

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Policy, practice, process or service title:	Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy 2025-2030
Policy, practice, process or service lead/ owner:	Pauline Hanesworth
Others involved in EqlA assessment group	Assessment group included: Academic Enhancement Lead, Academic Enhancement Officer, Head of Learning and Teaching, Lecturer x 2
Policy, practice, process or service implementation date:	01/09/2025

1 Framing the policy, practice, process or service

1.1 Briefly describe the outcomes, aims and purpose of the policy, practice, process or service:

The Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Strategy 2025-2030 outlines SRUC's aims for learning and teaching and its main strategies to enhance learning and teaching over the 2025/26 to 2029/30 period.

1.2 Is the policy, practice, process or service new or being changed, reviewed or stopped?

The policy is an updated version of the 2020-2030 version. The main pillars and principles have not changed: these outline how SRUC's learning, teaching and assessment will enable our learners to become successful in their chosen profession, able to anticipate, respond to, and bring about real change in an uncertain world, full of new challenges and opportunities (Learning for Change), and will widen

access to and participation in subjects relating to their natural worlds and their economies, nurturing all learners' potential to succeed (Learning for All). Overall, learning and teaching at SRUC aims for all our learners to have an effective and inclusive learning experience. It is the strategies to further implement these aims that have been updated.

1.3 Who is affected by this policy, practice, process or service?

The strategy applies to all learners studying at SRUC, and to staff that contribute to learning and teaching activities, and to the broader learning experience.

1.4 Are there any other SRUC policies that may be affected by this policy, practice, process or service?

There will likely be cumulative impacts on various policies within the Education Manual. These will be updated, and EqIA'd as required throughout the strategy implementation period.

2 Evidence relevant to the policy, practice, process or service including consultation.

The information you gather in this section will:

- help you to understand the importance of your policy, practice, process or service for different equality groups,
- inform the depth of equality impact assessment you need to do (this should be proportional to the potential impact on equality groups), and
- provide justification and an audit trail behind your decisions, including where it is agreed an equality impact assessment is not required.

2.1 Evidence: Set out in the table what you know about the experiences of people in terms of each equality group. Consider the diversity within each group (e.g. experiences of people from different religions or faiths) as well as the differences between groups. There may also be cumulative barriers experienced by people when you look at more than one group together (e.g. experiences of women of different minority ethnic groups, so the intersectional impact of sex and race).

You can add more rows to present the evidence if required.

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
A note on data. Data is taken from the latest available, with reference to earlier years where possible.		
A note on surveys. The SSES and SWS survey return significantly more responses than the NSS (in 2024, the SSES and SWS saw 1,236 responses (619 and 617 respectively) while the NSS saw 161). The SSES and SWS also cover a much broader range of SRUC provision. As such, where there are differences between surveys, or where the SSES/SWS return a pattern not seen in the NSS, the SSES/SWS return is given greater weight. To note, the EDI Audit returned 146 learners in 2024, Speak Week, 205.		
Age	1] Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (FE only)	1] There is no substantial sustained difference in overarching responses to the SSES according to Age. With regard to question scales, there is no substantial difference in the Learning and Teaching or Assessment, Feedback and Communication scales or in Overall Satisfaction. There is a minor difference in Student Voice and Community, with mature learners (21+) less likely to return positive satisfaction scores in this category.
	2] SRUC-Wide Survey (HE and PGT)	2] There is no substantial difference in overarching responses to the SWS according to Age. With regard to question scales, learners aged 21-24 were slightly less likely to return positive satisfaction scores in the Student Voice and Community category.
	3] National Student Satisfaction Survey (Final Year HE only)	3] There is no substantial difference to most of the responses to the NSS, excepting the Organisation and Management scale and Students' Association question. For both, learners between 26-30 were substantially less likely to return a positive satisfaction score in 2024. However, this is not a sustained difference with previous years seeing this category of learners returning the highest or significantly higher satisfaction.
	4] Speak Week (All)	4] In 2024, Speak Week did not return any specific information regarding Age.

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>7] Appeals Data (All)</p> <p>8] Attainment Data (All)</p> <p>9] College Leavers Destinations Survey (FE)</p> <p>10] Graduate Outcomes Survey (HE)</p>	<p>over sitting within the Golf, Food and Drink, and Environment and Conservation Boards.</p> <p>7] Age data is not reported for appeals.</p> <p>8] In 2022/23, attainment data saw minor, but no substantial difference with respect to Age overall. Differences appear at the study and mode level. Learners aged 30+ studying at FE level were more likely to complete successfully than those 29 and under; learners aged 21+ studying at HE level were more likely to complete successfully than those 20 and under. Learners aged 21-29 were slightly more likely to complete if studying full time rather than part time.</p> <p>9] Those aged 25 and above are substantially less likely to be in a positive destination (further study / work) than those aged 16-24, though the extent of the gap varies (i.e. 11.9 percentage points, 20.4 percentage points, and 7.3 percentage points in 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2021/22 respectively).</p> <p>10] The 2023 survey (based on SRUC learners graduating in 2020/21) reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The percentage of SRUC graduates aged 21-25 in full-time employment is in line with the Scottish and UK average, those aged 20 and under working full-time is slightly higher than UK providers and 10 percentage points higher than Scottish providers. However, those aged 25-29 is behind both Scottish and UK averages (55% vs 68%). • Graduates aged 21-24 and 30 and over were substantially more likely to be in part time employment than the UK and Scotland averages.

