

INTRODUCTORY GUIDANCE TO EQUALITY SCREENING AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT

What is it? Equality screening and impact assessment helps us consider the effect of our policies and practices¹ on different people. It helps us minimise negative impact and potential discrimination and promote opportunities to advance equality, inclusion and good relations between different groups of people.

There are two main elements to equality screening and impact assessment. Firstly, a set of equality screening questions are reviewed. These questions help determine whether the policy is relevant to equality and whether it needs to go through an equality impact assessment. The second element, if required, is the equality impact assessment meeting. This is where a panel of people review the proposed policy, particularly thinking about its impact on different groups of people, trying to identify and counter any potential negative impact and promote any opportunities to enhance equality. The panel suggests actions for the policy owner to adopt.

Why do we do it? The process helps us improve our policies and build equality into our work. Equality screening and impact assessment helps us consider the potential impact of what we do on different groups who are susceptible to unjustified discrimination, some of whom are legally protected against this, whether by UK or other law. It helps us demonstrate that we have proactively considered equality when developing our policies.

When should we do it? Assessing the impact on equality should start early in the policy development process, or at the early stage of a review. Assessing the impact on equality should be ongoing rather than a one-off exercise, because circumstances change over time, so equality considerations should be taken into account both as the policy is developed and also as it is implemented. The guidance here is to help assess the impact on equality before the policy is implemented.

It takes some time to properly set up an equality impact assessment meeting if one is needed, so the equality screening questions should be considered as early as possible once the policy is drafted. If an equality impact assessment is required it will take a little time to identify a chair, a note-taker, a diverse panel and to set up the meeting arrangements. In addition once the meeting has taken place there are likely to be actions to be implemented before the policy is launched. All this needs to be considered when determining the best time to address equality screening and impact assessment.

When we are implementing a policy that has been developed elsewhere, for example by a government department, or by a partner organisation we also need to assess the impact on equality. Although responsibility for the policy itself rests with the organisation that developed it, we may have choices in how it is implemented that can help eliminate potential discrimination and promote equality, inclusion and good relations.

How do we do it? Consider the purpose of the policy, the context in which it will operate, who it should benefit and what results are intended from it. Reflect on its potential impact on people with different equality categories and think about which aspects of the policy, if any,

¹ Consistent with its broad definition in Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act and other equality legislation, this guidance uses the term ‘policy’ as a shorthand for policies, practices, activities and significant decisions about how we work and carry out our functions.

ECNI approved ESIA form

are most relevant to equality. Answer the equality screening questions to determine whether an equality impact assessment meeting is necessary.

Identify someone to chair the equality impact assessment panel meeting, if one is necessary, and someone to take the notes. The chair and note-taker play a crucial role and specific guidance has been developed to support them ([guidance for Chairs](#); [guidance for Note-takers](#)). A diverse panel should be approached, including a range of colleagues from different teams/departments/countries/regions as appropriate, some of whom should be directly involved in or impacted by the policy. Panel members should be sent the part-completed ESIA form and the policy documents, giving them at least a full week to read them and prepare for the meeting.

We particularly focus on the following equality categories (many of which are protected by equality legislation in the UK and beyond): age, dependant responsibilities (with or without), disability, gender including transgender, marital status/civil partnership, political opinion, pregnancy and maternity, race or ethnic origin, religion or belief and sexual orientation. Invariably there are other areas to consider including full-time/part-time working, geographical location, tribe/caste/clan or language, dependent on the country. We also review what is being proposed against the organisation's values (creativity, integrity, mutuality, professionalism and valuing people).

After the meeting the action points identified by the panel are reviewed by the policy owner and implemented as appropriate. The policy owner confirms implementation of the action points (and outlines a justification for any action points that won't be taken forward) and then signs off and sends the completed form to ESIA@britishcouncil.org.

Northern Ireland

There is particular legislation in Northern Ireland which requires a more detailed process of equality screening and impact assessment for policies that are deemed to have high relevance to equality. This includes external consultation with relevant contacts and organisations. Given this, there is a need to confirm whether the proposed policy affects anyone in Northern Ireland. **If it does, all parts of the form need to be completed and the guidance at Annex A must be read and followed.**

ECNI approved ESIA form

EQUALITY SCREENING

POLICY² DETAILS – Please complete

Title of policy	International Postings
Name of policy owner	Louisa Bench
Intended implementation date	September2018

BACKGROUND - Provide brief background information about the policy, or change to it. Include rationale, intended beneficiaries and expected outcomes. (Use as much space as you wish, the text box below will expand as you enter information).

Rotational roles are operational roles (fixed assignments) (e.g., country directors, regional SBU directors, teaching centre managers, deputy/assistant TCMs, deputy exams managers, etc) filled by globally mobile colleagues who hold the role for a period of time. When the assignment has ended, the expectation is for them to then move on to another overseas posting/role (usually in a different location) while someone else moves into the role.

The process in which these moves take place is called the International Postings Exercise. There are annual cycles where an exercise is run to fill a number of these rotational roles that are due to move the following year. The roles available are decided by when they are coming to an end. These roles are offered on mobility terms. The process is open to all colleagues globally to apply regardless of contract type.

Candidates can select up to two expressions of interest from the available roles in the exercise. As the International Postings process is a recruitment and deployment exercise, candidates can also indicate whether candidate they wish to be considered for all roles in the exercise. This is used at the posting panel stage if the panel feels the candidates' skills and experience are better matched to another role.

Candidates go through a standard selection process, however, the final decisions over which roles they are deployed/posted to are decided by a posting panel which will match the best interest of the organisation with the interests and talents of the individual. It is not possible to post everyone within their preferences so occasionally postings decisions are offered out of preference

Candidates also have the option to opt out of 2 roles for which they do not wish to be considered

Following feedback from candidates and stakeholders, the process has changed and developed over the last 3-4 years and the main changes which are different to normal one off recruitment activity are listed below:

² Consistent with its broad definition in Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act and other equality legislation, this guidance uses the term 'policy' as a shorthand for policies, practices, activities and significant decisions about how we work and carry out our functions.

