

Stage 1: Rapid Impact Checklist

Document title: Estates Strategy

Author & School/Service: Cullen Warnock, Head of Estates, Finance, Infrastructure and Corporate Services

Reason for the Equality Impact Assessment:

Proposed new document	X
Proposed change to existing document	
Review of existing document	
Other (please state): Proposed restructure of Schools and Divisions.	

Could any protected characteristics be affected by this proposal?¹

Yes	No
X	

If yes, which protected characteristic groups could be affected?

Age	X	Disability	X
Gender reassignment	X	Pregnancy and maternity	X
Race/ethnicity		Religion or belief (including lack of belief)	X
Sex	X	Sexual orientation	

Will the proposal have any impact on:

	Yes	No
Discrimination?		X
Equality of opportunity?	X	
Relations between groups?	X	

¹ 'Proposal' is used as shorthand for any policy, procedure, strategy or proposal that might be assessed.

Will the proposal have an impact on the physical environment? For example, will there be impacts on:

Living conditions?	
Working conditions?	X
Pollution or climate change?	X
Accidental injuries or public safety?	X

If the answer to any of the above is 'yes', please proceed to complete the Comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment, overleaf.

Stage 2: Comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment (CEIA)**Details of document**

Document title	Estates Strategy
Document owner	Cullen Warnock, Head of Estates
School/Service	Finance, Infrastructure and Corporate Services

Aim of the document

What are the aims and objectives of the document?

Our Estate Strategy vision underpins the Strategic Plan through the enablement of accessibility, space, and sustainability across the entire campus.

How important is the document in terms of equality in the University? Does it relate to an area with known inequalities or where equality objectives have been set by the University?

Very important in terms of ensuring inclusivity and equality across the campus.

Who is affected by the document and how have they been involved in the development of it?

Outputs from this document could affect all staff, students and visitors to the university. The document has been written and developed through consultation with the university community.

Are any persons affected by the document likely to benefit from it and in what way?

Outputs from this document could benefit all staff, students and visitors to the university. These benefits are derived from better design, functionality and accessibility to all areas of the campus. The strategy also includes our net zero trajectory and sustainability aspiration.

Is there any evidence or concern that any of the protected characteristic groups have different experiences, issues or needs in relation to this document? (Please provide details in the box below)

Age	X	Race	
Disability	X	Religion or Belief	X
Gender Reassignment	X	Sex	X
Pregnancy & Maternity	X	Sexual Orientation	
Marriage & Civil Partnership			

Further details: It is noted that the University’s estate provides is a place of work and study for staff and students, as well as providing facilities and hosting events, meetings, visits etc for the University community and the public and therefore affects people of all protected characteristics. The strategy will adopt any requirements associated with accessibility and safe access throughout the campus. It will also take account of wider inclusivity, e.g. in relation to facilities. Examples of relevant needs include: accessibility and safety in relation to physical and other disabilities and health conditions (e.g. people who are wheelchair-users, less mobile, sight or hearing impaired , or neurodiverse); facilities for breast-feeding/pumping, religious practice, changing rooms and toilets.

How does the document fit into the broader strategic aims of the University?
The strategy links directly to all other strategies noted in the document and sits within the University’s strategic plan.

Consideration of available data

(Consider what data is available. Data can include surveys, focus groups, analysis of complaints made, feedback received, consultations, etc.)

What do we know from existing data already held by the University?
Surveys, masterplan consultations and feedback from consultation – including direct consultation with the staff Lead Voices.

What do we know from existing data which is available externally?
Findings from existing data are included in the strategy document.

Are there any apparent gaps in knowledge?
No

Impact of document

Could this document lead to any positive, negative, intended or unintended impact on the University or any of its stakeholders?
Positive impact.

Could there be a differential ² impact on any protected characteristics? Could any differential impact be adverse?
Yes, due to different needs in relation to access and inclusion. The intention is for impact to take account of different needs and have a positive impact on inclusion.

Please consider

Is this policy directly discriminatory? If yes, is it intended to increase equality? If no, this is unlawful discrimination.

Is this policy indirectly discriminatory? If yes, is this justifiable or proportionate? If no, this is unlawful discrimination.

If this policy is not indirectly discriminatory, but could have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics, you must provide details of how the University will act to address this.

Is this policy unlawfully discriminatory? If you find that it is, you must decide how the University will act lawfully.

Consultation

What did this equality analysis conclude?
That the strategy as written and intended is not discriminatory.

Is any action required to be taken in response to the findings from the consultation?
Equality impact assessment will be integral to implementation of the strategy and included as part of each project.

What is the recommendation for this document following consultation?

Reject the document		Approve and publish the document	x
Amendment required		Other (please provide details below)	

² Differential impact = where the positive or negative impact on one particular protected characteristic is likely to be greater than on another.

Declaration

I confirm that this equality analysis represents a fair and reasonable view of the implications of the document for all protected characteristic groups, and that appropriate actions have been identified to address the findings.

Cullen Warnock, Head of Estates	CEIA owner
Gordon Weir, Director of Finance, Infrastructure and Corporate Services	Line manager (if appropriate)

Committee approval

Which Committee has this document gone before for approval?
University Court
Date of Committee meeting: 14 June 2023

Following Committee consultation, what is the decision for this document?

Reject the document		Approve and publish the document	x
Amend the document		Other (please give details below)	

If the Committee requires that the document be amended, please list amendments below.