

DEI Data Group Population Framework DRAFT for consultation v3

Introduction

This project is seeking to agree a shared framework (classification, language and approach) to categorise organisations either led by, or targeting and supporting groups experiencing structural inequity. The primary use will be for funders to monitor their grant programmes, but it is also anticipated that there will be wider use of a shared framework for sector analysis.

There are three elements to the framework.

1. The first is the **taxonomy** which is the classification system i.e. what are the groupings of charitable organisations that we might use when asking questions or reporting on results. The taxonomy is generic and can be applied to different contexts.
2. The second is the **approach** to applying those groupings to organisations and projects - ie do the categories relate to the project, the organisation or the leadership of the organisations - and the definitions of those areas. This is the context for use of the taxonomy.
3. The final area of the **framework** is guidance to support the consistency of application by funders. This will make it easier for applicants to grant programmes to be asked the questions in a similar way, and for funders to benchmark and compare their programmes.

This is a discussion document to support further development and shared understanding.

Aims

This framework is a general document to propose how to categorise organisations either led by, or targeting and supporting groups experiencing structural inequity. This framework is not a judgement of organisations, it simply spells out the different categories that enable funders to collect data in a systematic manner to understand the reach of the funding and their funding practices. It will be used to inform funding strategies and specific funding strands/programmes, not individual funding decisions - except where it is explicitly a part of the fund criteria.

It is not designed to develop profiles of organisations or their leadership - we discourage the collection of specific percentages against each area. The application areas and overall approach are intended to define what we mean by majorities to focus on the areas of greatest relevance to organisations to avoid excessive data collection and reporting on sensitive areas.

So far, there have been numerous challenges reported by stakeholders regarding collection of equalities data:

- There is a lack of data available on the communities served. Information is either not being collected or not being collected in a comparable way - impacting our understanding of the sector;
- Applicants may tick all the boxes available on monitoring forms to show how inclusive they are but clear and precise trends and impact cannot be drawn from the data;
- Being mindful of what is proportionate and simple to fill in given limited capacity of organisations to collect data, while capturing the complexities of the identities of various groups and intersectionality;
- Applicants and grantees may not understand why such data are being collected and what will be done with the data, and may be hesitant in providing the data;
- Striking the balance between using the data to inform funding strategy in general, but not for specific funding decisions.
- Striking a balance between the nuance and complexity that is the reality for communities, and the need to be able to collate and aggregate information in a consistent way to support it to inform decisions.

The taxonomy and the accompanying guidance have been created with these challenges in mind. It has been developed based on engagement with organisations working on social justice issues and a range of charitable grantees and funders. No framework can encompass every possible nuance, but we hope this provides a starting point for moving this forward.

Proposal

This proposal includes some principles for the overall framework:

1. **Data should only be asked and collected where it is intentional to the project/organisation** . If a project or organisation is not working with a specific population group, questions about the leadership of the organisation would not be relevant. If a project or organisation is working with a specific group, then questions about leadership should only be about those specific identified groups, not all of the groups. For example, if an organisation reports that it works with disabled people, only ask if it is led by disabled people and don't ask about other identities such as sexual identity if they have not specified that as part of the project or mission.
2. **The taxonomy is not seeking to develop full profiles.** We are looking to understand where the majority are from a specific identity. It is more a "Yes or No" question than asking for a percentage. No individuals will be identifiable in the data and people shouldn't feel they have to collect data which is not relevant to their mission eg sexual identity of their trustees if they are an organisation supporting disabled people.
3. **Organisations must be able to select multiple population groups if they identify as such.** For example a group might work with disabled women - it should not be asked to identify primary and secondary identities. This is to recognise intersectional identities of groups that organisations work with.

4. **Responses are not used for decision-making on individual applications unless it is explicitly part of the published criteria.** The purpose of collecting the data is for monitoring and informing strategy, not for decisions on individual grants. If it is part of a fund or programme criteria then this should be clear and publicised.
5. **There is not an implied judgment in the questions.** The purpose is to understand the populations and reach. There is no expectation in the response. For example, it is understood that for some types of organisations, the participants of services might be different to the leadership. Having the leadership from particular groups is not an expectation unless it is explicitly part of the grant criteria.
6. **Data should be provided directly by organisations unless data is publicly available.** We should avoid making assumptions about an organisation or its leadership. Where information is publicly available, for example in charitable objects or publicity from an organisation it can be recorded, but otherwise information should be sought from organisations and not guessed.

We aim for this data to be shared by funders with their 360Giving data to support future analysis - and for openness and accountability. As the data will be shared publicly, we also need to provide an opportunity for organisations to not have this data shared externally.

We recognise that the process of standardising a taxonomy should be a continuous one, to be owned and governed by the DEI Data Group, in order to facilitate ongoing alignment among institutions, and to solicit contributions and to address challenges with implementation.