ECNI approved ESIA form

Structure and cycles

- We have conflated the Senior Management Broadband (SMB) and Pay Band 8 (PB8) to one exercise which reduces the length of time to complete the exercise and number of interviews. The Posting Panel gains a wider view of pipeline across the organisation. All information is in one place and the Posting Panel sees all candidates.

Timings and timelines

- For the 2018 exercise, we have adjusted the length of time taken for the exercise to complete and will now conclude in December, rather than running to March the following year. This reduces the length of time of the process takes and reduces disruption to managers and candidates in the roles, and allows candidates more time to accommodate family arrangements in new postings. It also allows those left unposted, more time to find alternative roles.

Support

- Introduced video clips to provide information to candidates
- Improved role profiles providing more information to candidate at the point of advertising i.e. financial data, organisation charts, and role requirements to enable candidates to make informed decisions.
- Introductions of candidate webinars to support candidates during the application stage.
- Publishing the list of roles in advance, so career conversations can take place with line managers
- Interview preparation coaching is offered by a trained internal coach who supports those candidates applying on promotion or for the first time in the exercise. This provides support for candidates on promotion and support country appointed staff to apply for rotational roles.

Application

- We have introduced the need to give a mid-year rating and be able to submit a mid-year summary of their performance from the line manager in addition to the normal 2 years full ratings. Given there is a gap of 6 months from April up to October, where we do not have current view of performance of the candidate, asking for mid-year rating and summary data gives the panels an up to date view of the candidate's current performance.

Shortlisting

- Shortlisting stage follows normal recruitment practices, but the difference in this stage compared to normal one off recruitment is that the shortlisting panel scores applications based on job specifics, motivation and alignment, core skills, language and qualification and makes a recommendation whether to interview. The final decision is then decided by a decision panel that look at all candidates who have applied into the exercise and decide benchmark. The 3 strongest scoring

ECNI approved ESIA form

candidates are put forward to interview. Part of their responsibility is to ensure we have sufficient candidates to interview for the all the roles in the exercise

Selection Process

- Interviewing 3 strongest candidates from assessing their job specifics, motivation and alignment, core skills, language and qualification requirements, which reduces the time taken for managers involved in the exercise and also reduces disruption of candidates who have invested time in exercise.
- Over the last 2 years, we have introduced a presentation element to the interview process to allow candidates time before the interview to demonstrate their interest in the role(s) against a pre-defined topic. It allows the candidates to research and showcase their insight/experience and allows the panel to see the candidates thought process. This is one element of the interview process which allows candidates to have full control over being able to prepare in advance.

Posting Panel

- The posting panels aim is to have the strongest candidate posted to the role, and if a strong candidate cannot be identified, then the role is left vacant.
- An additional feedback step was introduced which is given to the candidate by a member of the posting panel to provide higher context of the outcome/decision. This step is for colleagues who are potentially displaced. This is not applicable for candidates in non-rotational roles, or applying on promotion. This is in addition to the feedback from the panel on the candidate's interview.
- Providing more information during out of preference call (after the 1st posting panel) where candidates have been identified as a good match for a role which they have not selected as a preference. A follow-up conversation with candidates is had to enable them to make informed decisions about whether they wish to be considered for that role or not.
- Should any out of preference appointments be considered by the panel and candidate, an additional step is introduced to have a follow up interview and conversation to the candidate can be interviewed for to that role.
- An introduction of an additional week between posting panel meetings to accommodate colleagues who are country appointed and have been recommended for roles, which allows for research on potential impacts i.e. visa, mobility package, tax implications and contracts.

After all these changes, this is the process we have currently.

IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED?

To determine this, please answer the following by ticking yes, no or not sure:

Question	Yes	No	Not sure
Is the policy potentially significant in terms of its anticipated impact on employees, or customers/clients/audiences, or the wider community?	X		

ECNI approved ESIA form

Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how programmes/services/functions are delivered?	X		
Might the policy affect people in particular equality categories in a different way?	X		
Are the potential equality impacts unknown?	X		
Does the policy have the possibility to support or detract from our efforts to promote the inclusion of people from under-represented groups?			X
Will the policy have an impact on anyone in Northern Ireland?	X		
Total responses Yes/No/Not sure	5	0	1

DECIDING IF AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT IS NECESSARY

If all the answers to the questions above are 'no' then an equality impact assessment is not needed.

Please move to the 'Record of decision' section below.

If there are any 'yes' responses then an equality impact assessment is necessary.

Please move to the 'Record of decision' section below.

If there are no 'yes' responses but there are any 'not sure' responses then please discuss next steps further with the Regional Diversity Lead or with the Diversity Unit, who will help you decide if an equality impact assessment is necessary. Examples of situations where it is not necessary to carry out an equality impact assessment include:

- Producing a team newsletter
- Changing the time of a meeting
- Planning an internal event

In these instances relevant equality issues should still be considered, but there is no need to carry out an equality impact assessment.

RECORD OF DECISION

I confirm an equality impact assessment is required

Policy Owner:

Date:

ECNI approved ESIA form

Note 1: *If an equality impact assessment **is required**, please complete questions 1-3 in the following section and send this part-completed form to the panel along with any relevant background documentation about the policy at least one full week prior to the EIA meeting. This should include the draft policy and any supporting data or relevant papers.*

Note 2: *If an equality impact assessment **is not required**, please send this screening section of the form to ESIA@britishcouncil.org.*

ECNI approved ESIA form

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

PART A: *This section is to be completed before the EIA panel meeting and sent at least one week in advance to the panel along with the policy and other relevant documents.*

TITLE OF POLICY:	International Postings Process
-------------------------	---------------------------------------

(Take as much space as required under each heading below)

1. Please summarise the purpose of the policy, the context in which it will operate, who it should benefit and what results are intended from it.

The benefit of International Postings process is to run an efficient and effective recruitment and deployment exercise to fill rotational roles in a fair and transparent way.

