



Equality Impact Assessment

A. Policy or Practice: University Parking Permit Allocation
B. Reason for screening <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Undertaking a review of an existing policy/practice
C. Person responsible for the policy area or practice: Name: Mr David Brook Job title: Support Services Operations Manager School/service/unit: Support Services, Estates & Buildings
D. Screening Analysis 1. Does the policy or practice affect primary or high level functions of the University? No 2. Is the policy or practice relevant to the promotion of equality (in terms of the Public Sector Equality Duty 'needs' set out in the introduction above)? Yes, in terms of access for mobility impaired users. 3. Is the policy or practice one on which interested parties could reasonably expect the University to have carried out an EqIA? Yes If the answer to any of these questions is 'Yes', an EqIA should be carried out on the proposed/revised policy or practice at an early stage and in any event before it is finalised.
E. Screening outcome Equality Impact Assessment required: Yes
F. Sign-off Screening undertaken by: Lyndsey Burns, Transport and Parking Officer Maureen Munro, Snr. Employee Relations Partner, University HR Services (UHRS) Denise Boyle, Employee Relations Partner, UHRS Accepted by (name): David Brook, Support Services Operations Manager Date: 14th January 2014

G. Equality Impact Assessment

1. Overview. Indicate the current status of the policy/practice or the stage of development/review. Also note any general comments here regarding the relevance and significance of the policy/practice to equality. Which aspects of the policy/practice are particularly relevant (which should be the main focus for EqIA)? On what aspects of equality does the policy/practice particularly impact?

This practice is already in place. Although gender is not asked for when making an application for a parking permit, the Transport & Parking Office worked with UHRS to identify if the permits allocated inadvertently discriminated against females with dependants. The data showed this was not the case.

2. To which equality groups is the policy/practice relevant? Policies/practices applying to substantial groups of students or staff will be relevant to all equality groups, which should be noted. However, also indicate any equality groups for which the policy/practice is particularly relevant, and why.

- **Disability – mobility impairment.**

3. What evidence is available about the needs of relevant equality groups? E.g. information/feedback from equality groups or other stakeholders, involvement or research with equality groups or individuals, equality monitoring data, service monitoring data, information for other similar policies/practices, staff surveys, research reports, demographic information, audit, inspection or management reports and recommendations.

- **Mobility data is gathered**
- **Gender data was gathered after the allocation of parking permits as noted at Section G1.**

Where are the gaps in evidence? If there is insufficient information to properly assess the policy, how will this be addressed? If information cannot be gathered now, consider building monitoring into the plans for implementation/review of the policy/practice. Note: the resources put into collecting evidence should be proportionate to the relevance of the policy/practice to equality.

There are no gaps in evidence. Sufficient evidence is gathered for the purpose of issuing those with a mobility impairment to be allocated a parking permit.

4. Might the application of this policy/practice lead to discrimination, harassment or victimisation? Might it result in less favourable treatment for particular equality groups or give rise to indirect discrimination?

No. Staff, Students, visitors and contractors across the University can apply for a parking permit. The process is in place to control and monitor and manage the allocation of parking permits.

The criteria used for the allocation of permits, is based on need, and also to enable the University to control and manage the allocation of parking permits Applicants are assessed on their answers to the questions in the application form. For example, the applicant's postcode is assessed to establish their level of access to their work place (i.e. distance to the workplace and links to public transport), criteria related to work activities and personal circumstances is also considered.

5. Are reasonable adjustments built in where they may be needed?

Specific parking bays are available and allocated to applicants with mobility issues. Advice is sought from the University's Occupational Health Unit in order to establish the requirements of those with a mobility or medical impairment but not recognised by the issued of a Blue Badge or EU Model Parking Card.

6. Does the policy/practice contribute to advancing equality of opportunity¹? Will it help to:

- remove or minimise disadvantage? **Yes**
- meet the needs of different equality groups? **Yes**
- encourage increased participation of particular groups? **Yes**
- take account of disabled people's impairments? **Yes**

7. Is there an opportunity in applying this policy/practice to foster good relations between people in any protected group and those who are not²? Will it help to tackle prejudice and/or promote understanding?

No

8. Is there evidence (or an expectation) that people from different equality groups have different needs or experiences in relation to the policy/practice? If so, what are they?

Yes. Mobility requirements.

9. Is there evidence (or an expectation) of higher or lower uptake by any equality group(s)? If so, give details of the differences and the reasons for these (if known)?

N/A

10. Is any equality group excluded from participating in or accessing the service or functions? If so, why?

No

11. Does the policy/practice create any barriers for any other groups? For example, because of the time when the service is delivered or because of restricted income? Is the communication of the policy/practice accessible to all groups?

No

12. How are relevant equality groups or communities involved in the development, review and/or monitoring of the policy or practice?

The practice is based on business reasons and was introduced to effectively manage the finite number of University parking spaces, through the introduction of a need based permit allocation process. The practice was agreed at senior lever by the University's Senior Management Group. Joint Unions were consulted and invited to review and agree the practice. The process also supports the University's sustainable Transport and Travel Planning Policy.

¹ This question does not apply to the protected characteristic of marriage or civil partnership

² This question does not apply to the protected characteristic of marriage or civil partnership.

13. Are there any other points to note regarding the potential or actual impact of applying the policy or practice, with regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality and promote good relations? If so, note these here.

All applications made due to mobility reasons were upheld if registered or supported by the University's Occupational Health Unit.

In terms of significance to total applications and allocation, a one off exercise looking at gender was taken into account following the issue of parking permits. The data showed that there was no disparity between males/females with dependants successfully allocated parking permits, or those who were unsuccessful. Further information on this data may be available on request.

H. Equality Impact Assessment Outcome

No change required – the assessment is that the policy/practice is/will be robust. There is no evidence of potentially unlawful discrimination and all reasonable opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations have been taken, subject to continuing monitoring and review.

I Action and Monitoring

The process and service will continue to be based on need. If there is a further reduction in car parking spaces available a further evaluation of the practice may be necessary, and will be impact assessed at that time.

J. Sign-off

EqIA undertaken by:

Lyndsey Burns, Transport and Parking Officer

Maureen Munro, Snr. Employee Relations Partner, University HR Services (UHRS)

Denise Boyle, Employee Relations Partner, UHRS

Accepted by: **David Brook, Support Services Operations Manager**

Date: **14th January 2014**