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRUC remains behind the Scottish and UK average for graduates entering further education for all age groups apart from graduates aged 25-29. • Unemployment rates for SRUC graduates are below the UK and Scottish averages for all age groups apart from the age group 25-29.
Disability	<p>1] Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (FE only)</p> <p>2] SRUC-Wide Survey (HE and PGT)</p> <p>3] National Student Satisfaction Survey (Final Year HE only)</p> <p>4] Speak Week (All)</p> <p>5] EDI Audit (All)</p>	<p>1] There is no substantial sustained difference in overarching responses to the SSES according to Disability. There is also no substantial difference in the questions scales.</p> <p>2] There is no substantial difference in overarching responses to the SWS according to Disability. There is also no substantial difference in the questions scales.</p> <p>3] Respondents disclosing as disabled generally returned higher positive measures than those who did not in the NSS. In 2024, the Organisation and Management Scale was an exception to this, with learners disclosing as disabled – particularly a cognitive or learning disability – less likely to return a positive satisfaction score than those who did not. However, this is not a sustained difference when compared to previous years.</p> <p>4] The 2024 Speak Week reported a call for more and more consistent support for learners disclosing as disabled.</p> <p>5] Learners disclosing as disabled were significantly less likely to say that SRUC is committed to promoting EDI and that SRUC is responsive to concerns about EDI than those who did not disclose as disabled. Learners disclosing as disabled were also significantly less likely to feel comfortable speaking up and expressing their opinions than those who did not disclose. Learners disclosing as disabled were significantly less</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
		<p>likely to feel their mental health and/or wellbeing are being supported and that they feel confident in asking for mental health and/or wellbeing support than those who did not disclose. The qualitative analysis also highlighted lack of appropriate / adequate support for learners with disabilities in teaching and learning, lack of access and/or awareness of support for disability (mainly with reference to physical disabilities, mental health issues, and neurodivergence) and lack of resources and/or training for particular groups, including learners with disabilities. The EDI audit recommended that SRUC provide specific training, resources, and support to improve the experiences of staff and learners with disabilities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing training provision to ensure there is robust training in disability and mental health for all staff, in particular staff involved in teaching and learning. • Ensuring there is clear information and guidance for disabled learners on available support and that this is clearly communicated and signposted. • Reviewing disability and reasonable adjustment policies in collaboration with disabled staff and learners to ensure they are robust. • Ensuring that the disclosure of disability by staff and learners is adequately supported. • Considering joining the Disabled Students Commitment, developed by Advance HE's Disabled Students' Commission. • Reviewing student support mechanisms such as the accessibility of student support email addresses, whether these are adequately resourced/working at capacity, and ensuring that support mechanisms/processes are clearly communicated with learners. • Reviewing curricula to ensure that there is disability representation and that it is accessible to disabled learners.

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	6] Student Demographics (All)	6] In 2023/24, 28% of SRUC learners disclosed a disability, 30% at FE level, 24% at HE level and 23% at PG level. This is commensurate with sector averages at the FE level, higher than sector averages for HE level (Scotland and rUK 2021/22 data: 18%) and substantially higher for PG level (Scotland = 9%, rUK = 10%). This varies by Board of Study with the highest percentage of learners disclosing a disability sitting in the Horticulture and Landscape Board, and the lowest percentage sitting in Golf, Food and Drink.
	7] Complaints and Appeals Data (All)	7] Disability data is not reported for appeals.
	8] Attainment Data (All)	8] In 2022/23, attainment data saw minor, but no substantial difference with respect to Disability overall. Differences appear at the study and mode level. Learners disclosing a disability and studying at FE level were slightly more likely to succeed than those who did not, whereas those at the PG level disclosing a disability were less likely to succeed. Those disclosing a disability and studying part time were more likely to succeed.
	9] College Leavers Destinations (FE)	Data differs every year, with some years those respondents disclosing as disabled more likely to be in a positive destination those who did not disclose. In 2018/19 and 2021/22, those disclosing an SpLD were less likely to be in a positive destination, but this was not seen in 2019/20. In 2019/20 and 2021/22, those disclosing a social impairment were less likely to be in a positive destination, but this was not seen in 2018/19.
	10] Graduate Outcomes Survey (HE)	10] The 2023 survey (based on SRUC learners graduating in 2020/21) reported that:

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The percentage of SRUC graduates disclosing a disability in full-time employment is 10 percentage points lower than those graduates who did not disclose a disability and 17 percentage points lower than the UK average. However, this is in line with Scottish average. • SRUC graduates disclosing a disability recorded much higher rates of part-time employment than seen in UK and Scottish averages. • SRUC remains behind the Scottish and UK average for graduates disclosing a disability entering further education. • Unemployment rates for SRUC graduates disclosing a disability are in line with UK and Scottish averages.
Race	1] Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (FE only)	<p>It is difficult to make claims to significance in relation to data with regard to race owing to the underrepresentation of learners from Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) backgrounds (see 6]). This underrepresentation also means that where data exists, disaggregation has not been possible.</p> <p>1] There is slight difference in overarching responses to the SSES according to Race, with learners from White ethnic backgrounds returning higher positive satisfaction scores than those from BAME backgrounds. With regard to question scales, learners from White ethnic backgrounds were slightly more likely to return positive satisfaction scores in the Learning and Teaching and Student Voice and Community scales than those from BAME backgrounds. There is no substantial difference in the Assessment, Feedback and Communication scale. Learners from White ethnic backgrounds were substantially more likely to be satisfied with their college experience in 2024 than those from BAME backgrounds, though this is not the case in previous years.</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>2] SRUC-Wide Survey (HE and PGT)</p> <p>3] National Student Satisfaction Survey (Final Year HE only)</p> <p>4] Speak Week (All)</p> <p>5] EDI Audit (All)</p>	<p>2] There is substantial difference in overarching responses to the SWS according to Race with learners from BAME backgrounds returning higher positive satisfaction scores than those from White backgrounds. With regard to question scales, learners from BAME backgrounds were slightly more likely to return positive satisfaction scores in the Learning and Teaching and Assessment, Feedback and Communication scales than those from White backgrounds, and substantially more likely to return positive satisfaction scores in the Student Voice and Community scale.</p> <p>3] Responses from learners from BAME backgrounds have not been published by Ipsos Mori owing to low numbers.</p> <p>4] In 2024, Speak Week did not return any specific information regarding Race.</p> <p>5] Learners from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds felt significantly more strongly that people really care about them at SRUC and that they are comfortable speaking up and expressing opinions than learners from White ethnic backgrounds. Learners from BAME backgrounds were also significantly more likely to feel that their mental health and/or wellbeing are supported than learners from White ethnic backgrounds. However, the qualitative analysis highlighted the impact of a visible lack of ethnic diversity at SRUC, and the need to fit around the culture of the dominant majority. The EDI audit recommended that SRUC provide specific training, resources, and support to improve the experiences of staff and learners from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds and support the increase in staff and learners from diverse ethnic backgrounds, including:</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	6] Student Demographics (All)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring training goes beyond statutory requirements and includes awareness raising of cultural/structural issues. • Considering unconscious bias training for all staff members. • Working on building trust and sustained relationships with staff and learners from diverse ethnic backgrounds, with the aim of engaging them as co-creators. • Reviewing recruitment processes to ensure they are inclusive of and attractive to those from minority ethnic backgrounds. • Reviewing curricula to ensure that there is representation of those from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds. <p>6] In 2023/24, 97% of SRUC learners were from White ethnic backgrounds. This is substantially higher than sector averages for UK domiciled learners at the HE/PG level (Scotland and rUK 2021/22 data: 89.1% and 71.2% respectively), higher than Scotland FE levels (91.5% FT and 84.1% PT in 2021/22) and higher than the Scottish population according to the 2022 census (92.9%). It is also higher than UK domiciled learners at the HE/PG level studying agriculture, food and related studies (93%), engineering and technology (88.4%), geographical and environmental studies (natural sciences) (88.9%), veterinary sciences (92.2%), and business and management (68.4%), though it is commensurate with FE learners in Scotland's colleges studying agriculture, horticulture and animal care (98.2% in 2021/22) (though this average will be significantly influenced by SRUC's own figures).</p>
	7] Complaints and Appeals Data (All)	7] Race data is not reported for appeals.