The International Postings Exercise is guided by the following principles:

- Fairness in our processes which adhere to British Council values.
- Transparency of the recruitment/deployment processes and supporting documentation.
- Opportunity for to all colleagues globally to access to these globally mobile roles.
- Quality and valuable process for both candidates and the organisation as a whole providing a constructive experience.

2. Please explain any aspects of the policy you've been able to identify that are relevant to equality. This will contribute to the equality-focused discussion the panel will have.

1. Parents with school age children – There is a potential impact where not all school years begin in September. The exercise runs in alignment to UK schooling timings, because historically the majority of the population in rotational roles were UK contracted and therefore have followed UK schooling timetables. However, as these roles are open to all colleagues globally, not all countries have the same schooling timetables.
2. Lack of diversity in terms of the current role-holders
3. Posting lengths - How do posting lengths impact on families (i.e. children who are critical stages in their education)
4. Gender/Carer status - A potential impact in the ability for single parents to move around. (The current population the gender split is around 50%)
5. Same sex partners/unmarried partners

- 3. Please outline any equality-related supporting data that should be considered. This could include consultation with Trades Union Side or staff associations, equality monitoring data, responses from staff surveys or client feedback exercises, external demographic and benchmarking data or other relevant internal or external material.**

1. TUS have been informed of the development and changes to the International Postings and have inputted to feedback on the process.
2. The main policy used in the International Postings process is the Global Recruitment Policy
3. We have evaluation survey data, feedback and analysis 2016/17
4. Graphs to show a breakdown on number from 2015-2018 on Applications, Displaced/Posted, Gender, Promotion rates, Ethnicity
5. Resilience Assessment FAQ and example report

ECNI approved ESIA form

PART B: *This section captures the notes of the Equality Impact Assessment panel meeting.*

TITLE OF POLICY³:	International Postings Process
DATE OF EIA PANEL MEETING:	19th September 2018

1. Please list the names, roles/business areas and geographical location of the panel members. If contributions have been received in writing by people who could not attend please list their details too and note 'input in writing' by their name.

Jane Franklin – Deputy Head of Equality, Diversity & Inclusion (Chair)
Louisa Bench – Global Talent & Development Director (Process Owner)
Oliver Sweeting – Executive Assistant to Global People Director (Note-taker)
Aida Salamanca – Country Director, Croatia
Summer Xia – Country Director, Azerbaijan
Andy Phillips – Learning & Development Manager
Chika Idoko – Resourcing Lead, SSA
Louise Crow – Global Resourcing Delivery Manager, CoE
Richard Sunderland – Country Director, Burma & PCS Representative(*)
Ally MacIndoe – Regional Finance Director, MENA
Donna McGowan – Country Director, Vietnam
Karen Jack – Global Talent Manager
Chris McLean – International Postings Lead

* Richard's comments were made in writing as technical difficulties prevented him from attending.

2. Summarise the main points made in the discussion, noting which documents were reviewed. Note any points relating to clarity/quality assurance as well as points relating to equality issues.

The chair facilitated introductions, summarising the roles of the panel members and the reasons for conducting the ESIA review. The chair highlighted the importance of the impact on people and the need to pause for thought and consider the impacts of policies carefully.

The chair pointed to p12-13 in the ESIA form and that attendees here today should focus on the equality categories as we go through this process. The chair will steer discussions towards equality as this is a legally required component of all policies.

The chair asked people to introduce themselves, talk about their relationship to the policy and their previous experience of ESIA processes. Responses as follows:

- Summer has some previous experience of this process.

³ Consistent with its broad definition in Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act and other equality legislation, this guidance uses the term 'policy' as a shorthand for policies, practices, activities and significant decisions about how we work and carry out our functions.

ECNI approved ESIA form

- Aida went through IP exercise herself two years ago and may go through it again this year. First ESIA exercise, so completely new to it.
- Louise is aware of the links between IP process and global recruitment policy.
- Richard is representing PCS and its members at today's meeting. Doctorate on organisational behaviour and is particularly interested in that aspect of the (recruitment) process. PCS has a role in supporting people who don't get a job.
- Donna has some experience of ESIA as a panel member.
- Karen has extensive experience of IP exercise – ran it for past 14 years until Chris took it over this year.
- Chris has been involved in IP process for past 3 years and now interim lead and first time running this year's process. First time part of an ESIA review.
- Louisa has been in role since April, previously HRD East Asia and has experience of IP process from a Regional HRD perspective. Some experience of ESIA as participated in a panel with Summer for BESS. Also, the Process Sponsor.
- Ally is locally appointed so not associated with IP process. Has not done ESIA process before.
- Chika is regularly part of ESIA panels and has chaired some sessions.

ESIA form – Part A

Louisa provided an overview and introduction, before handing over to Chris for a detailed view.

For selecting most significant and important leadership roles across the organisation such as Country Directors and regional SBU leads. It's an annual process in which everyone rotates on a 3-years plus optional 1-year extension basis. At band 7, it's 2 years plus 1, which is predominantly for teaching roles.

There is always a limited number of roles that go into the process, based on who are due to rotate that year. We have put this in for ESIA as we know there are areas to consider from an EDI perspective and would like the panel to support, challenge and provide guidance.

The process has evolved over the years and changes from year to year. Documentation that has been included this year is slightly different to previous years and includes some improvements.

When Chris was putting the paper together, he noticed that the process is annual in line with UK schooling system and it's hard to analyse the impact on that. Lack of diversity of current role holders is another factor that came to mind. We tried to remove barriers and restrictions, but statistics still indicate a lack of diversity.

Is there monitoring data on single parents? The global mobility team has some, but we don't have the data with us now.

If this is a known issue – are we receiving feedback from parents? There was some feedback in this area following the previous process – Richard would have been able to add insight from PCS members at this juncture.

Not everyone has the same academic cycle – it's not the same around the world (i.e. academic years don't always start in September). If school year is different

then it will impact the child's education. There is a lack of awareness of different school years around the world.

