Equality Impact Assessment

A. Policy or Practice (name or brief description): **The Procedures for Dealing with Suspected Academic Misconduct**
B. Reason for screening (delete as applicable): • **Undertaking a review of an existing policy**
C. Person responsible for the policy area or practice: Name: **Dave Robinson** Job title: **Academic Policy Officer** School/service/unit: **Academic Services**
D. Screening Analysis 1. Does the policy or practice affect primary or high level functions of the University? **Yes.** 2. Is the policy or practice relevant to the promotion of equality (in terms of the Public Sector Equality Duty 'needs' set out in the introduction above)? **Yes.** 3. Is the policy or practice one on which interested parties could reasonably expect the University to have carried out an EqIA? **Yes.** If the answer to any of these questions is 'Yes', an EqIA should be carried out on the proposed/revised policy or practice at an early stage and in any event before it is finalised.
E. Screening outcome Equality Impact Assessment required: **Yes.** Record notes about the screening process or outcome here. • If EqIA is required, note when/at what stage(s) and by whom EqIA will be carried out. **Maggie Marr and Sara Welham will carry out the screening process for the review of this policy.**
F. Sign-off Screening undertaken by: **Maggie Marr, Academic Registry, and Sara Welham, Head, Governance and Regulatory Framework Team, Academic Services** Accepted by: **Dave Robinson, Academic Policy Officer** Date: **10.12.14**

G. Equality Impact Assessment

1. Overview. Indicate the current status of the policy/practice or the stage of development/review. Also note any general comments here regarding the relevance and significance of the policy/practice to equality. Which aspects of the policy/practice are particularly relevant (which should be the main focus for EqIA)? On what aspects of equality does the policy/practice particularly impact?

   This existing procedure relates to the University's procedures for dealing with suspected cases of academic misconduct by students or graduates of the University. These procedures apply to all type of academic misconduct including plagiarism, self-plagiarism, collusion, falsification, cheating, deceit and personation.

2. To which equality groups is the policy/practice relevant? Policies/practices applying to substantial groups of students or staff will be relevant to all equality groups, which should be noted. However, also indicate any equality groups for which the policy/practice is particularly relevant, and why.

   The protected characteristics under the Equality Act are (delete any that are not relevant):

   - Age
   - Disability
   - race (including ethnicity and nationality)
   - religion or belief
   - sex
   - sexual orientation
   - gender reassignment
   - pregnancy and maternity
   - marriage or civil partnership[1]

   The procedures apply to all students and are relevant to all protected characteristic groups.

3. What evidence is available about the needs of relevant equality groups? E.g. information/feedback from equality groups or other stakeholders, involvement or research with equality groups or individuals, equality monitoring data, service monitoring data, information for other similar policies/practices, staff surveys, research reports, demographic information, audit, inspection or management reports and recommendations.

   Statistics from academic misconduct cases are reviewed annually by the Senatus Quality Assurance Committee.

   Where are the gaps in evidence? If there is insufficient information to properly assess the policy, how will this be addressed? If information cannot be gathered now, consider building monitoring into the plans for implementation/review of the policy/practice. Note: the resources put into collecting evidence should be proportionate to the relevance of the policy/practice to equality.

   The statistics reviewed by QAC are not currently analysed by different characteristic groups. When the academic misconduct procedures are next reviewed we will consider what would be the most appropriate form of monitoring.

---

[1] Note: only the duty to eliminate discrimination applies to marriage and civil partnership. There is no need to have regard to advancing equality or opportunity or fostering good relations in this respect.

4. Might the application of this policy/practice lead to discrimination, harassment or victimisation? Might it result in less favourable treatment for particular equality groups or give rise to indirect discrimination? **No**

5. Are reasonable adjustments built in where they may be needed?

   Not applicable

6. Does the policy/practice contribute to advancing equality of opportunity[2]? Will it help to:
   - remove or minimise disadvantage
   - meet the needs of different equality groups
   - encourage increased participation of particular groups
   - take account of disabled people's impairments?

   The procedure advances equality – as it sets a standard approach for dealing with academic misconduct for all University students and graduates.

7. Is there an opportunity in applying this policy/practice to foster good relations between people in any protected group and those who are not[3]? Will it help to tackle prejudice and/or promote understanding? **No**

8. Is there evidence (or an expectation) that people from different equality groups have different needs or experiences in relation to the policy/practice? If so, what are they? **No**

9. Is there evidence (or an expectation) of higher or lower uptake by any equality group(s)? If so, give details of the differences and the reasons for these (if known)? **No**

10. Is any equality group excluded from participating in or accessing the service or functions? If so, why? **No**

11. Does the policy/practice create any barriers for any other groups? For example, because of the time when the service is delivered or because of restricted income? Is the communication of the policy/practice accessible to all groups?

    No barriers are created. The procedures will be made available in different formats if necessary.

12. How are relevant equality groups or communities involved in the development, review and/or monitoring of the policy or practice?

    The procedures are approved by the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee. CSPC has widespread representation, including from Edinburgh University Students Association (EUSA), to gain input into the development of policies and regulation and their review and monitoring. Relevant procedures are checked with the Student Disability Service and those with responsibility for the provision of particular services, who have insight into the needs of particular groups, for example College Offices and Student Administration.

13. Are there any other points to note regarding the potential or actual impact of applying the policy or practice, with regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality and promote good relations? If so, note these here. **No**

---

[2] This question does not apply to the protected characteristic of marriage or civil partnership
[3] This question does not apply to the protected characteristic of marriage or civil partnership.

H. Equality Impact Assessment Outcome

Option 1: No change required – the assessment is that the policy/practice is/will be robust. There is no evidence of potentially unlawful discrimination and all reasonable opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations have been taken, subject to continuing monitoring and review.

State the reasons for this conclusion and the evidence used, if not already included in section G.

> **The procedure sets a standard approach for dealing with academic misconduct for all University students and graduates.**

I Action and Monitoring

1. Specify the actions required to implement the findings of this EqIA.

    No further action needed.

2. State how the policy or practice will be monitored in relation to its equality impact (or note where this is specified above).

    See section 3 above.

3. When will the policy/practice next be reviewed? **2016/17**

J. Publication of EqIA

Can this EqIA be published in full, now? **Yes**

J. Sign-off

EqIA undertaken by: **Maggie Marr, Academic Registry, and Sara Welham, Head, Governance and Regulatory Framework Team, Academic Services**

Accepted by: **Dave Robinson, Academic Policy Officer**

Date: **10.12.14**

Retain a copy of this form for your own records and send a copy to equalitydiversity@ed.ac.uk