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>8] Attainment Data (All)</p> <p>9] College Leavers Destinations (FE)</p> <p>10] Graduate Outcomes Survey (HE)</p>	<p>8] In 2022/23, attainment data saw differences with respect to Race overall, with learners from BAME backgrounds less likely to succeed than those from White ethnic backgrounds (69% and 75% respectively). Differences appear at the study and mode level for learners from BAME backgrounds only. Learners from BAME backgrounds studying at HE level were less likely to succeed than those studying at FE or PG level; and learners studying part-time were more likely to succeed than those studying full time.</p> <p>9] Respondents from BAME backgrounds were less likely to report being in a positive destination than those from white backgrounds across the latest three years for which we have data. However, numbers are very low (n = 5-10).</p> <p>10] Responses from learners from BAME backgrounds are too low for analysis.</p>
Sex	<p>1] Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (FE only)</p> <p>2] SRUC-Wide Survey (HE and PGT)</p>	<p>1] Where known, there is no substantial sustained difference in overarching responses to the SSES or the question scales according to Sex.</p> <p>2] Where known, there is no substantial difference in overarching responses to the SWS between female and male learners; however, “other” learners returned substantially lower positive satisfaction scores. With regard to question scales, female learners returned slightly lower positive satisfaction scores than male learners in the Assessment, Feedback and Communication, and Student Voice and Community scales. Other learners returned substantially lower positive satisfaction scores in all scales.</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	3] National Student Satisfaction Survey (Final Year HE only)	3] Male respondents returned substantially lower positive measures in the Teaching on My Course, Organisation and Management, and Student Voice scales in 2024. Female respondents returned slightly lower positive measures in the Learning Resources scale. The difference in the Teaching on My Course scale is common to previous NSS returns. The differences in Organisation and Management and Learning Resources are not consistent, varying each year. The differences in Student Voice appears to be an anomaly with previous NSS years seeing female respondents returning lower positive measures in this scale.
	4] Speak Week (All)	4] In 2024, Speak Week did not return any specific information regarding Sex.
	5] EDI Audit (All)	5] Female learners were significantly more positive in their rating of people being treated equally at SRUC than male learners. Male learners felt more involved in the social life at SRUC than female learners. Elsewise, no significant differences were found in the EDI audit with regard to Sex.
	6] Student Demographics (All)	6] In 2023/24, 53% of SRUC learners were female and 46% male. There are differences according to level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At FE level, 46% of learners were female, 53% male. This is different to the Scottish FE sector overall (data from 2022/23) which saw 51% female learners and 49% male learners. • At HE level, 62% of learners were female, 37% male. This is slightly different to Scottish and rUK sector averages (within 2 percentage points of Scotland average and 5 percentage points of rUK; data from 2021/22). • At PG level, 59% of learners were female, 40% male. This is commensurate with Scottish and rUK sector averages (data from 2021/22).

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>7] Complaints and Appeals Data (All)</p> <p>8] Attainment Data (All)</p> <p>9] College Leavers Destinations (FE)</p> <p>10] Graduate Outcomes Survey (HE)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This varies extensively by Board of Study, with the highest percentage of female learners sitting within Veterinary Sciences (95%), and the highest percentage of male learners sitting within Golf, Food and Drink (97%), followed by Forestry, Forgework and Engineering (88%). In comparison, at the HE/PG level (data as of 2021/22), 63.8% of learners studying agriculture, food and related studies were female, 20.5% of learners studying engineering and technology, 53.3% of learners studying geographical and environmental studies (natural sciences), 82.9% of learners studying veterinary sciences and 47.1% of learners studying business and management. <p>7] Appeals data indicates disparity between female and male students, with female students more likely to appeal than male students (2023/24: 15 vs 2; 2022/23: 13 vs 3).</p> <p>8] In 2022/23, attainment data saw no substantial difference with respect to Sex overall. Differences appear at the study level for male learners, who were more likely to succeed if studying at HE level, than FE level and PG level (77%, 73% and 70% respectively). There was no difference according to mode of study.</p> <p>9] Excepting in 2018/29, there is no substantial difference in respondent data according to Sex.</p> <p>10] The 2023 survey (based on SRUC learners graduating in 2020/21) reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Male SRUC graduates show higher rates of full-time employment than female graduates. This is in line with Scottish and UK trends. SRUC remains below UK and Scottish averages for male graduates entering full-time employment (SRUC

