



Edinburgh Napier University  
Equality Impact Assessment  
Flexible Working Policy  
December 2011

**Please complete and return by email to Mohammed Hameed, Diversity Partner**  
[m.hameed@napier.ac.uk](mailto:m.hameed@napier.ac.uk)

Faculty/Service Area <b>Human Resources</b>	Date of Assessment 12/12/11	Name of the proposal to be assessed Flexible Working Policy	Person responsible for the assessment Mohammed Hameed
Who was present at the EIA? Please list Desk-based exercise completed by Mohammed Hameed	Is this a <b>new</b> or <b>existing</b> proposal?  <b>Revised</b>		When will this proposal be reviewed?  <b>Every 3 years unless there is legislative change</b>
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the proposal	This is a policy update to take account of changes in related family-friendly policies. Flexible working is open to most staff and this update reflects minor changes brought about by changes in legislation.		
2. Who is intended to benefit from the proposal and in what way?	Most staff.		
3. What outcomes are wanted from this proposal?	To have a clear and up-to-date policy and process for staff to use when considering a change to their pattern of working.		

4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Poor communication could detract from the objective of providing clear guidance to staff. It is essential therefore that managers are aware of the contents of this policy so that they can communicate its contents at the appropriate time to relevant staff.	
5. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on minority ethnic groups? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Y	This policy update does not vary dramatically from the Scheme already in operation. The EIA that was done in March 2009 accepted that there was a possibility that where there was over-representation of groups covered by a particular protected characteristic a perceived disadvantage may be observed. However, in such cases the appeals process would be activated and a decision could be reviewed. There is no evidence to suggest that this process is not working. The policy is designed to allow maximum flexibility within the business needs of the University and therefore should continue to have a positive impact on all groups.
6. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact due to gender (including pregnancy and maternity)? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Y	This policy update does not vary dramatically from the Scheme already in operation. The EIA that was done in March 2009 accepted that there was a possibility that where there was over-representation of groups covered by a particular protected characteristic a perceived disadvantage may be observed. However, in such cases the appeals process would be activated and a decision could be reviewed. There is no evidence to suggest that this process is not working. The policy is designed to allow maximum flexibility within the business needs of the University and therefore should continue to have a positive impact on all groups.
7. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact due to disability? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Y	This policy update does not vary dramatically from the Scheme already in operation. The EIA that was done in March 2009 accepted that there was a possibility that where there was over-representation of groups covered by a particular protected characteristic a perceived disadvantage may be observed. However, in such cases the appeals process would be activated and a decision could be reviewed. There is no evidence to suggest that this process is not working. The policy is designed to allow maximum flexibility within the business needs of the University and therefore should continue to have a positive impact on all groups.

<p>8. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to sexual orientation? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>9. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to their age? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>This policy update does not vary dramatically from the Scheme already in operation. The EIA that was done in March 2009 accepted that there was a possibility that where there was over-representation of groups covered by a particular protected characteristic a perceived disadvantage may be observed. However, in such cases the appeals process would be activated and a decision could be reviewed. There is no evidence to suggest that this process is not working. The policy is designed to allow maximum flexibility within the business needs of the University and therefore should continue to have a positive impact on all groups.</p>
<p>10. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to their religious belief (or none)? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>This policy update does not vary dramatically from the Scheme already in operation. The EIA that was done in March 2009 accepted that there was a possibility that where there was over-representation of groups covered by a particular protected characteristic a perceived disadvantage may be observed. However, in such cases the appeals process would be activated and a decision could be reviewed. There is no evidence to suggest that this process is not working. The policy is designed to allow maximum flexibility within the business needs of the University and therefore should continue to have a positive impact on all groups.</p>
<p>11. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people with dependants/caring responsibilities? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>This policy update does not vary dramatically from the Scheme already in operation. The EIA that was done in March 2009 accepted that there was a possibility that where there was over-representation of groups covered by a particular protected characteristic a perceived disadvantage may be observed. However, in such cases the appeals process would be activated and a decision could be reviewed. There is no evidence to suggest that this process is not working. The policy is designed to allow maximum flexibility within the business needs of the University and therefore should continue to have a positive impact on all groups.</p>

<p>12. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to them being transgender or transsexual? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>		<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>13. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to their marital or civil partnership status? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>		<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>14. Can any adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for a particular group? (For example, the proposal may be deliberately designed to promote equality for disabled people but may run the risk of this being at the expense of non-disabled people which is permissible under law).</p>		<p><b>N</b></p>	<p>The Flexible Working Policy is open to the majority of staff and provided a proposal to alter 'normal' working patterns meets with the needs of the particular area only positive benefits should occur. However, it is recommended that the Scheme is monitored to ensure that it is being fairly and equitably adopted across all areas.</p>