

GSA SUMMARY REPORT OF EQUALITY CONSIDERATION AND ASSESSMENT OF EQUALITY IMPACT

Date of Assessment:	1st February 2016	
School / Department:	International Academic Development	
Lead member of staff:	Marianne Greated	
Location of impact assessment documentation (contact or web link):		
Area of decision making / Title of policy, procedure or relevant practice:	International Articulation Policy	
Please indicate if this is:	New:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Existing/Reviewed:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Revised/Updated:	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Summary of how equality, diversity and participation have been considered and due regard given to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED):</p> <p>The purpose of the policy in developing new relationships with international partner institutions is to extend opportunities for international students to study at GSA and achieve success in line with the Institutional Strategic Plan 2015-18 and GSA's international ambitions.</p> <p>In the absence of any current articulations this new policy and, in particular, the principles of international articulation and their alignment with the definition of articulation outlined in the policy have been considered in relation to the PSED. Equality Impact Assessment has been embedded in all stages of decision making and implementation as related to the policy.</p> <p>This policy has been developed alongside the UK articulation policy. In undertaking this impact assessment it is recognised that although the principles of articulation are similar, the drivers for implementation in the UK and international articulation are different, the former relating to widening participation and the latter to internationalisation and globalisation of learning and citizenship.</p> <p>It may however be useful to review the UK articulation policy and amend where relevant in light of the actions identified in this equality impact assessment.</p> <p>This impact assessment has been undertaken retrospectively rather than as part of its initial development. However incremental development has been undertaken in consultation with academic staff, widening participation, student recruitment, registry and equality staff.</p>		

Evidence used to make your assessment:

Formal international articulation routes are a new development at GSA and therefore quantitative data relating specifically to articulation is not available. However in order to inform policy and practice development the current profile of international students at GSA has been examined as far as possible by country of origin and relative to protected characteristic.

Key findings of statistical analysis

Analysis of international students studying at GSA's Glasgow campus by country of domicile for the 2 year period 2013/14 – 2014/15 indicates that the largest proportion are from East Asia, being 75% and 73.8% respectively. In the same period students from the USA made up 4% and 11.8% respectively, with students from Norway, Canada and Iceland making up the remainder.

The policy offers GSA the potential to open formal articulation routes to broaden the global profile of students who study at GSA's UK campuses.

With regard to sexual identity it is noted that there is little difference in representation of male and female students between UK domiciled and international students.

It is noted that formal disclosure of disability related needs in the current international cohort is significantly lower than for UK domiciled students. The reasons for this will be considered as part of ongoing monitoring and review at institutional and articulation levels.

Although, for the two year period considered in this impact assessment, international students are mostly found within the 22-24 and 25-39 age brackets, it is difficult to identify specific trends in respect of age, particularly related to year of entry and level of study.

This is a new policy and there is limited data with which to make an assessment. However when an articulation agreement is implemented the monitoring of students by protected characteristic, their experience, progression and success will be undertaken and reported on an annual basis through PMAR. An overview of monitoring data for all articulations will be undertaken and reported by the International Development office.

Outline any positive or negative impacts you have identified:

This policy has the potential to result in positive equality impact and foster good relations for all protected characteristic groups in relation to the internationalisation of GSA and a culture which values learning with and from others at institutional, studio and individual level.

However, whilst the purpose and key characteristics contained in the policy have the potential to deliver positive equality impact by facilitating access and the development of mutually beneficial curriculum related international relationships, there are elements of the proposed implementation which have the potential to contradict the definition of articulation set out in the policy and consequently result in negative equality impact.

Actions have been included in the action plan below to mitigate potential negative impact prior to final approval of the policy. Overarching points of note are as follows:

- The policy refers to partnership institutions. However, the relationship outlined in the policy and process of implementation would appear to be one sided without opportunity for the type of exchange which has the potential to result in the positive impact outlined above and

to meet GSA's strategic ambitions for internationalisation.

- The policy also contradicts its stated purpose with an implicit assumption of assimilation and deficit. If curriculum mapping has already been undertaken in order that articulation can take place as per the definition at 2.1 in the policy bridging programmes should not be required.

However, orientation and induction activities represent good practice for a whole cohort of students with a range of different needs (UK and international) who are progressing to a different level of study,. Where this activity separates out international articulating students then the opportunity to foster good relations is lost.