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
		<p>59%; Scotland 63%; UK 62%), as well as for female graduates (SRUC 47%; Scotland 61%; UK 60%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRUC graduates find themselves in part-time employment at higher proportions than seen across the sector, with 20% female graduates and 13% of male graduates in part-time work (Scotland: 11% and 8%; UK: 11% and 9%). • SRUC female graduates taking up further study was 18%, close to the Scottish and UK average of 17%. Male graduates taking up further study was 13%, remaining consistently below the UK and Scottish averages for the fourth survey in a row. • 3% of male graduates said they were unemployed at the time of survey, below UK and Scottish provider averages (6% and 5% respectively). 4% of female graduates said they were unemployed at the time of survey, the same as the Scottish average, and close to the UK average (4% and 5% respectively).
Gender Reassignment	<p>1] Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (FE only)</p> <p>2] SRUC-Wide Survey (HE and PGT)</p>	<p>1] There is no substantial sustained difference in overarching responses to the SSES or the question scales according to Gender Reassignment.</p> <p>2] In 2024, respondents whose gender identity is different from the gender originally assigned at birth were substantially less likely to return a positive measure in their overarching responses to the SWS than those whose gender identity was the same. This is the same for overall satisfaction and the Assessment, Feedback and Communication scale, but not for the Learning and Teaching or Student Voice and Community Scales.</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>3] National Student Satisfaction Survey (Final Year HE only)</p> <p>4] Speak Week (All)</p> <p>5] EDI Audit (All)</p> <p>6] Student Demographics (All)</p>	<p>3] Data on Gender Reassignment is not reported in the NSS.</p> <p>4] In 2024, Speak Week did not return any specific information regarding Gender Reassignment.</p> <p>5] 18 learners who responded to the survey identified as trans or having a trans status. This equates to 12.3%. Of those learners, 28.6% felt unable to discuss their trans identify with others at SRUC. Learners who identified as trans or having a trans history were significantly less likely to say that they are involved in the social life of SRUC than learners who did not identify as trans. Learners who identified as trans or having a trans history were significantly less likely to say that they know how to report bullying and/or harassment at SRUC than learners who did not identify as trans. The qualitative research indicated that for some participants, their personal characteristics including gender identity made them feel othered at SRUC, causing a barrier to their sense of belonging. These participants felt they were outside of the norm of the dominant majority at SRUC, contributing to a feeling of being an outsider. The EDI report recommended that SRUC provide specific training, resources, and support to improve the experiences of staff and learners in relation to gender (including transgender) and sexual orientation. More detail on this can be found in the Sexual Orientation row.</p> <p>6] In 2023/24, just over 1% of learners reported being transgender, equivalent to the sector average. However, the question at registration on gender identity has been removed for HE learners, so this figure may not be an accurate representation of the cohort as 33% of learners have not disclosed this information. This figure must also be</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>7] Complaints and Appeals Data (All)</p> <p>8] Attainment Data (All)</p> <p>9] College Leavers Destinations (FE)</p> <p>10] Graduate Outcomes Survey (HE)</p>	<p>understood in the context of under-disclosure emphasised in the EDI audit report. The numbers were too low to report at SCQF level or by Board of Study.</p> <p>7] Gender reassignment data is not reported for appeals.</p> <p>8] In 2022/23, attainment data saw no substantial difference with respect to Gender Reassignment overall, where the data was provided. While differences appear at the study level for those whose gender identity is different from the gender originally assignment at birth (i.e., more likely to succeed at FE level than HE level) the numbers are very small and should be treated with caution.</p> <p>9] Data on Gender Reassignment is not reported in the CLD.</p> <p>10] Data on Gender Reassignment is not reported in the GOS.</p>
Sexual orientation	1] Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (FE only)	1] In 2023 and 2024, respondents who are other were less likely to return positive satisfaction scores in their overarching responses to the SSES than those who are heterosexual, bisexual, gay or lesbian. Overall satisfaction sees consistent lower positive scores for other learners; 2024 also saw gay or lesbian learners returning lower positive scores, though this is not the case for previous years. The same pattern can be found in the Learning and Teaching scale. The Assessment, Feedback and Communication scale sees the same difference for other learners, but those who are gay or lesbian returned

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	2] SRUC-Wide Survey (HE and PGT)	the highest positive scores. The Student Voice and Community Scale sees bisexual and other learners returning lower positive scores. 2] In 2024, respondents who are gay or lesbian or other were less likely to return a positive measure in their overarching responses to the SWS than those who are heterosexual or bisexual. Gay or lesbian learners were substantially less likely to return a positive score in the Assessment, Feedback and Communication scale. Gay or lesbian or other learners were substantially less likely to return a positive score in the Student Voice and Community scale. No substantial difference was seen in the Learning and Teaching scale.
	3] National Student Satisfaction Survey (Final Year HE only)	3] In 2024, respondents who are lesbian, gay or bisexual were substantially more likely to return a positive score in the overall satisfaction question than those who are heterosexual. This is the reverse of 2023, where heterosexual learners were more likely to return a positive satisfaction score. The only scales to see substantial difference in 2024 were the Learning Resources scale, where heterosexual learners were more likely to return a positive satisfaction score, and the Student Voice scale where lesbian, gay or bisexual learners were more likely to return a positive satisfaction score. The latter is the reverse of 2023, while the former saw no difference in 2023. Sexual orientation data was not reported on prior to 2023.
	4] Speak Week (All)	4] In 2024, Speak Week did not return any specific information regarding Sexual Orientation.
	5] EDI Audit (All)	5] No statistically significant differences were found in the responses to the survey with respect to Sexual Orientation. However, the qualitative research indicated that for some

