



EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

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

<p>Who is likely to benefit from this policy, procedure, relevant practise or decision?</p>	<p>Applicants will have a clear understanding of SRUC's commitment to widening access and to encourage applicants from the widest possible range of backgrounds to participate in Higher and Further Education at SRUC. Those providing support and guidance to individuals making applications (advisors/guidance staff, parents) will also benefit from the policy.</p> <p>This policy will allow applicants to identify themselves as benefiting from additional consideration in the admissions process. The policy clearly identifies the contextual indicators used in SRUC's decision making process.</p> <p>Staff will benefit from understanding of the identified contextual indicators and how they are used. Ensuring consistent and transparent use of the indicators in admissions process.</p>
---	---

<p>Who is intended to benefit from the proposal and in what way?</p>	<p>Applicants who fall within the identified contextual indicators will benefit from this policy.</p> <p>The policy will hopefully encourage potential applicants to declare information in their application that highlights meeting contextual indicators. Allowing admissions to consider applications in a consistent and transparent way.</p>	
<p>1. What outcomes are wanted from this proposal?</p>	<p>The outcomes expected are that: Applicants and their supporters are aware of the contextual indicators used in SRUC's admissions process. Applicants who met the criteria have a good chance of success in FE/HE are encouraged to apply even though they don't meet publish entry requirements (for good reason). SRUC meets widening access targets set by SFC.</p>	
<p>2. <u>Could</u> the proposal have a positive or negative impact on minority ethnic groups?</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please explain: Positive Contextual indicators within the policy highlights support for applicants identifying as coming from a Gypsy, Roma or Travelling Community and Government recognised refugee or asylum status.</p> <p>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 checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please explain: Positive Contextual indicators within the policy highlights support for applicants identifying as unpaid carers.</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: Negative Applicants from contextual indicators groups may also have ASN requirements. Ensuring that applicants declare ASN requirements at application stage allows support to be determined and arranged before start of course.</p>

5. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to sexual orientation?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please explain: Not an indicator in this policy.
6. Is it likely that the proposal <u>could</u> have a positive or negative impact due to age?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Please explain: Positive Contextual indicators within the policy highlights support for applicants identifying as having an unpaid caring role including young carers aged 16-25 and applicant's estranged from family and living without family support.
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: Not an indicator in this policy.
8. <u>Could</u> the proposal have a positive or negative impact due on people with dependants/caring responsibilities?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Please explain: Positive – the policy encourages applicants from those with an unpaid caring role including young carers aged 16-25.
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: Not an indicator in this policy.
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: The policy is written to encourage and support applicants from contextual indicators groups
11. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Please explain: The policy promotes equality of opportunity for more than one group (including veterans, service children, areas of deprivation (SIMD and free school meals, gypsy and travelling community, refugee and asylum status)
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 12 then how does the policy advance inclusivity?	The policy advances inclusivity by encouraging applications from applicants who don't meet published entry requirement but meet one or more of the contextual indicators.		
14. If 'no' to 12, could the policy, procedure or relevant practise be changed or revised to advance equality of opportunity and if so then how?			

<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes / No / Not known (delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Further analysis is needed on which contextual indicators are most common with applicants/accepted applicants.</p>
--	--

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

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