- There is a lack of clarity with regard to the operation of articulation in terms of the definition. This arises as a consequence of the introduction of the consideration of selection procedures within the process - this currently contradicts the definition of articulation at 2.1 in the policy. The potential for negative impact relates to a lack of clarity for partner institutions and potential students as it is not clear that places are limited or how this policy differs to targeted recruitment initiatives.

Summary of the actions you have taken or plan to take as a result:

(Please attach your action plan)

The action plan below includes actions related to equality impact identified in specific sections of the policy to mitigate potential negative impact. Where these relate to policy amendments these will be taken prior to final approval of the policy.

**International Articulation Policy
Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan**

Policy area / potential equality impact	Action	Equality impact	Person responsible	Timeframe
<p>Policy sections 3.1; 3.3; 3.6; 4.3 References to ‘normal’ / ‘normally’ introduces the potential for negative quality impact for protected characteristic (PC) groups by introducing inconsistency and a lack of clarity in decision making and could result in inadvertent discrimination.</p>	<p>Remove reference to ‘normal’ and ‘normally’ in these sections. Where exceptions have been identified these should be specified.</p>	<p>This will mitigate against inconsistencies in practice, assure non-discriminatory practice and support effective implementation of the policy</p>	<p>Marianne Greated Have removed word normal in 3.6 and 4.3 but not in 3.1 or 3.3 as this gives us scope with partners in the future</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>Policy sections 3.8; 5.2.3 The references to “additional specific” and “entry requirements” do not align with articulation as defined at section 2.1. This has the potential to result in negative equality impact as a result of (i) a lack of clarity for partners and potential students and (ii) opportunity for differential practice that could inadvertently disadvantage PC groups, for example disabled students or students from different international partners.</p>	<p>Provide clarity within the policy in respect of entry requirements and admissions in line with the definition of articulation outlined at section 2.1.</p>	<p>This will ensure that the policy mitigates against any practice which could result in inadvertent discrimination or adverse equality impact</p>	<p>Marianne Greated Have taken out 3.8 and amended 5.2.3</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>Policy section 3.9 (also see Proposal Proforma – Process for selecting entrants) Where there is the notion of ‘acceptance’ this suggests selection rather than progression and does not fit with the definition at 2.1, introducing the</p>	<p>Provide clarity within the policy in respect of entry requirements and admissions in line with the definition of articulation outlined at section 2.1.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Marianne Greated Please see amendments to 3.9</p>	<p>Completed</p>

potential for negative equality impact as a result of a lack of clarity that could inadvertently result in discrimination against PC groups.				
Policy section 5.3.1 The type of articulation is defined in 2.1 – there are no other types of articulation included in this policy. Again, a lack of clarity has the potential to result in practice, which inadvertently discriminates against PC groups.	If this point refers to the model of articulation (eg 2+2 or 1+3) rather than ‘type’ a greater level of clarity needs to be provided	Greater clarity will ensure that practice is transparent and mitigates any potential negative equality impact	Marianne Greated Please see amendments to 5.3.1	Completed
Policy sections 5.3.2; 5.3.4 The lack of clarity in the definition in respect of (i) anticipated student numbers (places available or anticipated number of potential students?) and (ii) entry requirements. Both these points imply that selection may be an aspect of articulation. As highlighted for previous sections this introduces the potential for negative quality impact for protected characteristic groups by introducing inconsistency and a lack of clarity in decision-making	Adjustment will be made to the policy to provide clarity - if the number of articulation places is limited and selection will be an aspect of articulation this should be added at the beginning of the policy in section 2.1, highlighting in what circumstances it will be employed. Any selection process will need to be equality impact assessed as part of the proposal stage, to include who is selecting and what criteria will be applied given that students will have already reached the articulation threshold.	As above	Marianne Greated Have removed 5.3.4 and amended 5.3.2	Completed
Policy sections 5.3.7; 5.3.9 These sections suggest deficit in the incoming students. Given the nature of articulation described in 2.1 these	Amend the policy and provide an appropriate programme of orientation for the whole cohort at the beginning of the	These amendments will support the advancing of equality and fostering of good relations for all	Marianne Greated Have removed 5.3.7 and amended 5.3.9 (now 5.3.6)	Completed