Chair asked about disabled applicants and people with different religions. Karen said she had never received a query relating to disability or religion from outside the pool of applicants. This is a reflection of the lack of diversity from within the current applicant pool. There are challenges in some countries, such as particular disabilities will prevent a visa being issued in some countries. Age also creates a barrier to visas for people over 60 in some countries.

The chair asked the panel to think broadly in terms of disability, e.g. mental health. There is also an issue of non-disclosure; is there anything we can do to reassure or provide clear information about what is and isn't possible?

It would be useful to look at the EDI graphs – this is useful data which supports the point on lack of diversity of current role holders. If we are doing the equality monitoring, it would be useful to look at trends. Until last year, men were slightly more successful than women. It seems that ethnicity is not such a factor, although there is a dip last year and we assume (and hope) this is not the start of a downward trend. Data does show that locally appointed colleagues are less successful than UK appointed colleagues. There was very high displacement last year. Should this be reflected in the process this year as a change to what happens to those who have no role to go to as part of the process.

IP Process document

The panel reviewed the IP document taking each section in turn.

Page 3. Regarding access globally to all roles, it does not seem clear to non-British employees that these roles are accessible equally all around the globe. Not sure there is enough information available globally about what the process involves and who it's available to. **Action:** Consider how to improve the communication so it is clear roles are accessible to all regardless of contract type. The chair pointed out that this is a side-point about better communication and does not relate specifically to EDI.

This is something that has been identified and it's a valid point to ensure that these roles are available to everyone. We refreshed the role profiles last year with the aim of broadening viability for applicants, particularly in relation to passport requirements.

When it was communicated that locally engaged staff could apply, there was some concern about how viably people could compete against UK appointed people. Why would I see myself as eligible? What can I do from a practical perspective to be included in the pool? What practical steps can we take to cascade the information effectively? **Action:** consider practical steps to support managers to encourage potential candidates to apply regardless of contract type. **Decision:** The reason a UK passport is required for a post needs to be more clearly stated (and explained) in the role profile.

Timelines

There has been some feedback that candidates would like more time to prepare for their postings and to know about their postings earlier in the process, so they can make suitable arrangements for their families. Therefore, requesting to bring

ECNI approved ESIA form

the outcomes forwards. Also, to shorten the overall duration because of the stressful nature of the period from advertisement to outcome.

This year we have fewer roles in the exercise, which enables the process to take place in a shorter timeframe.

Question about process (interviews etc.) – is it all done virtually? Most interviews were conducted through zoom and this worked well, and it was felt this was better than before when it was conducted via global crossing. No negative feedback was received. In fact, positive feedback was received because it was a visual experience rather than just an audio interview.

Decision is communicated from one week to ten days after the IP panel sitting. Does this give candidates enough time? We introduced a two-week period between first posting and second, to conduct research.

The chair asked those on the panel who have been through the IP process to comment on their experience. Does this two-week period feel reasonable? It was felt that two weeks was ok but perhaps for people with children, searching for schools and similar matters relating to children could mean the two-week window is not enough time if colleagues were posted out of preference. It was felt that healthcare issues and caring responsibilities are serious considerations that take time to research.

Is it worth considering a longer period for out-of-preference posting? People are asked to give two places they would *not want* if posted out-of-preference, for example if they don't like the place or the role or there are personal constraints which could relate to childcare, family matters etc. These are entirely dependant on the individuals. This is a way to try to mitigate the issues arising surrounding posting out-of-preference.

The anxiety between the first meeting and outcomes can be considerable, so if it was extended to more than 2 weeks, this could cause increased levels of anxiety for those in the process. It may be that more than 2 postings may be difficult for some people. Following the first meeting, a phone call is made the next day to the candidate, so they can say immediately if it won't be possible.

Have we had instances in the past when people asked for longer to think about it? Yes, which is why historically we extended the period to two weeks. Since we extended it to 2 weeks, we haven't. 90% of people are posted within preference. If someone asked for more time to think about it, we would be flexible and accommodate this as much as possible.

Do we have country factsheets which include information on schooling etc. to give to candidates? Yes, and we have various links on the intranet to information, country factsheets, access to FCO reports, insight reports, contact details of BCA colleagues who are available for queries, links to Family Liaison Officers in British Embassies, if they need it. There is a sheet on the intranet site which links to all this information. We do not update the information, but we do signpost to this.

In summary, the two-week window for out-of-preference postings is already an extension. There is a series of steps in place to provide additional support, which kicks in straight away. Colleagues will be supported in deciding and monitoring through this two-week window. If somebody requests additional time, it would always be allowed. This is an important point.

ECNI approved ESIA form

People are immediately connected with the Country Director or local HR, so they can obtain more information. There hasn't been the need to provide a cut-off point but perhaps having more than an additional week would be unfair on other candidates, as they would not be able to be informed of outcomes, offered the role, subject to medical clearance, visa clearance etc. There are many checks and balances as part of the subsequent process.

It's worth highlighting that people can talk to someone in-country, such as local HR manager to discuss visa access, what it's like to work in the country in a same sex relationship or as a single parent, a gay man or woman etc.

Can people visit the country? No, not until the person starts their placement. There is sometimes a pre-visit but after being appointed and part of their onboarding. Way to promote greater inclusion is to be sure that the process kicks in and people offered out-of-preference are pointed to the reference information and contacts. This would be of benefit to people with dependants, with disabilities, from different religions, with different sexual preferences etc. **Action:** To ensure there is as much information made available and clear details about where to find out more and who to contact. This is likely to promote greater inclusion (and reduce anxiety) for all.

We are not allowed to hold FCO reports but people can request them, and they are available from the International Mobility advisers.

Why do we only advertise the vacancies for two weeks? This is our standard advertising period. This is recommended as a minimum. We used to have longer (3 weeks) and we decided to reduce this because although it gives an opportunity for the applicants to do more research and prepare their submission, but it was felt that this made the process more protracted. The list of roles is made available before they are advertised, so people can research before they apply.