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	6] Student Demographics (All)	<p>participants, their personal characteristics including sexual orientation made them feel othered at SRUC, causing a barrier to their sense of belonging. These participants felt they were outside of the norm of the dominant majority at SRUC, contributing to a feeling of being an outsider. The report highlighted the lack of resources and/or training on support for particular groups (including LGBTQ+). The report recommended that SRUC provide specific training, resources, and support to improve the experiences of staff and learners in relation to gender and sexual orientation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating safe spaces both in person and online for LGBTQ+ communities to develop, encouraging visibility and peer support. • reviewing toilet provisions to ensure there are gender neutral toilets available to trans gender and non-binary staff and learners. • ensuring mental health and disability support acknowledges the intersection of these with gender and sexual orientation and that student wellbeing services are competent with specialist knowledge of sexuality, gender orientation and identity alongside representation from LGBTQ+ staff (Marshall, 2023). • reviewing curricula to ensure that there is LGBTQ+ (Ward and Gale, 2017) and female representation. • celebrating and championing LGBTQ+ staff and learners through communications, research, fostering of inclusive spaces, representation on campus, in media and in curriculum, and consider the use of pronouns in email signatures (Marshall, 2023). <p>6] In 2023/24, 82% of learners reported being heterosexual. 8% reported being gay, lesbian or bisexual. 7% chose not to disclose. There are differences according to level with 6% of FE learners being gay, lesbian or bisexual, 10% of HE learners, and 14% of</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>7] Complaints and Appeals Data (All)</p> <p>8] Attainment Data (All)</p> <p>9] College Leavers Destinations (FE)</p> <p>10] Graduate Outcomes Survey (HE)</p>	<p>PG learners. Sector average (as of 2021/22) is 7.7% gay, lesbian or bisexual, 2.3% other, and 16.2% either refusing the information or leaving the field blank. Sexual orientation was not broken down by Board of Study owing to figures available being too low.</p> <p>7] Sexual orientation data is not reported for appeals.</p> <p>8] In 2022/23, attainment data saw differences with respect to Sexual Orientation overall with gay or lesbian learners less likely to succeed than heterosexual or bisexual learners. Differences appear at the study and mode level for bisexual learners, who were more likely to succeed at HE level than FE and slightly less likely to succeed if studying full time rather than part time. Minimal differences were seen at the study and model level for gay, lesbian or heterosexual learners.</p> <p>9] Data on Sexual Orientation is not reported in the CLD.</p> <p>10] Data on Gender Reassignment is not reported in the GOS.</p>
Religion or Belief		<p>Religion and belief data is not returned by the SSES, SWS, NSS, CLD or GOS, or in complaints and appeals data. Speak week also did not return information regarding Religion. In lieu of the paucity of internal data, external research on religion or belief in tertiary education has been included.</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>1] EDI Audit (All)</p> <p>2] Student Demographics (All)</p> <p>3] Attainment Data (All)</p> <p>4] Equality Challenge Unit's 2011 <i>Religion or belief in higher education: the experiences of staff and students</i></p>	<p>1] More than half of the learners who participated in the survey reported having no religious belief system (63.8%). The remaining half of the sample consisted of participants from Christian, Hindu, or Spiritual backgrounds, with 10 learners preferring not to disclose. Some participants who reported a religion felt able to discuss religion with other SRUC members with 44.2% of learners selecting yes and an additional 30.2% selecting with some but not all. No statistically significant differences were found in the responses to the survey with respect to Religion or Belief, and the characteristic did not come up in the qualitative research.</p> <p>2] In 2023/24, 78% of learners did not belong to any religious denomination. 17% of learners reported being of Christian faith. This is higher than the sector average (as of 2021/22) which saw 43.8% learners claim no religion, increasing to 54.7% in Scotland. This is also higher than subject averages (at HE/PG level), which saw 52.3% agriculture, food and related studies learners claiming no religion, 42.2% engineering and technology learners, 58.3% geography, earth and environment studies (natural sciences), 54.9% veterinary sciences and 30.5% business and management learners.</p> <p>8] In 2022/23, attainment data saw no differences with respect to Religion or Belief overall with only minimal differences according to mode or level of study.</p> <p>4] The overwhelming majority of learners reported themselves satisfied with both the content and the teaching of their courses. There was a level of variety among learners by religion or belief group as to how far course content and teaching were seen to be sensitive to their religion or belief. Muslim, Christian and Jewish learners were more likely to disagree that their course content was sensitive to their religion or belief than Hindu, Sikh or No religion learners. Muslim, Christian and Buddhist learners were more</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>5] NUS's 2012 <i>No Place for Hate: Hate Crimes and Incidents in Further and Higher Education</i>.</p>	<p>likely to disagree that their teaching was sensitive to their religion and belief than Spiritual, Pagan and No religion learners.</p> <p>The research highlighted how most institutions organise their academic year based on public holidays, which broadly align with the western Christian calendar, which could be challenging for learners and staff of other faiths (and sometimes Orthodox Christians), who wished to celebrate holy days and religious festivals.</p> <p>Relatively few participants in the study wished to wear religious dress or symbols (10%). Those that did wish to observe certain dress codes (mostly Muslim, Sikh and Jewish respondents) mostly felt comfortable doing so (79.3%). However, participants reported experiencing challenges, particularly in programmes of study in medical or health-related disciplines, where clothing must meet health-and-safety requirements.</p> <p>The research indicated that in some cases there were tensions between religion or belief and other protected groups. Of particular note was the tension between religion or belief and sexual orientation</p> <p>5] 52% of Muslim, 35% of Hindu, 33% of Sikh and 32% of Jewish respondents were very or fairly worried about being subject to abuse because of prejudice against their religion or belief, compared to 4% of respondents who were atheist and 4% of respondents who identified as having no religion. Almost one fifth of hate incidents reported by respondents were thought to have had an element of religious prejudice. 43% Jewish, 37% Hindu, 36% Buddhist and 36% Muslim learners surveyed also stated that they altered their behaviour, personal appearance, or daily patterns due to worries about prejudiced abuse.</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>6] University UK's 2016 <i>Report of the UUK Taskforce examining violence against women, harassment and hate crime affecting university students.</i></p> <p>7] Advance HE's 2020 <i>Research Insight: Religion and Belief in UK Higher Education</i></p>	<p>6] Of the 924 antisemitic incidents recorded in the UK in 2015, 2.3% of cases involved Jewish learners, academics, or other student bodies, with 1.4% taking place on campus. Of the 1,128 reports of anti-Muslim incidents from victims, witnesses, and third-party organisations, around 6% of female victims and 14% of male victims were at an educational institution (level not specified) when the incident occurred. Of the hate crimes reported by the home office for 2014/15 (England and Wales only), 6% were religion hate crimes (vs 82% being race based and 11% sexual orientation based). Nb., later reports show an increase in the proportion of hate crimes motivated by religion each year.</p> <p>7] There is a strong relationship between learner religious identification and their declared ethnicity. Hindu and Muslim learners were relatively overrepresented in science, engineering and technology subjects. Learners who were relatively underrepresented in SET subjects included Jewish, Spiritual and Buddhist learners and learners with any other religion or belief. Nearly nine out of 10 learners who declared their religion as Jewish graduated with a First or 2:1 degree. Learners with no religion also qualified with relatively high attainment. In contrast, less than two-thirds of Muslim learners graduated with a first or 2:1. Attainment gaps were present both within university mission groups and within different subject areas. On average, HEIs with a higher proportion of Muslim learners or staff had smaller attainment gaps between Muslim learners and those with no religion or belief. HEIs with fewer Muslim learners and staff had larger attainment gaps.</p> <p>Intersectionality: Learners who reported no religion and Muslim learners made up larger proportions of younger learners and smaller proportions of learners aged 36 and over.</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
		The converse was true for Christian learners. Relatively high proportions of Spiritual and Jewish learners disclosed a disability. Muslim, Sikh, Buddhist and Hindu learners disclosed a disability in relatively low proportions. Attainment gaps by religion and belief were present and relatively similar in almost all subgroups of age, disability, ethnicity, gender, and social background.
Pregnancy or maternity	<p>1] EDI Audit (All)</p> <p>2] ECU's 2010 <i>Student pregnancy and maternity</i>.</p>	<p>Pregnancy or maternity data is not returned by the SSES, SWS, NSS, CLD or GOS, or in student demographics, complaints and appeals, or attainment data. Speak week also did not return information regarding pregnancy or maternity. In lieu of the paucity of internal data, external research on pregnancy and or maternity in tertiary education was sought; however, very little research exists.</p> <p>1] There was an insufficient number of learner participants reporting any type of leave of absence from their course related to a pregnancy or partner's pregnancy to consider any differences for learners according to this protected characteristic.</p> <p>2] Reports NUS 2009 research based on interviews with 2,167 learners in higher and further education with children. 29% of these respondents became pregnant during their course (sector data on this is not available). Of these, 59% did not feel supported by their college or university. Issues facing pregnant learners included being forced to withdraw from their course, taking longer out of their course after giving birth than they would like, and being prevented from sitting exams.</p> <p>The number of learners who become pregnant during their studies is likely to increase as data from Scotland and other European countries show a positive correlation between the increasing age profile of learners and the likelihood of their having a child.</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
Marriage or civil partnership	N/A	N/A – not considered in student-focused policies.
Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation	<p>1] National Student Satisfaction Survey (Final Year HE only)</p> <p>2] Speak Week (All)</p> <p>3] EDI Audit (All)</p>	<p>SIMD data is not gathered for SSES or SWS</p> <p>1] Learners from SIMD20 returned substantially lower overall satisfaction scores than other learners in 2024. However, this is not the case in previous years where they have either returned in the highest overall satisfaction scores (2023 and 2021) or equivalent to other learners. In 2024, SIMD20 learners returned substantially lower positive measures in the Learning Opportunities, Assessment and Feedback and Learning Resources scales. The only scale where this appears to be common is in Learning Resources; the other two scales vary year-by-year. In 2024, SIMD20 learners returned highest positive measures in the Organisation and Management, Academic Support and Teaching on My Course scales; however, these scales again vary year-by-year.</p> <p>2] While Speak Week in 2024 did not mention SIMD specifically, the report highlighted that finance was one of the most mentioned themes in the survey returns. The majority of comments focused on food and the impact of the cost-of-living crisis and rising canteen costs, followed by transport costs, and then a lack of financial support.</p> <p>3] SIMD was not explored in the EDI audit. However, learners were asked about parental qualifications and type of school attended. No statistically significant findings regarding this arose from the survey and the topic did not appear in the qualitative research.</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>4] Student Demographics (All)</p> <p>7] Complaints and Appeals Data (All)</p> <p>8] Attainment Data (All)</p> <p>9] College Leavers Destinations (FE)</p> <p>10] Graduate Outcomes Survey (HE)</p>	<p>4] In 2023/24, 6% of learners were from SIMD10 areas and 12% from SIMD20. Numbers were too small to disaggregate at level or Board of Study. The Scottish Government's ambition is that by 2030 learners from the most deprived 20% backgrounds (SIMD20) should represent 20% entrants to higher education.</p> <p>7] SIMD data is not reported for appeals.</p> <p>8] In 2022/23, attainment data saw differences with respect to SIMD overall, with learners from SIMD20 backgrounds being least likely to succeed and likelihood of success increasing as the SIMD progresses from most to least deprived. Differences appear at the study and mode level. SIMD20 learners were substantially more likely to succeed if studying at FE level, and if studying part time. This difference by study level begins to flip as you progress through the SIMD levels. Difference by mode varies.</p> <p>9] 2019/20 and 2021/22 saw learners from both the most deprived (SIMD10/20) and least deprived (SIMD90/100) least likely to be in positive destinations. 2018/19 saw minimal differences between the SIMD classifications.</p> <p>10] SIMD is not reported in the GOS reports.</p>
Care Experienced		<p>Care experienced data is not returned by the SSES, SWS, or GOS, or in complaints and appeals data. Data returns were too low to be reported in the NSS and in the attainment returns. Neither Speak Week nor the EDI Audit returned information regarding care experienced learners. While the College Leavers Destinations survey does report on</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>1] Student Demographics (all)</p> <p>2] CELCIS' 2019 <i>Being a Student with Care Experience is Very Daunting: Findings from a survey of care-experienced students in Scottish colleges and universities</i>.</p>	<p>care-experienced learners, there was little to no difference in likelihood to be in positive destinations in the years for which we have data. In lieu of the paucity of internal data, external research on care experienced learners has been included.</p> <p>1] The percentage of learners disclosing care experienced status has increased over the past five years from 1% in 2019 to 3% in 2023. However, data collected informally from the Corporate Parenting Working Group would indicate that there are more care-experienced learners than disclose. SFC have reported a year-on-year increase in Scottish domiciled HE learners from a care-experienced background (0.3% in 2013/14 – 2.0% in 2021/22).</p> <p>2] Most respondents to the survey reported feeling positive about their time in college and university. However, learners who reported having a disability or mental health issue were less likely to rate their experience as positive. The proportion of care-experienced learners reporting a disability in the survey was much higher than the national average: 51% of university learners, 43% of college HE learners, and 46% of college FE learners).</p> <p>Just over half of respondents had considered leaving their course. In 2017/18, the retention rate of first year care experienced learners in HE in Scotland was 87.2%. I.e., 12.8% of learners left their course (compared with 7.5% for all learners and 10.6% for SIMD20 learners), suggesting more learners consider leaving than do. Reasons cited for considering leaving were academic expectations, financial strain, a lack of support, feelings of not belonging and social isolation, and caring commitments. Complexities of family and personal lives outside of college/university were also factors.</p>