<p>students will have demonstrated, through their achievement at the partner institution, a level of study which enables them to enter the programme and succeed. An assumption that articulating students will need 'bridging' programmes has the potential to introduce negative equality impact</p> <p>Although this section uses the term 'orientation' it implies that international students will be assimilated into the cohort. There is potential here for negative equality impact where the receiving cohort is not included in a whole cohort programme of orientation. The opportunity to foster good relations between PC groups, particularly race, is therefore lost.</p>	<p>academic year. This could include an introduction to Glasgow and an induction to GSA that involves the UK based cohort working with incoming international articulation students.</p>	<p>protected characteristic groups</p>		
<p>Policy section 5.3.8 It is unclear as to why comment on summative assessment is required, as this would operate in the same way for all students. There is therefore potential for negative equality impact if differential assessment processes / methods are operated.</p>	<p>Remove this point from the policy</p>	<p>This amendment will ensure that there is parity of experience for all students in assessment regardless of protected characteristics</p>	<p>Marianne Greated Have removed 5.3.8</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>Policy section – flowchart Reference to equality impact assessment as an integral aspect of the approval process for articulation agreements has</p>	<p>Amend flowchart to include equality impact assessment along side Business Care and Risk Assessment</p>	<p>This amendment will ensure that equality consideration is mainstreamed in the approval process,</p>	<p>Marianne Greated This amendment is in process</p>	<p>In process</p>

<p>been omitted.</p>		<p>highlighting positive equality impact and ensuring that any potential for negative impact is mitigated.</p>		
<p>Policy sections 7.1.2; 7.2; 7.3 These sections assume knowledge exchange from GSA out to the partner only. There may be opportunity to advance equality and foster good relations for PC groups, particularly race, as highlighted in 5.3.7; 5.3.9.</p>	<p>Amend policy to reflect that international articulation provides an opportunity to learn from international partners and enhance GSA practice</p>	<p>Amendments will support the advancing of equality and fostering of good relations for all protected characteristic groups</p>	<p>Marianne Greated Have amended and added in sections 7.1.2 and 7.2.7</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>Proposal proforma: Process for selecting entrants With reference to policy section 3.9 above this does not appear to fit with the notion of articulation (as defined in 2.1). There is therefore potential for negative impact for students studying at international partner institutions where their expectations are raised with regard to progression through articulation and where these expectations are not managed appropriately.</p> <p>If selection takes place within an articulation agreement it is not clear how the experience for an international student who progresses to GSA through an articulation agreement is different to that of a student who applies with the same qualifications from the same institution outwith the articulation</p>	<p>Provide clarity within the policy in respect of entry requirements and admissions in line with the definition of articulation outlined at section 2.1.</p>	<p>This will ensure that the policy mitigates against any practice which could result in inadvertent discrimination or adverse equality impact</p>	<p>Marianne Greated Have removed these boxes from the form</p>	<p>Completed</p>

agreement.				
Proposal proforma: GSA input to partner institutions See policy sections 5.3.7; 5.3.9 above	As policy sections 5.3.7; 5.3.9	As policy sections 5.3.7; 5.3.9	Marianne Greated Have amended section and changed wording to good practice	Completed
Proposal proforma: Equality Impact Assessment Section	Proforma to be amended to make it clear that equality impact assessment is a requirement, non submission of which will result in a proposal being considered incomplete.	This will support the mainstreaming of equality consideration as an integral aspect of the development and implementation of international articulation agreements	Marianne Greated Have amended section	Completed
Monitoring and reporting	All monitoring and reporting in respect of the development and delivery of articulation agreements to include equality consideration and analysis of equality statistics related to protected characteristics.	This will ensure that equality impact is monitored effectively and the three needs of the PSED are mainstreamed into the development of practice	Marianne Greated This is embedded in document	Completed

Sign-off, authorisation and publishing

Review Lead

Name	Marianne Greated
Position	International Academic Lead
Signature	
Date	10.04.16

Executive Lead

Name	Vicky Gunn
Position	Head of Learning and Teaching
Signature	Vicky Gunn
Date	12.04.2016

Equality Lead (Head of Student Support and Development)

Name	
Signature	
Date	