Publication of roles and when we advertise could be considered – this could enable more time for research. How many posts are being put out this year? Around 17-18 roles this year. It will be up to the policy owner to make these decisions based on feedback given here.

'Identifying International Roles for that year' – the paragraph talks about the process of discussion between HR and SBUs / GNT on roles. There is no mention here of localisation of roles which is increasing year on year and reducing the number of international posts. From EDI perspective PCS would argue that this is a gap - there needs to be equal, open and transparent way of deciding on what is localised and what remains an international post

In the same way, there is no reference to which posts may be advertised internally or externally. Under the Global Approach there are guidelines for when we go external, but this is not referenced here and as with the localisation issues appears an arbitrary decision depending on the region. The presents issues around equality of treatment as a result. **Action:** Amend policy to make reference to how decisions are made about whether posts are localised or part of the globally mobile pool and about how decisions are made about their recruitment.

What is the process around obtaining or avoiding an extension to your role of one year? There are disadvantages when there are fewer roles and we are led by the business. This is a process which manages roles but extensions are decided by

the business. What is in scope? The default is that it's a 3-year posting with the option to extend by one year. Those decisions are business decisions; they could be part of a change programme that has more time to run, just one of many reasons that extensions may be required. **Decision:** This is feedback we will take on board to continue to develop the process.

Eligibility of Candidates

Passport restrictions; it is always a concern when a policy says, 'at our discretion'. This was raised last year, and we need to continue to raise it. We do need clarity. This sits with IMT and Reward who own the role profile wording. We sought feedback this year to try to improve on the wording. It's standard wording across all international assignment role profiles. We agree it doesn't make sense. We can understand if it says will be determined by ability to obtain a visa, but we also don't like the expressions at our discretion. **Action:** we will obtain clarification and seek to amend the wording to remove reference to discretion. Wording doesn't make sense because it's not discretionary, it's based on actual restrictions that may be encountered.

Role posting duration; can they apply at any time or do they have to complete a year or apply on promotion? Wording is unclear. You can apply on promotion at any time, but you need to have completed one year in post before applying. **Action:** Clarify the wording.

If not in a mobility post, then you only need to complete one year, but if on rotational posting then you need to have completed two. Is this inconsistent? The three parts seem inconsistent. **Action:** check for consistency and make sure it feels equitable across candidates' different situations.

Screening requirements: would help to clarify 'clearance'. E.g. HIV positive people can never work in Singapore. This is part of the research we expect candidates to undertake. The medical clearance is a British Council duty of care and this is the same for the FCO and any other international organisation. Dependant on the outcome of the medical report, a decision will be made on the candidate's suitability for posting to that country. What reassurance could be given at this point, e.g. for a disabled person that their disability will not be seen as a disqualifying factor as part of the medical clearance process. **Action:** we will find out from IMT what additional information is available.

If someone is offered an out of preference posting and they subsequently found out they were not eligible because of country restrictions – what are the legal implications for us that they were de-selected based on their individual situation. We will consider everyone against their preference first. We have never not posted someone owing to a medical reason. The posting panel will consider very carefully the match of the person to the role and it would be a great loss to the organisation for that person not to take up a post for which they have been appointed.

There is more information we could provide on the intranet, e.g. you will not be able to get a visa for Singapore if you are HIV positive. This would mean that a candidate could alert us immediately if they are posted out-of-preference that they would not be able to work in that region. There have been examples in the past where we have not been aware of health issues which have caused difficulties and then we have ended up in a grievance situation because we appear not to have been acting appropriately. **Action:** we will provide more information, so we are

seen to be promoting as much inclusion and support for inclusivity in the process as possible.

Action: Needs to be clarified in the process document that screening takes place after the interview.

Screening Requirements (Resilience Assessments): Should this be handled by a separate conversation? This question to be considered at the end of today's meeting.

Candidate Support: this section has always been part of the process. Candidate support has been missed from the timelines section.

Interview preparation

Coaching session offered by a trained coach for candidates applying on a promotion. Does this exclude those who have been part of the posting process? It is only available for people applying on promotion or people who are not in the IP process. The reason why we limit the pool of people it's available to is because we don't have enough coaches for everyone and we want to give opportunity to those who haven't already been part of the process. **Action:** Wording in timeline needs to change to it's clear this is not something that's available to everyone.

Are line managers helped? We provided line managers with a guide and talking points last year to help them to have better career conversations. We know we have different levels of capability across our line manager population but from an IP process this is not something we can address, although we are definitely working on it from a Global T&D perspective. It would be good to include something on support that can be provided to individuals who are not successful. **Action:** We will be explicit on the provision of additional support at outcome stage.

Selection

No comments.

Interviews

Do all candidates get the opportunity to present in the same way? The presentation is scored. How is the presentation framed and what is being assessed and is this being scored in a consistent way?

We give the same opportunities to use zoom to all candidates. In the event of any technical issues, the back-up solution is global crossing. It is much better to use zoom but can often be at the mercy of technical issues. Skype for Business will hopefully resolve this.

The presentation is historically around the challenges and opportunities that the candidate may see in the role that they see as their preference. They are given time in advance to research and identify these. Their presentation is based on their research – have they identified the main challenges? Are their ideas realistic? So, they are scored on their research skills and their ideas, as well as their presentation skills but the format is entirely the candidate's choice – either to use slides, or another method. The greater risk is if some candidates are interviewed face-to-face and others not, but all candidates in the IP process are interviewed remotely. It is much easier to build rapport face-to-face. We have

ECNI approved ESIA form

taken the decision to interview everyone virtually, as this is an opportunity to promote inclusion. This builds fairness into the process.

This year, candidates will have one interview for both preferences with a requirement to give one presentation. The presentation will therefore be on a specific, more corporate topic with individual role-specific challenges explored for each role during the interview.

What do we need to do to ensure consistency in how the presentations are assessed? **Action:** important to build clear indicators. This is where bias can creep in.

