

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

TITLE: Rising Stars Initiative

VERSION CONTROL

Date	Name	Version	Comments
January 2025	Lisa Murray	0.1	

Stage 1 Description: Fact-finding about you and your research

Organisation	NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre (BRC)
Researcher responsible for assessment	NA
Other members of the team undertaking assessment	Georgina Moulton, Academic Capacity Building Lead Lisa Murray, BRC Education and Training Lead Manchester BRC Theme Leads
Give a brief description of your research	The MBRC Rising Stars initiative is designed to identify and support a selected group of early career researchers who demonstrate high potential. The scheme provides access to tailored development opportunities including mentoring, leadership training, networking, and increased visibility. The selection of Rising Stars has been undertaken at Theme level during the development of the BRC 2022–2028 bid. This EIA has been conducted as part of a review of the scheme to assess whether it aligns with the BRC’s Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) commitments.
What are the key aims and benefits of the research?	• Identify and support high-potential early career researchers. • Accelerate leadership development within the BRC. • Provide tailored development opportunities. • Enhance research capacity and future leadership pipeline. • Increase visibility of emerging talent.

2. Stakeholders and Impact

Who is intended to benefit from your research and how?	Selected Rising Stars • Access to mentoring, coaching, and leadership development. • Increased visibility and recognition. • Opportunities to build networks and collaborations. BRC and partner organisations • Development of future research leaders. • Strengthened research capacity. • Enhanced collaboration across Themes. Wider research community • Long-term benefits through development of high-quality researchers.
Could there be a different impact or outcome for some groups?	Potential risks identified: • Inconsistent selection processes across Themes may lead to unequal opportunities. • Selection may be influenced by subjective judgement, visibility, or existing networks. • Individuals from underrepresented groups may be less likely to be identified. • Risk of reinforcing a perceived hierarchy or exclusivity within the workforce. • Those not selected may feel excluded or undervalued. Groups potentially impacted: • Individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds. • Women and other underrepresented genders in certain fields.

	- Individuals with caring responsibilities or non-linear career paths. - Those from lower socio-economic backgrounds. - Individuals with less access to senior networks or sponsorship.
Is there any specific, targeted action to promote equality? Is there a history of unequal outcomes? (Do you have enough evidence to prove otherwise?)	Current mitigations are limited and vary across Themes. Planned / recommended actions: - Introduce clear, transparent, and consistent selection criteria. - Provide guidance to Themes to reduce unconscious bias. - Monitor diversity of selected individuals. - Consider widening access to elements of the support offer. - Ensure alignment with BRC EDI principles.

Is there an actual or potential negative impact on these specific characteristics? Please highlight either yes or no								
Age	Yes	No	Disability	Yes	No	Gender Reassignment	Yes	No
Marriage & Civil Partnership	Yes	No	Pregnancy & Maternity	Yes	No	Race	Yes	No
Religion & Belief	Yes	No	Sex	Yes	No	Sexuality	Yes	No
Socio-Economic Impact	Yes	No	Carers	Yes	No	Care-Experienced	Yes	No
People From Armed Forces Backgrounds	Yes	No	Migrant Status (e.g.: asylum seekers, refugees, economic migrants)	Yes	No	Homeless People	Yes	No

Stage 3: Evidence

What evidence do you have to support your findings? (quantitative and qualitative) Please provide additional information that you wish to include as appendices to this document, i.e., graphs, tables, charts		Level of Risk (High, Medium or Low)
Age	Early career researchers are the primary target group. However, no consistent criteria were applied across Themes, meaning opportunities may not have been equally distributed across different age groups or career stages.	Medium
Disability	No evidence that accessibility or reasonable adjustments were considered within the identification or support of Rising Stars. Lack of data on disabled representation within the cohort.	Medium
Gender Reassignment	No specific data collected. Potential risk due to reliance on informal nomination and visibility within networks.	Low
Marriage & civil partnership	No direct evidence of impact identified.	Low
Pregnancy & Maternity	Career breaks or non-linear career paths may not have been consistently considered in selection, potentially disadvantaging this group.	Medium
Religion	No consistent EDI data collected on selected individuals. Risk that selection based on visibility, networks, or reputation may disadvantage researchers from ethnic minority backgrounds.	High
Race	No direct evidence identified; however, no consideration of inclusive practices within the scheme design.	Low
Sex	Potential for gender imbalance depending on Theme-level selection approaches. No central monitoring data available.	Medium

