students and staff weren’t negatively impacted by using colours/unsuitable colours. ECSA and student support should be involved and consultation could also occur during LDT sessions, for example (with a mini-survey/questionnaire?) * Communication plan of the changes to the signage, so all groups understand the new signage and so staff can further assist students who are not sure. * Could run a pilot scheme on one campus to further measure impact. |
| Is there a need to address any gaps in evidence? |  |
| How will equality be advanced/ good relations be fostered? | Consultation and giving ownership to the people concerned will help us to come up with the best possible solution. A more inclusive form of signage will help to make it clear that these toilets are accessible for many different people, making them feel more comfortable in the college. |
| Who has been involved in carrying out this assessment? |  |
| If you cannot fully review the impact now, what else must be done, by/with whom and why? | * Proposals need to go to the College Health and Safety Committee, for approval by the EIS and Unison. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommended decision:** (place an x against relevant outcome)  See note 9 | Outcome 1 - Proceed – no potential identified for discrimination or adverse impact, and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken |  |
| Outcome 2 – Proceed with adjustments to remove barriers identified or to better promote equality |  |
| Outcome 3 – Continue despite having identified some potential for adverse impact or missed opportunity to promote equality |  |
| Outcome 4 – Stop and rethink as actual or potential unlawful discrimination has been identified |  |
| Any other recommendations? | | |
|  | | |

**Step 4: The monitoring and review stage**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan actions to reduce negative impact, advance equality and monitor the impact of the policy, proposal or decision**   * Please indicate if there is any data which needs to be collected as part of action to be taken and how often it will be analysed. * Indicate how the person responsible will continue to involve relevant groups and communities in the implementation and monitoring of the policy, etc. * How will the impact of the policy/procedure/decision be monitored?   See Note 10 | | |
| **Action to be Taken:** | **Person Responsible:** | **Completion/Review Date:** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Signature of Lead:**  **Date:** | | |
| **Step 5 – Review and Publication**  See Note 11  Please send the completed EIA record to Kevin McGlynn, Head of Quality and Equalities, [kevin.mcglynn@edinburghcollege.ac.uk](mailto:kevin.mcglynn@edinburghcollege.ac.uk) for   * review by Equalities team * publication in whole or in part on the College website. | | |