The process talks about measuring behaviour for example through interview but is there any evidence that someone's ability to talk about their own behaviour is a reliable and valid measurement of that behaviour? It seems not. The reliance on interviews and presentations also arguably favour more extrovert personality types so present issues of potential inequality in that regard.

The use of presentations and measuring behaviours is part of our standard recruitment process and in line with best recruitment practice.

The use of self-rated surveys e.g. as being proposed for the resilience test is open to challenge as there is little evidence to back them up as either reliable or valid. Can it therefore be an equal assessment?

The resilience assessment is being reviewed as we will have some outcomes of its effectiveness in October 2018. **Action:** share outcome of the review of resilience assessment.

We understand that a 'Line manager supporting statement' will be required for those on promotion – several concerns have been expressed about this and whether it is fair and equal given the large variances in the quality of line management relationships and attention to current PM processes. One manager may take a serious interest in this statement and write it thoroughly, another less so. As with concerns above about reliability and validity, how subjective is this assessment.

The supporting statement will be extended to all candidates not only those applying on promotion or for the first time in the exercise. As previously mentioned, management capability is something the wider T&D team will be working on to build so that managers are equipped to complete these forms. They are the people who know the individual and their work best so their input is very valuable. **Action:** extend request for supporting documents for all candidates.

In previous years a briefing has been provided and guidance issued to the interview panel. Need to ensure that panel members are briefed again this year.

Online recruitment training is out-of-date. We have applied for funding to apply for a new module and we could discuss whether anything could be incorporated for the posting process.

Action: Unconscious bias training should also be incorporated.

Donna's feedback was interesting to say that she had two different experiences through the two different panels. **Action:** We need to ensure we have experienced panel members and that criteria and briefings are provided.

There is mandatory EDI training for recruiters. Unconscious bias is also being incorporated into that.

Data gathered

We monitor diversity of panels and provide a report at the end.

How are languages considered and addressed? Languages are added to the role profile by the line manager as a requirement of the role. The level of proficiency is self-assessed by the candidate in their application form, against a set criteria. Very few roles in which speaking language of the country is an imperative but would be stated on the role profile if that were the requirement. Do we need to encourage people to speak more languages; it builds relationships and helps to understand the culture of the country they are operating in? This is a question of funding. The languages candidates speak is gathered as data and if it is seen as a benefit, it will be mentioned in the role profile and would then be considered.

Action: Would be good to make clear that proficiency in language will be tested, if it is a requirement of the role.

Posting Meeting

Unconscious bias training should extend to the posting panel, so there is a balanced outcome. Is the posting panel a moderation panel? The interview panel makes recommendation and then all data is fed into the posting panel and they review the scores and make a moderation decision based on the data. They will also look at roles that haven't been filled. They will then need to recommend the people who might be suitable for the roles that haven't been filled.

How do they ensure the scoring of one panel isn't more generous than the scoring of another panel? There is a webinar for panel members (more than one is held to ensure we capture everyone), in which we discuss how to approach the panel, so the briefing includes understanding the evidence that comes through, the levels we are looking for and the evidence for the more senior roles. That is our method for mitigating as much bias as possible. We have one member of the interview panel on each moderation panel. So, there is an opportunity for people to check why interview panels gave particularly low or high ratings. This provides an opportunity for people to ask why.

What is the level of appeals? Very low. Last year there were appeals against displacement, but recruitment appeals rarely occur. **Action:** add a line at the end, so colleagues are clear that decisions can be appealed.

Last year, out of 178 interviews, only one didn't have gender diversity on the panel. We try with ethnicity as well, but we struggle with reduced number of ethnic minorities within the workforce. The third representative is a member of HR; this is critical for the integrity of the process.

Out-of-preference appointments

'There may be a follow up interview for that role?' **Action:** Wording needs to be changed to 'there will be'.

The period between an offer being made and accepted is shorter this year. Between December and taking up post in September is a long time – if another job comes up and there is another role that is more suitable that becomes available, are they technically allowed to apply? Can't recall an instance where that has happened. However, in principle, there would have to be a very good reason why the person wouldn't take up that role, due to the time and investment by the organisation and the individual.

Now that displacement can mean risk of redundancy, people may prefer to go for a role that is not part of the process if it is viewed as more secure. **Action:** we will take this up for discussion with our colleagues, as this is an important question that needs consideration.

Historically, we had a process in which we provided written feedback to everybody, then we changed it to being provided only to those who requested it, and now we have introduced the same process for all, which is verbal feedback only. This is purely because we feel candidates benefit from a verbal conversation with the interview panel member. This provides more information and context and is more personal. We offer the option of a written summary from this feedback conversation. This is BC's standard recruitment approach; not to give written feedback. **Action:** add this into the text.

Action: In addition to the standard interview feedback, colleagues who are unsuccessful will have a posting panel member contact them to give them context around why they didn't secure a role in the exercise – we will add this into the document as well.

Is any support offered at this point? Yes, in region or in country from HR, and we encourage line managers to talk with them. **Action:** This should also be clarified in the document.

Action: Should be clarified in the document that the standard displacement process follows.

Resilience:

Action: This should be discussed separately and Andrew Spells to be part of the conversation.

Protected characteristics:

There was a real case in which the process included a pregnant candidate, who applied and was not able to take up the post because of her confinement. That information was not disclosed until the second panel meeting, where they would be confirmed into the post. It was disclosed at that point. The purpose was then to see if during the period someone else could do the role whilst she was unable to take up the role. In that case, a maternity cover was put in place to cover the role before she could take up the position. So, we have a rigorous process in place in this regard.

Wherever the 3+1 is recorded, this may be amended due to someone's personal circumstances, such as pregnancy. **Action:** make it clear in the document.

ECNI approved ESIA form

Anything to consider around part-time? We can't think of a job share situation. This has significant financial implications. We would need to have a conversation with the business. Developing a potential successor for a role and having them in a job share situation is quite a good option from a talent perspective. **Action:** If we could get business buy-in, then making it clear posts could be offered on a job-share basis would be something worth considering.