Sexual Orientation	No data collected, potential indirect risk due to informal selection processes.	Low
Socio-Economic	Individuals with greater access to networks, mentorship, and visibility may have been more likely to be selected, potentially disadvantaging those from lower socio-economic backgrounds.	High
Carers	No evidence that caring responsibilities were considered in selection or participation. Those with reduced availability may have been less visible or nominated.	Medium
Care Experienced	No data collected, potential indirect disadvantage linked to reduced access to networks and support.	Medium
Armed Forces	No specific evidence identified.	Low
Migrant Status (e.g.: asylum seekers, refugees, economic migrants)	Potential barriers relating to visibility, language, or integration into networks, no data collected.	Medium
Homeless People	No direct evidence, low likelihood of representation within cohort.	Low

Notes: A key limitation identified is the lack of consistent EDI monitoring data for the Rising Stars cohort. This has informed the need for a more transparent and equitable approach moving forward.

Stage 4: Action Plan

Note: Actions should include SMART actions highlighting reasonable adjustments you will take within the scope of your research, study, review or proposal. Based on indications of negative impact identified in Section 2, examples may include a) What you might do to mitigate the risk of people from ethnic minority communities, people with disabilities or people of religion being unable to participate in your research study; b) Extending the research study scope to better understand the experiences of people from one or more of the Protected Characteristic groups; c) Consulting with people from a particular Protected Characteristic group in more detail; d) Putting monitoring procedures in place focusing on one group in particular.

Protected characteristics	Mitigating action	Justification	Person responsible	Target date
Age	Ensure selection criteria recognise different career trajectories and do not disadvantage those with non-linear progression.	Reduces bias toward traditional/accelerated career paths.	BRC Leadership/Capacity Building Team	Short-term
Carers	Ensure flexibility in engagement (e.g. timing of activities, remote access).	Supports those with caring responsibilities.		Ongoing
Care-Experienced	Increase transparency and access to opportunities to reduce reliance on informal support networks.	Addresses structural disadvantage.		Ongoing
Disability	Ensure accessibility requirements and reasonable adjustments are considered within participation and support offer.	Addresses lack of consideration of accessibility.		Ongoing
Gender Reassignment	Promote inclusive practices and ensure all staff involved in selection complete EDI training.	Mitigates risk of bias within informal selection processes.		Ongoing
Marriage & civil partnership	No specific action required at this stage, continue to monitor.	No evidence of direct impact identified.		Ongoing
Pregnancy & Maternity	Ensure selection processes account for career breaks and adjusted outputs.	Prevents disadvantage due to maternity leave		Short-term

		or reduced output periods.		
Religion	Ensure inclusive practices within programme delivery (e.g. scheduling, awareness).	Supports inclusive participation environment.		Ongoing
Race	Introduce EDI monitoring of selected individuals and review diversity outcomes.	Addresses lack of data and risk of underrepresentation.		Immediate
Sex	Monitor gender balance within selected cohort and review outcomes.	Identifies and addresses potential gender imbalance.		Ongoing
Sexual Orientation	Promote inclusive culture and ensure EDI training is completed by all involved in delivery.	Reduces risk of exclusion or bias.		Ongoing
Socio-Economic	Reduce reliance on informal nomination by introducing transparent and open processes.	Addresses advantage linked to networks and visibility.		Immediate
Armed Forces	No specific action required, continue to monitor,	No evidence of direct impact identified,		Ongoing
Migrant Status (e.g.: asylum seekers, refugees, economic migrants)	Ensure clear communication and equitable access to opportunities.	Reduces barriers linked to integration and visibility.		Ongoing
Homeless People	No specific action identified, continue to monitor.	Low representation expected.		Ongoing

Stage 5: Monitoring

How will you monitor and evaluate the equality impact of your study?	This EIA will be a live document and EDI quantitative and qualitative data will be reviewed by the recruiting team
--	--

Stage 6: Signatures

Authors Signature	L. Murray	Date	January 2025
Senior Signature			
Date for Review	January 2026		