It should be noted that use of this framework by funders is entirely voluntary. While there are a number of trusts and foundations who are looking to adopt this framework, some funders will continue to adopt their own approach.

Taxonomy

The table below defines the population groups. It is a generic grouping that could be used in different contexts. This is the classification of the groups and the definitions to support a consistent approach - it is not intended that the table would be presented in this way to applicants or grantees.

Options on online forms should allow a selection of one option from each population group, where relevant - but not multiple categories within the same population group. Sub-category selections are not mandatory - and ideally relevant options will only become available when a category has been selected.

Moreover, the taxonomy does not necessarily reflect how questions should be asked - there will be nuances in asking some questions which will be explained in the guidance section.

In addition to the areas in the classification, there will be options to specify other population descriptions e.g. Geographical/residential and other options for lived experience e.g. care experienced or experience of the criminal justice system that can be combined with the population groups below e.g. care experienced disabled people. This lived experience or “other identity or

experience” option can be a free text option - or an option that can be defined by grantmakers where relevant to a specific fund or programme.

Population Groups	Category	Sub-Category	Description
<p>Communities experiencing racial inequity</p> <p>(Communities that experience inequity as a result of their race or ethnic group. Ethnic group refers to the group that people self-identify with, which may be related to their national/geographical origin, skin colours, and other identities. This is often referred to as “Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic” or BAME.)</p>	Communities experiencing racial inequity		Organisations working on racial justice or supporting people from multiple communities
	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	African	
		Caribbean	
		Any other Black / African / Caribbean background	
	Mixed	White and Black	
		White and Asian	
		Any other Mixed / Multiple ethnic background	
	Asian / Asian British	Indian	
		Pakistani	
		Bangladeshi	
		Chinese	
		Any other Asian background	
	Other Ethnic Group experiencing racial inequity	Arab	
		Jewish	
		Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Communities	
		Any other Ethnic group	
Faith communities	Faith		Interfaith and multi-faith groups
	Catholic ¹		People who describe their faith as Catholic or Roman Catholic

¹ Religion may be made a mandatory selection in Northern Ireland. In Northern Ireland the appropriate term may also be community. Further consultation is needed in relation to requirements by groups in Northern Ireland

	Protestant		Anglicans, Adventists, Baptists, Methodists, Pentecostals and other Protestant denominations
	Other Christian denominations		Eastern Orthodox and other denominations
	Buddhist		
	Hindu		
	Jewish		
	Muslim		
	Sikh ²		
	Atheist		
	Agnostic		
	Other		
Migrants (Groups who are first-generation and/or recent migrants to the UK)	Migrants		Migrants with multiple status
	Asylum seekers		
	Refugees		
	Undocumented People		
	Other Migrants		This includes other migrants with official immigration status, e.g. international students; and who are naturalised British
Disabled people (self-identify as disabled, with particular impairments, which have a long-term impact on quality of life) ³	Disabled people		Working with people across multiple disabilities
	Physical Impairment	Mobility	Physical/mobility impairment, such as a difficulty using your arms or mobility issues which require you to use a wheelchair or crutches
		Visual impairment / partial sight / sight loss	Visual impairment, such as being blind or having a serious visual impairment

² Note Judicial review pending for this to be recognised as part of race

³ This is adopting the Social Model of Disability, which holds that people with impairments are 'disabled' by the barriers operating in society that exclude and discriminate against them.

		Deaf / Hard of hearing / Hearing loss	Hearing impairment, such as being deaf or having a serious hearing impairment
		Speech impairment	Impaired ability to produce speech sounds
		Multiple	Multiple impairment
	Mental Health		Mental health condition or experience, such as depression or psychosis or addiction that impacts people's lives
	Cognitive differences	Learning difficulty ⁴	Learning difficulties such as Down's syndrome
		Neurodiverse	Cognitive difference such as autistic spectrum disorder where individuals are impacted by the social environment
	Health		Long-standing illness or health condition, such as cancer, HIV, diabetes, chronic heart disease or epilepsy, or other rare conditions
Other		Other - An impairment, medical condition or environmental disadvantage that is not listed above	
Older and younger people	Older People		Normally ⁵ those aged 60 and over
	Young adults		Normally young people from 16 to 25 years of age
	Young people		Normally young people from 8 to 25
	Children and Young People		Normally people under 26 but sometimes people under 19
	Children		Under 16
	Infants		Under 2 years of age
Women and girls	Women and girls		Those who identify and live as women and girls ⁶

⁴ There will be more consultation on the term 'learning difficulty' versus learning disability'

⁵ Added "normally" as some may identify as older people but falling outside of the age bracket.

⁶ Trans women are also recognised under LGBT+ people. LGBT+ communities advocate for 'lived sex' (gender) rather than sex assigned at birth or legal sex.