Action: Oli to share notes with panel. Chair will get comments from Richard. Panel reviews minutes. Once notes have been corrected, they are sent to the ESIA inbox.

ECNI approved ESIA form

3. **Capturing information about the protected groups/characteristics** - Based /on the notes of the discussion (section above), record here any potential for negative impact identified and any opportunity to promote equality, inclusion and good relations.

Equality categories (with prompts to guide full consideration)	Potential for negative impact	Opportunity to promote equality, inclusion and/or good relations between different groups
Different ages (older, middle-aged, young adult, teenage, children; authority generation; vulnerable adults)	Some countries have visa restrictions on employing people above a certain age	Links and resources will make it clear where any age restrictions are in place that are beyond the organisation's control, so candidates have clarity from the start.
Different dependant responsibilities (childcare, eldercare, care for disabled and/or extended family)		Shortening the process aims to give candidates with caring responsibilities more time to set things in place before taking up post.
Disabled people (physical, sensory, learning, hidden, mental health, HIV/AIDS, other)		Links and resources will make it clear where any visa restrictions (or similar) are in place that are beyond the organisation's control so candidates have clarity from the start.
Different ethnic and cultural groups (majority and minority, including Roma people, people from different tribes/castes/clans)		Almost all roles are available to colleagues regardless of nationality. Where passport restrictions do apply it will be clearly explained why this is the case.
Different genders (men, women, transgender, intersex, other)		Links and resources will provide information on the context in country so that candidates have the information they need from the outset and can make informed applications.
Different marital status (single, married, civil partnership, other)		
Different political views or community backgrounds (particularly relevant to Northern Ireland)		

ECNI approved ESIA form

Equality categories (with prompts to guide full consideration)	Potential for negative impact	Opportunity to promote equality, inclusion and/or good relations between different groups
Pregnancy, maternity, paternity and adoption (before/during/after)		The 3+1 posting allows personal circumstances such as pregnancy to be taken into account when roles are up for rotation.
Different or no religious or philosophical beliefs (majority/ minority/ none)		Links and resources will provide information on the context in country so that candidates have the information they need from the outset and can make informed applications.
Different sexual orientations (gay, lesbian, bisexual, heterosexual)		Links and resources will provide information on the context in country so that candidates have the information they need from the outset and can make informed applications.
Additional equality grounds (such as full-time/part-time working, language, geographical location, other ⁴)		Explore ways to raise with the business the possibility of making some roles available as job shares.
British Council values (valuing people, creativity, integrity, mutuality, professionalism)		

⁴ Any other categories people share that might impact on how the policy affects them.

ECNI approved ESIA form

Action identified by Panel	Agreed by Policy Owner (Yes/No)	Justification if not agreed	Date to be implemented	Confirmation of implementation
<p>Action: Consider how to improve the communication so it is clear roles are accessible to all regardless of contract type. The chair pointed out that this is a side-point about better communication and does not relate specifically to EDI. Pg12</p>	Yes		The new way in which international assignments will be communicated in January. Between January and March 2019, the new procedures will be communicated	The process by which international assignments are filled is changing and comments from this ESIA will be taken into account and addressed in the future process.
<p>Action: consider practical steps to support managers to encourage potential candidates to apply regardless of contract type. Decision: The reason a UK passport is required for a post needs to be more clearly stated (and explained) in the role profile. Pg12</p>	Yes		Jan-March 2019	Will be made clear in role profiles and to HRDs and managers
<p>Action: To ensure there is as much information made available and clear details about where to find out more and who to contact regarding information on special needs, schooling, religious and sexual orientation issues. This is likely to</p>	Yes		January – March 2019	We will clarify where this information can be obtained in new procedures

ECNI approved ESIA form

promote greater inclusion (and reduce anxiety) for all. Pg14				
Action: Amend policy to make reference to how decisions are made about whether posts are localised or part of the globally mobile pool and about how decisions are made about their recruitment. Pg14	Yes		January – March 2019	We will clarify where this information can be obtained in new procedures
Decision: This is feedback (posting lengths) we will take on board to continue to develop the process. Pg15	Yes		January – March 2019	We will clarify where this information can be obtained in new procedures
Action: we will obtain clarification and seek to amend the wording to remove reference to discretion. Wording doesn't make sense because it's not discretionary, it's based on actual restrictions that may be encountered. Pg15	Yes		January – March 2019	Will be made clear in role profiles and to HRDs and managers
Action: Clarify the wording on minimum time in role before moving. Pg15	Yes		January – March 2019	This will be made clear when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled

ECNI approved ESIA form

<p>Action: check for consistency and make sure it feels equitable across candidates' different situations – can apply after one year or after 2 years minimum in post – whether on promotion or not. Pg15</p>	Yes		January – March 2019	This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled
<p>Action: we will find out from IMT what additional information is available regarding 'medical clearance' e.g. HIV positive candidates. Pg15</p>	Yes		January – March 2019	This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled
<p>Action: we will provide more information, so we are seen to be promoting as much inclusion and support for inclusivity in the process as possible regarding visas v/s medical conditions e.g. HIV positive. Pg15/16</p>	Yes		January – March 2019	This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled
<p>Action: Needs to be clarified in the process document that medical screening takes place after the interview. Pg16</p>	Yes		January – March 2019	This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled

ECNI approved ESIA form

<p>Action: Wording in timeline needs to change to it's clear not everyone is entitled to interview coaching preparation.</p> <p>Pg16</p>	Yes		January – March 2019	This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled if applicable
<p>Action: We will be explicit on the provision of additional support at outcome stage for candidates who are not successful. Improve manager capability around having career conversations. Pg16</p>	Yes		September 2019 – once we have management development programmes up and running	We will be doing this as part of management development
<p>Action: important to build clear indicators on how presentations are assessed. This is where bias can creep in. Pg17</p>	Yes		January – March 2019	We will share this with Resourcing team to consider providing more guidance.
<p>Action: share outcome of the review of resilience assessment. Pg17</p>	Yes		January – March 2019	We will feedback to Head of Wellbeing to share this assessment.

