



## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>PROPOSAL TO BE ASSESSED:</b>	<b>Admissions Policy</b>
<b>IS THIS A NEW OR EXISTING PROPOSAL?</b>	Existing
<b>WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROPOSAL?</b>	Admissions, Registry
<b>ASSESSED BY:</b>	Assessment group included: Registrar Marketing and Student Recruitment Manager Admissions Lead SRUCSA President
<b>DATE OF ASSESSMENT:</b>	16/09/2021

Who is likely to benefit from this policy, procedure, relevant practise or decision?	This policy will benefit anyone thinking of making an application to SRUC. This will include potential applicants and those providing support and guidance to individuals (advisors/guidance staff, parents). Current students will also benefit from an understanding about progression between courses levels. SRUC staff will benefit from understanding how the policy works, their role in admissions and ensure a consistent and transparent admissions process.
Who is intended to benefit from the proposal and in what way?	As above, transparency of information for all applicants/supporters. Applicants can be treated in equitable and fair way.
1. What outcomes are wanted from this proposal?	The outcomes expected are that: SRUC has an admissions policy that is equitable and fair for all applicants.

<p>2. <u>Could</u> the proposal have a positive or negative impact on minority ethnic groups?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Please explain:  Positive  Group could not envisage how minority ethnic groups could be positively or negatively impacted.   Negative  Discrimination towards applicants at interview. Processes are in place to manage this.</p>
<p>3. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to gender?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Please explain:  Positive – policy includes wording that we welcome application from underrepresented groups.   Negative – there are courses within SRUC, where there are gender splits (eg few males within Vet Nursing, few females undertake Engineering. Work is ongoing to address the imbalance. We are restricted currently to the question asked at application on gender due to an external provider. This is being addressed and will be changed in the future.</p>
<p>4. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to disability?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Please explain:  Positive – included within policy that applicants should contact the Admissions Team to discuss support requirements that may be required to attend interview.   Negative – not all applicants will declare ASN at application stage. Ensure alternative points throughout the admissions process for applicants to disclose and discuss requirements.</p>
<p>5. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to sexual orientation?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Please explain:  Positive - Policy clearly states SRUC does not discriminate against protected characteristics</p>
<p>6. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to age?</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Please explain:  Positive – SRUC has one single admissions policy covering FE and HE level. Applicants/students working to same policy regardless of type of entry.  Policy mentions in specific terms – mature students</p>

7. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to religion, faith or belief?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please explain: Positive - Policy clearly states SRUC does not discriminate against protected characteristics. If interviews conflicted with religious periods, alternative arrangements could be made for applicants.
8. <u>Could</u> the proposal have a positive or negative impact due on people with dependants/caring responsibilities?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please explain: Positive - the policy explicitly mentions carers and refers them to also look at the contextual admissions policy.
9. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to transgender or transsexual?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please explain: Positive - Policy clearly states SRUC does not discriminate against protected characteristics. Policy is written using gender neutral words.
10. Will the positive or negative impact identified in sections 3-10 have a potentially adverse effect on this proposal?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please explain: Although may be negative impact there are arrangements in place to minimise the impact.
11. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please explain: Characteristics are being protected through the use of this policy.
12. Does the policy, procedure or relevant practise advance equality of opportunity	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
13. If 'yes' to 13 then how does the policy advance inclusivity?	This policy encourages inclusivity for all applicants. SRUC seeks to support all applicants from application stage through to enrolment and success undertaking a course.		
14. If 'no' to 13, could the policy, procedure or relevant practise be changed or revised to advance equality of opportunity and if so then how?			
Could this policy, procedure, relevant practise or decision result in a negative impact on people who share protected characteristics (Age, Disability, Gender reassignment, Marriage and civil partnership, Pregnancy and maternity, Race, Religion and belief, Sex and Sexual orientation) giving due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)? If YES or NOT KNOWN, what kind of evidence gathering and analysis is needed to improve this policy?	<del>Yes / No / Not known</del> (delete as appropriate)  Moving forward Admissions will analyse data relating to age, gender and disability of applicants to converted students.		

**Recommendation:**

No action required – no potential adverse impact



Amendments or changes required to remove barriers  
Proceed with awareness of adverse impacts  
Further evidence and analysis required

- To be undertaken by [Click here to enter a date.](#)
- 
- To be undertaken by [Click here to enter a date.](#)

Signed:	Claire Morrison
Name:	Claire Morrison
Job Title:	Admissions Lead