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
	<p>3] Ellis and Johnston's 2019 <i>Pathways to University from Care: Findings Report One</i>.</p> <p>4] UCAS and Unite Foundations' 2022 <i>Next Steps: What is the Experience of Students from a Care Background in Education</i>.</p>	<p>Recommendation 15 of this report was that: Colleges and universities should provide a detailed list of the variety of study options which exist for learners, and the flexibility within those options. This should include the possibilities around breaks in study, deferment, distance learning, part time learning and any other option which may support learner retention.</p> <p>3] 68% of respondents to the survey for care-experienced learners reported that they had experienced mental health difficulties while at university. 51% of participants reported seriously considering dropping out of university owing to workload, health, financial, and personal and family issues.</p> <p>The report noted that learners benefited most when both academic and support staff were aware of their backgrounds and understood when and why they might find university challenging.</p> <p>4] Although focused mostly on the applicant experience, this report indicated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intersectionality of care experience with other personal characteristics presents additional challenges: these applicants are 38% more likely than non-care-experienced applicants to come from the most disadvantaged areas (POLAR4 Quintile 1), twice as likely to be from Mixed or Black ethnic groups, 79% more likely to identify as LGBT+, almost twice as likely to share a disability, and nearly three times as likely to share a mental health condition. • Applicants from a care experienced background have positive expectations for support in HE: two thirds expect the pastoral and educational support and student living to be good or very good, and two in five believe the social and extracurricular support will be good or very good.