LGBT+ People (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans + people)	LGBT+ People		Working with people with multiple identities
	Bisexual people	Bisexual men	
		Bisexual women	
	Gay men	Gay men	
	Lesbian/gay women	Lesbian/gay women	
	Transgender people	Trans men	
		Trans women	
	Non-binary people	Non-binary people	
Other		Other LGBT+ People, including queer and intersex people	
People who are educationally or economically disadvantaged (self-identify as coming from an economically and/or educationally disadvantaged backgrounds, including working class backgrounds, with long-term impact on their life outcomes; and also include people experiencing financial hardship)	People who are educationally or economically disadvantaged		This will be defined by the organisation, such as children eligible for free school meals or for adults were eligible for free school meals as a child, families receiving benefits or universal credit, people who are homeless, people who did not complete formal education or otherwise considered in deprivation etc. ⁷
Welsh Language Speaking ⁸	Welsh Language Speaking		Only to be asked in Wales
Community background ⁹	The Protestant community		

⁷ Do we need to be more specific about the categories? We want to avoid IMD categorisation and other categories being used especially around parental professions can be quite complex and don't always reflect lived realities

⁸ Option in Wales only

⁹ Option in Northern Ireland only

	The Catholic community		
--	------------------------	--	--

Application of Taxonomy for Grants

The taxonomy above is generic and can be applied in different contexts. Here we outline the definitions of how it might be used in specific contexts for grantmaking.

The taxonomy above will be applied for grants, in three different areas. The population groups defined in the taxonomy will be choices. The areas below might be different sections on an application form. Not all funders will be interested in all three areas, depending on the nature of their funds and programmes. They may decide to only ask about one area - but ideally would still use the same definition/criteria when approaching the questions.

Eg a youth club working on a housing estate, but charitable objects restricted to young people in a geographical area. Board mainly from Black and Asian backgrounds

- Receiving support - Black, young people, economically disadvantaged
- Mission and purpose - young people
- Leadership - Communities experiencing racial inequity

Area	Description	Definition/criteria
People receiving primary benefits/ service users	The people who benefit from the project or the organisation	Over 75% of direct participants of the project or organisation/those receiving support
Mission and purpose	There is a specific community that the organisation was created to serve, or that their existing work explicitly and proactively engages a specific community	Referenced in the organisation's governing documents, constitution or Charity Commission registration, where relevant and/or be clear in their public facing materials
Leadership	The Board of Trustees, Directors, Management Committee and the Senior staff of the organisation collectively.	75% or more from Trustees (Board) from a particular identity or experience, or working towards that. AND 50% of senior staff from a particular identity or experience, or working towards that. Where a project within an organisation has a separate steering group with autonomous decision-making within this group, the threshold should apply to this unit.

Obviously the taxonomy above can be used in other areas - for example for funders' own leadership and staff looking at actual numbers instead of majorities – but this has been designed more as a framework for organisations than recording individuals.

Guidance

This will be developed when the overall taxonomy has been confirmed - but it is an explanation of how funders should collect the data/frame the questions.

It will include an explanation of why the data is being collected and how it will be used.

It will also recommend that questions are only asked where they are relevant.

It will also include guidance for recording other areas of lived experience that are additional to the classifications.

Examples

Below are some example organisations and how the taxonomy might be applied.

Description	People receiving support	Mission and Purpose	Leadership
A youth club working on a social housing estate, but charitable objects restricted to young people in a geographical area. Board mainly from Black and Asian backgrounds	Black, Young People, Economically disadvantaged	Young People	Communities experiencing racial inequity
Infrastructure organisation working on racial justice	Communities experiencing racial inequity	Communities experiencing racial inequity	Communities experiencing racial inequity
A project working with neurodivergent young people as part of a wider LGBT+ organisation	Neurodivergent Young People LGBT+	LGBT+	LGBT+
An organisation supporting asylum seekers with a mixed leadership	Asylum seekers	Asylum seekers	
A young people's mental health charity	Young people Mental Health	Young people Mental health	Mental Health
An organisation working to alleviate poverty	Economically disadvantaged	Economically disadvantaged	
A project supporting older people within an organisation supporting Chinese	Asian/Chinese Migrants	Asian/Chinese Migrants	Asian/Chinese

migrants. Board is mainly second generation Chinese migrants.	Older People		
---	--------------	--	--

In addition there will be an option for organisations to enter other forms of lived experience that are relevant to them but not included in the classifications - such as care experienced, experience of the criminal justice system, carers etc.

Annex: Participants

Organisations and individuals interviewed

Organisations:

- Inclusion London
- LGBT Consortium
- Women's Aid
- Women's Resources Centre
- Voice4Change
- Small Charities Coalition
- Race Disparity Unit
- The Funders for Race Equality Alliance
- Stonewall
- Ubele
- Migrant Voices
- Social Mobility Foundation
- Turn2Us
- UK Youth
- Centre for Mental Health
- Superhighways
- London Plus
- HERA Human Rights and Equalities Network
- Wing Hong Centre

Individuals:

- Fozia Irfan
- Osman Coban
- Elizabeth Balgobin