ECNI approved ESIA form

<p>Action: extend request for supporting documents for all candidates. Pg17</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled</p>
<p>Action: Unconscious bias training should also be incorporated. Pg17</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>We will share this feedback with our Resourcing team.</p>
<p>Action: We need to ensure we have experienced panel members and that criteria and briefings are provided. Pg18</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled</p>
<p>Action: Would be good to make clear that proficiency in language will be tested, if it is a requirement of the role. Pg18</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>This will be made clear how this will be done when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled</p>

ECNI approved ESIA form

<p>Action: add a line at the end, so colleagues are clear that decisions can be appealed. Pg18</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The grievance and appeals procedures are clear that they apply to all staff.</p>		
<p>Action: Wording needs to be changed to 'there will be'. Pg18</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled.</p>
<p>Action: we will take this up for discussion with our colleagues, as this is an important question that needs consideration. Pg19</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled</p>
<p>Action: add this into the text of any guidance on IP that feedback is verbal as per Recruitment policy as it is felt that this way it provides more information and keeps the feedback in context. Pg19</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled</p>
<p>Action: In addition to the standard interview feedback, colleagues who are unsuccessful will have a posting</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>This will be made clear when when designing new process by which</p>

ECNI approved ESIA form

<p>panel member contact them to give them context around why they didn't secure a role in the exercise – we will add this into the document as well. Pg19</p> <p>Action: This should also be clarified in the document – what support is offered to those who don't land a role and are displaced. Pg19</p>				<p>international assignments will be filled.</p>
<p>Action: Resilience assessments should be discussed separately and Andrew Spells to be part of the conversation. Pg19</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>We will discuss this with Andrew Spells, Head of Wellbeing.</p>
<p>Action: make it clear in the document how pregnancy and other such personal circumstances may impact on posting lengths. Pg19</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled.</p>
<p>Action: If we could get business buy-in, then making it clear posts could be offered on a job-share basis would be something worth considering. Pg20</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>January – March 2019</p>	<p>This will be made clear when when designing new process by which international assignments will be filled.</p>

ECNI approved ESIA form

Action: Oli to share notes with panel. Chair will get comments from Richard. Panel reviews minutes. Once notes have been corrected, they are sent to the ESIA inbox. Pg20	Yes		February 2019	
--	-----	--	---------------	--

4. Agreed actions - *Insert additional rows for more action points and number these.*

5. Sign off by policy owner

I confirm that the policy has been amended as identified in the **Agreed actions** table above.

If the policy has an impact on people or functions in Northern Ireland, I confirm Annex A has also been completed.

_____ (Name) _____ (Role) _____ (Date)

6. Record keeping

The Policy Owner (or their agent) must email the completed ESIA form to ESIA@britishcouncil.org.

POLICIES WITH AN IMPACT IN NORTHERN IRELAND

In accordance with the Guide for Public Authorities, policies which have a MAJOR impact on equality will share some of the following factors:

- they are deemed to be significant in terms of strategic importance;
- the potential equality impacts are unknown;
- the potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or experienced disproportionately by groups who are marginalised or disadvantaged;
- the policy is likely to be challenged by a judicial review;
- the policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

Policies which have a MINOR impact on equality will share some of the following factors:

- they are not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential differential impact is judged to be negligible;
- aspects of the policy are potentially unlawfully discriminatory but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making the changes identified in the action points at Section 4;
- any differential equality impact is intentional because the policy has been designed specifically to promote equality for particular groups of disadvantaged people;
- by amending the policy there are opportunities to better promote equality, inclusion and/or good relations.

Policies which have NO impact on equality will share some of the following factors:

- they have no relevance to equality, inclusion or good relations;
- they are purely technical in nature and have no bearing in terms of the impact on equality, inclusion or good relations for people in different equality groups.

For policies impacting on people or functions in Northern Ireland, you must identify whether any of the issues identified by the EIA panel in the table at Section 3 are likely to have a MAJOR, MINOR or NO impact on equality. This consideration must be given to all the items listed in the table at section 3 whether they have potential for negative impact or the opportunity to promote equality, inclusion and good relations.

Equality categories	Negative/Positive impact on equality, inclusion or good relations		
	NO	MINOR	MAJOR
Age			
Dependants			
Disability			
Ethnicity			
Gender			
Marital status			
Political opinion			
Religious belief			
Sexual orientation			

If the answer to the above questions is NO, no further action is needed.

ECNI approved ESIA form

If MINOR impact is identified and the actions listed at Section 4 will address this, no further action is needed. Where the actions listed at Section 4 will not sufficiently address the impact, additional measures that might mitigate the policy impact as well as alternative policies that might better achieve the promotion of equality of opportunity and/or good relations should be considered. If mitigating measures and/or an alternative approach cannot be taken then the policy should be subject to full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) aligned to Northern Ireland's equality legislation.

If a MAJOR impact is identified in any of the answers above then the policy should be subject to full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) aligned to Northern Ireland's equality legislation.

For guidance on completing full EQIA aligned to Northern Ireland's equality legislation, see <http://www.equalityni.org/archive/pdf/S75GuideforPublicAuthoritiesApril2010.pdf>.

A member of the Diversity Unit should be involved in any EQIAs that take place.

RECORD OF DECISION AND SIGN OFF BY POLICY OWNER: *(please delete 2 of the following statements)*

I confirm that a full EQIA is needed and that I will refer to the Guide for Public Authorities and the Diversity Unit for support in carrying this out.

or

I confirm that a full EQIA is not needed, providing all the Agreed actions at Section 4 and/or other noted mitigating actions are carried out.

Note other mitigating actions that are not listed at Section 4 here _____

or

I confirm that a full EQIA is not needed and no further action needs to be taken.

Signed by:

_____ (Name) _____ (Role)

_____ (Date)

RECORD KEEPING

The Policy Owner (or their agent) must email the completed ESIA form to ESIA@britishcouncil.org.