Equality characteristics	Evidence source (e.g. web link, report, survey, complaint)	What does the evidence tell you about the experiences of this group in relation to the policy, practice, process or service? Lack of evidence may suggest a gap in knowledge/ need for consultation (step 3).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants from a care background are motivated by career prospects, especially in health and social care: they are 179% more likely to apply for health and social care than non-care-experienced students, and 50% more likely to apply for nursing and midwifery. • HE choices are strongly influenced by applicants' individual support needs: over three quarters prioritised access to mental health and wellbeing support, with financial support, accommodation, and pre-entry support also important influential factors.

2.2 Consultation and stakeholder involvement: Speaking to people who will be affected by your policy, practice, process or service can help clarify the impact it will have on different equality groups. Describe below what you learned from the consultation/ involvement. Consultation can take time so make sure that you build this into your policy, practice, process or service review/ development timeline.

Consultation took place through Learning and Teaching Committee meetings, Team meetings, consultation conversations (on campus and online) and 1:1 meetings. Three consultation conversations were ring-fenced for underrepresented groups (BAME staff and students, LGBTQIA+ staff and students, and staff and students with lived experience of disability). Consultation took place October – December 2024 and reached 114 staff and students. The consultations highlighted that there are particular strengths in learning and teaching at SRUC in student-centred learning and support – with a strong focus on personalised and supportive learning, with tailored support for diverse student needs and a widening access approach to education – and in a commitment to a SEEDABLE curriculum (with the ED of SEEDABLE meaning the embedding of equality and diversity). Consultation suggested that we could build on these strengths through further supporting the embedding of SEEDABLE, further developing inclusive learning environments and experiences creating flexible curricula that meet the needs of our increasingly diverse student body, moving from embedding E&D in the curriculum to developing an anti-racist curriculum, streamlining assessment loads and introducing compassionate assessment, and cultivating resilient, independent

learners by developing self-efficacy, interpersonal skills and real-world problem-solving abilities and by providing consistent expectations, accessible tools, and opportunities for active engagement and collaboration.

2.3 Record here if you need to undertake a full equality impact assessment based on your evidence above.

Outcome of Step 2 following initial evidence gathering and relevance to equality characteristics	Yes/ No (Y or N)	Next steps
There is no relevance to equality		Proceed to sign off (step 5) to agree with decision makers that no EqIA is required based on current evidence
There is relevance to some or all the equality groups	Y	Proceed to Step 3: complete full EqIA
It is unclear if there is relevance to some or all the equality groups		Proceed to Step 3: complete full EqIA

3 Impact on equality groups and changes to policy, practice, process or service

You must consider the three aims of the general duty for each protected characteristic. The following questions will help:

- **Is there potential for discrimination, victimisation, harassment or other unlawful conduct that is prohibited under the Equality Act 2010?** How will this be mitigated?
- **Is there potential to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a characteristic and those who do not?** How can this be achieved?
- **Is there potential for developing good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not?** How can this be achieved?

3.1 Does the policy, practice, process or service have any impacts (whether intended or unintended, positive or negative) on any of the equality characteristics? In the tables below, record the impact of the policy, practice, process or service, as it is planned or as it operates, might have on each equality characteristic and describe what changes in policy, practice, process or service or actions will be required to mitigate that impact or to take advantage of a positive impact.

Equality group	Public sector equality duty	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. E.g. to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
		Positive impact	Negative impact	No impact	
Age	Potential for discrimination	X	X		<p>The new iteration of strategy should continue to embed equality and diversity, foster inclusivity, and support the development of learning communities. It should continue to recognise and celebrate the diversity of learners, ensuring they feel safe, valued and have a sense of belonging in their learning experiences.</p> <p>It should further support staff in understanding the diversity of their learner cohorts and in adapting their teaching practices to meet varied needs effectively.</p> <p>It should continue to empower learners to have a voice and build their confidence to advocate for themselves. It should aim to</p>
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity	X	X		
	Potential to foster good relations	X			

Equality group	Public sector equality duty	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. E.g. to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
		Positive impact	Negative impact	No impact	
					<p>cultivate self-efficacy and resilience among learners, enabling them to thrive.</p> <p>It should enhance the flexibility of learning, teaching and the curriculum to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse and evolving learner population. Achieving this will require the development of supportive and adaptive policies.</p> <p>It should also focus on supporting learners in transitioning between the SCQF Levels, particularly from FE to HE and from HE to PGT. This includes fostering ambition for progression as well as implementing measures that provide robust support to ensure successful transitions.</p>
Disability	Potential for discrimination	X	X		As per Age. In addition, the new iteration of the strategy should include staff development, going deeper than the current SEEDABLE training to focus in on what can be done in learning and teaching to support neurodivergent learners and learners with ill mental health, how to promote mental
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity	X	X		
	Potential to foster good relations	X			

Equality group	Public sector equality duty	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. E.g. to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
		Positive impact	Negative impact	No impact	
					wellbeing through learning and teaching, and where the boundaries lie between what can be done in learning and teaching and where student support is required.
Race	Potential for discrimination	X	X		As per Age. In addition, the new iteration of the strategy should again focus on staff development, going deeper than the current SEEDABLE training to offer specific guidance and case studies on how to develop anti-racist and decolonised curricula in our subject areas.
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity	X	X		
	Potential to foster good relations	X			
Sex	Potential for discrimination	X	X		As per Age with a specific focus on supporting male student voice / self-advocacy, particularly among younger male learners.
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity	X	X		
	Potential to foster good relations	X			
Gender Reassignment	Potential for discrimination	X	X		As per Age. In addition, the new iteration of the strategy should again focus on staff development, going deeper than the current SEEDABLE training to offer specific guidance on learning and teaching in relation to gender reassignment.
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity	X	X		
	Potential to foster good relations	X			
Sexual orientation	Potential for discrimination	X	X		As per Age.
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity	X	X		

