



Edinburgh Napier University
Equality Impact Assessment
Staff Development Policy
December 2011

Please complete and return by email to Mohammed Hameed, Diversity Partner
m.hameed@napier.ac.uk

Faculty/Service Area Human Resources	Date of Assessment 12/12/11	Name of the proposal to be assessed Staff Development Policy	Person responsible for the assessment Mohammed Hameed
Who was present at the EIA? Please list Desk-based exercise completed by Mohammed Hameed (earlier policy impact assessed in July 2011)	Is this a new or existing proposal? Revised		When will this proposal be reviewed? Every 3 years unless there is legislative change
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the proposal	This policy sets out the framework within which staff can request time and, potentially funding, to undertake periods of study/training relevant to their post within the University. It defines the criteria employed to determine whether a request will be supported and, if appropriate, the level of funding support available.		
2. Who is intended to benefit from the proposal and in what way?	All staff		
3. What outcomes are wanted from this proposal?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To ensure that staff and managers are provided with clarity on the circumstances in which requests will be supported or otherwise. 2. Clearly state the levels of financial support that may be available to staff 3. Ensure that decisions about support for study and or training are consistent with the University's overall commitment to fairness and equity. 		

4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	<p>Unrealistic expectations on the part of staff or managers</p> <p>Poor communication of the contents of this policy</p> <p>Inability to fund requests due to budgetary constraints</p>	
5. Is it likely that the proposal could have a positive or negative impact on minority ethnic groups? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	N	<p>This policy is underpinned by the University's Equality and Diversity commitments and is further complemented by its Investors in People status. The right to request time to train, which came into force in April 2010, merely formalised established practice at the University and is strongly linked to the University's Personal Development Review process. Provided all of the above are adhered to there should not be any impact, negative or positive, as a result of the protected characteristic of ethnicity.</p>
6. Is it likely that the proposal could have a positive or negative impact due to gender (including pregnancy and maternity)? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	N	<p>This policy is underpinned by the University's Equality and Diversity commitments and is further complemented by its Investors in People status. The right to request time to train, which came into force in April 2010, merely formalised established practice at the University and is strongly linked to the University's Personal Development Review process. Provided all of the above are adhered to there should not be any impact, negative or positive, as a result of the protected characteristic of gender. Women returning from maternity leave will be expected to have the benefit of a return to work interview within which their developmental needs will be considered.</p>

<p>7. Is it likely that the proposal could have a positive or negative impact due to disability? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>		<p>N</p>	<p>This policy is underpinned by the University's Equality and Diversity commitments and is further complemented by its Investors in People status. The right to request time to train, which came into force in April 2010, merely formalised established practice at the University and is strongly linked to the University's Personal Development Review process. Disabled staff are also provided with another opportunity to discuss their developmental needs as part of the University's commitments under the Positive About Disabled People initiative. It is possible for this policy to have a positive impact on disabled staff should the staff development intervention forms part of a "reasonable adjustment" which is permissible under the Equality Act 2010. Provided all of the above are adhered to there should not be any impact, negative or positive, as a result of the protected characteristic of disability.</p>
<p>8. Is it likely that the proposal could 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>This policy is underpinned by the University's Equality and Diversity commitments and is further complemented by its Investors in People status. The right to request time to train, which came into force in April 2010, merely formalised established practice at the University and is strongly linked to the University's Personal Development Review process. Provided all of the above are adhered to there should not be any impact, negative or positive, as a result of the protected characteristic of sexual orientation.</p>
<p>9. Is it likely that the proposal could 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 is underpinned by the University's Equality and Diversity commitments and is further complemented by its Investors in People status. The right to request time to train, which came into force in April 2010, merely formalised established practice at the University and is strongly linked to the University's Personal Development Review process. Managers may still be required to balance the needs of the University against the possibility of a staff member's retiral and whether that would amount to an effective use of finite resources. Care will, however, need to be taken to ensure that managers do not discriminate on grounds of age. Provided all of the above are adhered to there should not be any impact, negative or positive, as a result of the protected characteristic of age.</p>

<p>10. Is it likely that the proposal could 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>N</p>	<p>This policy is underpinned by the University's Equality and Diversity commitments and is further complemented by its Investors in People status. The right to request time to train, which came into force in April 2010, merely formalised established practice at the University and is strongly linked to the University's Personal Development Review process. Provided all of the above are adhered to there should not be any impact, negative or positive, as a result of the protected characteristic of religion and belief (or none).</p>
<p>11. Is it likely that the proposal could 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>N</p>	<p>This policy is underpinned by the University's Equality and Diversity commitments and is further complemented by its Investors in People status. The right to request time to train, which came into force in April 2010, merely formalised established practice at the University and is strongly linked to the University's Personal Development Review process.</p>
<p>12. Is it likely that the proposal could 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>N</p>	<p>This policy is underpinned by the University's Equality and Diversity commitments and is further complemented by its Investors in People status. The right to request time to train, which came into force in April 2010, merely formalised established practice at the University and is strongly linked to the University's Personal Development Review process. Provided all of the above are adhered to there should not be any impact, negative or positive, as a result of the protected characteristic of transgender.</p>
<p>13. Is it likely that the proposal could 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>N</p>	<p>This policy is underpinned by the University's Equality and Diversity commitments and is further complemented by its Investors in People status. The right to request time to train, which came into force in April 2010, merely formalised established practice at the University and is strongly linked to the University's Personal Development Review process. Provided all of the above are adhered to there should not be any impact, negative or positive, as a result of the protected characteristic of marital or civil partnership status.</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>N</p>	<p>This policy is designed to impact without detriment or favour to all groups with the possible exception of disability, where a positive impact could apply, no other impact, adverse or otherwise, is anticipated. It is strongly recommended however that appropriate monitoring mechanisms are put in place that can provide evidence that staff are being provided with developmental opportunities on a fair and equitable basis.</p>