Impact across education and careers in law

	Early outreach	Admission to law	Entry to the	Early career	Progression to
		school	profession	progression	partner
Unequal social, economic and cultural capital What are some of the key factors and resources that differentiate people from higher socio-economic background (SEB) and lower SEB or with protected characteristics?	Target students from lower SEBs : > Typically don't know law graduates or legal professionals whom they could ask informally for information and advice. > Employers' outreach and work experience placements and universities' outreach provide important exposure and insight that wouldn't otherwise be available.	Applicants have unequal access to accurate information about entry requirements. This is because: > The level of information available on law schools' websites about admissions requirements is variable. It is hard to find detailed and specific information. > Low-SEB students' schools and families are less likely to be able to fill the gap. Nonetheless, low-SEB students with the required grades are equally likely to apply to the top law schools. However, low-SEB students may unknowingly be wasting UCAS choices on law schools unlikely to accept their qualifications.	 Students from diverse backgrounds can be disadvantaged in: Knowing where to apply, how and when. Being able to draw on social networks for advice and guidance. Knowing how to make applications 'stand out'. Facing pressure to succeed immediately – not being in a position to make applications across multiple years. Confidence in interviews. 	Early career law professionals from low-SEBs are likely to be disadvantaged by: > Being less able to develop a strong professional social network. > Finding it harder to make positive connections with senior colleagues due to the lack of shared life experiences.	Law professionals from diverse backgrounds are likely to be disadvantaged in progressing to partner level by: > Not 'fitting in' with the business culture. > Being unable to access diverse mentors. > Being unable to mobilise familial professional networks.
Subjective judgements & unconscious biases What systems and processes are there that create space for bias and lead to unequal outcomes?	 Employers tend to: Reach out to schools that are nearby, rather than those whose students could benefit most. Ask schools to nominate young people to participate, which may lead to teachers selecting well-behaved rather than those from lower SEB and who would benefit the most. 	 Selective law schools: Admit high-SEB students with lower grades than they require from low-SEB. May be using applicants' schools as a proxy for quality and potential. And were not generally able to refer to evidence for: (Not) accepting Access or BTEC qualifications or some A-level subjects. Their choice of additional admissions requirements (eg LNAT, interview, contextual information). 	 Employers: Use university as a proxy for capability. Consider who will 'fit in' and value 'polish' in candidates. Favour 'traditional' educational pathways in which HSEB students are overrepresented. Use assessment styles that may favour candidates from HSEBs or with particular characteristics. 	 Employers: > Use opaque criteria and informal social networks allocation and performance evaluation. > Line managers and senior staff with influence tend to trust people with a similar background. 	 Employers: Give an informal 'tap on the shoulder' to those who are deemed to meet criteria. Use non-transparent definitions of what constitutes talent.
The experience of coming from a lower socio-economic and/or minority ethnic background How do people experience this inequality, what is the impact?	 Students and early career lawyers say: Summer schools and work experience can help them make informed decisions about studying law and their career. Work experience is helpful even when delivered online. However, work experience does not always reflect the reality of working in the legal sector for people from a 'minority' background. Mentoring is of very variable usefulness. 	 Our research in law suggests that low-SEB applicants: May be feeling disadvantaged by the process. May not know where to begin. Our other research suggests that low-SEB law students may experience: Imposter syndrome anxieties. Social unease from first exposure to affluent peers and workplaces. 	 Our research suggests that low-SEB applicants: Face considerable financial barriers in entering the profession. Can be misled in outreach about the kind of workplace the legal profession is. Face a pressure to succeed because of an absence of a safety net. Struggle to navigate complex pathways. 	Our research found that early career lawyers from low-SEBs are over- performing, but under- progressing. They also experience: > Cumulative exposure to micro-aggressions. > Psychological toll of code-switching. > Exclusion from socials. They do not: > See role models from a shared background further up the career ladder. > Feel able to call out behaviour for fear of recrimination.	 Our research found that law professionals from diverse backgrounds: Experience microaggressions in work and social settings. Have to balance multiple responsibilities over the duration of a career. Take significantly longer to reach partner level. Do not see role models from diverse backgrounds.

Recommendations

	Early outreach	Admission to law school	Entry to the profession	Early career progression	Progression to partner
Data collection, monitoring & management Including qualitative research	 Employers should: Recruit students through outreach charities and universities that have good systems and processes for data collection and monitoring impact - this will simplify monitoring and evaluation. Collect qualitative data to understand experiences and impact. Synthesise survey and interview data to provide comprehensive insight. 	Law schools need to undertake robust and detailed data collection and analysis of successful and unsuccessful applicants by SEB to check for unintended barriers	 All stakeholders should: Ensure ongoing robust data collection on successful and unsuccessful applicants. Conduct qualitative research looking at lived experiences of navigating pathways. Monitor all pathways to ensure particular routes are not being favoured. 	 Employers should systematically collect data on: Who is getting ahead and at what rates. Specificity of talent and how performance evaluation varies by demographic criteria. Conduct independent exit interviews. 	 Employers should: Ensure ongoing collection of demographic data. Collect and submit diversity data to a trusted third party for sector-wide comparisons.
Need for collaboration and leadership	Cross-sector bodies should: Collaborate to achieve maximum impact. Share and learn from best practices. 	Law schools should share expertise in process and evidence with each other. Other research suggests prioritising low-SEB law students for bursaries and work experience placements.	 Cross-sector bodies should: Share best practice in recruitment strategies. Ensure consistency in implementing the SQE. Ensure that diversity is prioritised in the creation of new assessments. Learn from best practice in other professions. 	 Cross sector bodies should: Create a network of diverse legal professionals. Pool mentors across the sector. Take ownership of the D&I agenda with senior leaders across firms. 	 Cross-sector bodies should: Engage colleagues in research on diversity and inclusion. Ensure that firms' data is understood relative to the whole sector. Introduce formal mentoring programmes.
What is real impact? What would equal outcomes look like in each area ?	 Students: Make an informed decision about studying law and a career in law. Regardless of their background, successfully pursue a degree/career in Law, if they choose to. 	Law schools admit low-SEB and high-SEB students who meet entry requirements at the same rate. Students on different pathways (eg BTECs) have the same opportunities.	SEB has no bearing on rates of recruitment when controlling for other factors. Students using different legal qualification pathways have the same opportunities. Assessments do not favour particular groups.	The best people are promoted, regardless of background. Quality of work performance is the only criterion for progression. There is a clear pipeline of diverse talent being actively managed.	Partners are representative of the wider UK population. No barriers exist for law professionals from diverse backgrounds in reaching partner level. Criteria for progression to partner are transparent and based on performance.