Equality group	Public sector equality duty	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. E.g. to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
		Positive impact	Negative impact	No impact	
	Potential to foster good relations	X			
Religion or Belief	Potential for discrimination	X	X		As per Age. In addition, the new iteration of the strategy should again focus on staff development, going deeper than the current SEEDABLE training to offer specific guidance and case studies on learning and teaching in relation to religion or belief with a focus on the interrelation of religious beliefs and our specific subject areas.
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity	X	X		
	Potential to foster good relations	X			
Pregnancy or maternity	Potential for discrimination	X	X		As per Age, with a specific focus on flexibility in learning, teaching and the curriculum considering pregnancy and maternity, with the potential development of policy in this area. In addition, the new iteration of the strategy should again focus on staff development, going deeper than the current SEEDABLE training to offer specific guidance on the impact of pregnancy and maternity on learning.
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity	X	X		
	Potential to foster good relations	X			
Marriage or civil partnership	Potential for discrimination				N/A
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity				
	Potential to foster good relations				

Equality group	Public sector equality duty	Place 'X' in the relevant box(es)			Describe the changes or actions (if any) you plan to take. E.g. to mitigate any impact, maximise the positive impact, or record your justification to not make changes despite the potential for adverse impact.
		Positive impact	Negative impact	No impact	
(in employment only)					
Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation	Potential for discrimination	X	X		As per Age, with a specific focus on flexibility in learning, teaching and the curriculum considering cost of learning (including travel, timetabling etc.), with the potential development of policy in this area.
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity	X	X		
	Potential to foster good relations	X			
Care Experienced	Potential for discrimination	X	X		As per Age, with a specific focus on flexibility in learning, teaching and the curriculum considering the lived experience of care-experienced learners.
	Potential to advance equality of opportunity	X	X		
	Potential to foster good relations	X			

3.2 Think about and describe below how your assessment impacts on your policy, practice, process or service review or development timeline including but not limited to:

- Procurement criteria: The strategy will require no additional procurement, but SRUC/academic teams may in the future need to purchase specific digital packages to allow full student access.
- Communication plan/ products: The Strategy will be communicated to all staff across a variety of channels, using a variety of communication tools ensuring all can engage.
- Cost: There will be no additional cost for the implementation of changes on the back of the EqIA beyond current budgets, but extra staff development sessions will be needed to ensure the focused actions are understood and undertaken.

3.3 Record the outcome of this assessment below having considered the potential or actual impacts of your policy, practice, process or service on equality groups. Choose from one of the following (mark with an X or delete as appropriate):

Note: You must take action to remove barriers or take advantage of positive opportunities BEFORE the policy, practice, process or service goes live.

Please select (X)	Implications for the policy, practice, process or service
	No major change: Your assessment demonstrates that the policy, practice, process or service is robust. The evidence shows no potential for unlawful discrimination and that you have taken all opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations, subject to continuing monitoring and review.
X	Adjust the policy, practice, process or service: You need to take steps to remove any barriers, to better advance equality of to foster good relations. You have set actions to address this and have clear ways of monitoring the impact of the policy, practice, process or service when implemented.
	Continue the policy, practice, process or service: The policy, practice, process or service will continue despite the potential for adverse impact. You have justified this with this assessment and shown how this decision is compatible with our obligations under the public sector equality duty. When you believe any discrimination can be objectively justified you must record in this assessment what this is and how the decision was reached.
	Stop and remove the policy, practice, process or service: The policy, practice, process or service will not be implemented due to adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated.

4 Monitoring the policy, practice, process or service impact and further actions

It is important to continue to monitor the impact of your policy, practice, process or service on equality groups to ensure that your actual or likely impacts are those you recorded. Your monitoring information will also inform a future review of the policy, practice, process or service.

4.1 Record in the table below how you intend to monitor the impact of this policy, practice, process or service on equality groups. In the table below you should:

- list the relevant measures,
- Identify who or which team is responsible for implementing or monitoring any changes,
- Where the measure will be reported to (e.g. committee, ELT, Board) and how often.

Measure	Lead department/ individual	Reporting (where/ frequency)
Dissemination of policy to all staff involved in L&T across SRUC from July 2025	Head of Learning and Teaching	L&T Committee, Academic Board
Review of policy impact	Head of Learning and Teaching, L&T Enhancement Strategy Steering Group	L&T Committee, Academic Board

4.2 Record further actions or changes required after the policy, practice, process or service is implemented in the table below. Make it clear if there are no outstanding actions.

Action	Lead department/ individual	Action target date
The 2025-2030 Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy should incorporate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued embedding of the SEEDABLE curriculum. 	Head of Learning and Teaching / Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy Advisory Group	May 2025

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A flexible approach to teaching, learning and the curriculum to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse cohort. • A focus on student voice, including supporting all learners to be able to self-advocate as well as developing their self-efficacy and resilience. • Staff development, guidance and case studies to support staff to be comfortable with how to adapt their teaching for different protected characteristics. • Support for transitions between SCQF levels, particularly FE to HE and HE to PGT. 		
Implementation of the strategy and its impact on protected characteristics should be monitored annually, adapting as needed in light of emerging trends.	Head of Learning and Teaching / Strategy Steering Group	Annual review (September each year)

5 Sign off and future review.

Equality impact assessments must be signed off by the relevant Head of Service/ Department, even where an EqIA is not required. Also note here when you plan to review the policy, practice, process or service and accompanying EqIA which should be no later than 5 years from policy, practice, process or service implementation.

5.1 Senior Responsible Owner/ Committee sign off.

Committee title: Learning and Teaching Committee

Date: 15/04/2025

5.2 Equality impact assessment review date.

Date: 30/09/2026

Important: You must send the final version of this equality impact assessment to:

- **the Equality Diversity & Inclusion Lead.**
- **the Communications team for publication on SRUC's equality page on the external website.**

Document control		
Document control:		V0.1
Date policy, practice, process or service live from:		[DATE]
Review/ Approval Group:		[project board if relevant or delete]
Last reviewed:		Date
Review cycle:		[No more than three years]
Document change log		
Version/ Author	Date	Comment
V0.1		