



Edinburgh Napier University
Learning Teaching and Assessment
Equality Impact Assessment

January 2011

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

Faculty/Service Area University LTA Strategy	Date of Assessment 17 January 2011	Name of the proposal to be assessed Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy	Person responsible for the assessment Rowena Pelik and LTA Strategy Working Group
Who was present at the EIA? Please list Rowena Pelik, Mohammed Hameed, Kasia Bylinska, Anastasia Dragona, Mark Huxham, Karen Strickland, Karen Thomson, Alison Varey.	Is this a new or existing proposal? New		When will this proposal be reviewed? Around 2014.
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the proposal	<p>The new Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy aims to provide inspiration for staff to be creative and innovative; it recognises disciplinary diversity and encourages academic leadership and evidence-based pedagogic enquiry. It stresses the value that the University places on learning and teaching and, through the implementation of the strategy, seeks to continue to enhance our students' learning experiences and further the ways in which the University recognises and supports excellence in teaching and in supporting learning.</p> <p>The strategy provides direction and ambition and sets expectations for staff and for students. It provides a framework that confirms the values that we sign up to as staff and share with our student community, stressing that learning is core and that the purpose of teaching and of assessment is to enable students to learn and to encourage them to achieve their potential.</p> <p>The strategy is intended to be learner focused, regarding students as active partners in their learning, with responsibility for demonstrating their achievement of intended learning outcomes.</p>		

2. Who is intended to benefit from the proposal and in what way?	All students. All staff involved with student learning.		
3. What outcomes are wanted from this proposal?	Continued enhancement of LTA within the university. Emphasising innovation and free enquiry (key statement 8).		
4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	As the strategy is a dynamic document, a lack of uptake from staff and feedback from students may detract from the desired outcomes. To avoid or minimise this potential the University will set measures in place that will communicate the strategy widely. As well as utilising conventional methods of dissemination (such as committees etc.), other measures such as the staff conference were used and the strategy was also presented at Napier Students' Association in November.		
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?	<u>Y</u>	N	Please explain The strategy supports the University's wider goal of attracting students from as diverse a background as possible and therefore should only impact on minority ethnic students positively. The University collects and publishes comparative year-on-year data on the ethnicity of its student body and this data shows a steady increase in numbers, which is interpreted as showing general satisfaction with its approach.
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?	<u>Y</u>	N	Please explain The strategy is designed to enhance the student experience and appropriate measures are already in place to ensure there is no negative impact as a result of gender. It is recognised, however, that there may be access difficulties for some population groups to gain entry and this is addressed in key statement 4.

<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><u>Y</u></p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Please explain It may be difficult to find appropriate assessment in some cases – e.g. for those with Asperger syndrome and the difficulties they face with team work. The University also recognises that a greater reliance on distance learning and information technology may be problematic for some students (e.g. visually impaired).</p> <p>More positively, there are a lot of different points of access to the strategy, which are addressed through key statements 7&9; for example, specific work on inclusive assessment.</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><u>Y</u></p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Please explain The University acknowledges that key statement 8, ‘innovation and free enquiry’, has potential for discord where “free debate” may offend some students. The EIA group concluded that, provided debates are conducted within the terms set out in the University’s Equality and Diversity Statement, no disadvantage should occur. Potentially difficult areas discussed included the interface between some religions and 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><u>Y</u></p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Please explain The strategy is intended to be of benefit to all staff and students regardless 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><u>Y</u></p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Please explain The strategy is intended to be of benefit to all staff and students regardless of religion or belief (or none). Discussion of this protected characteristic was linked to the discussion for sexual orientation (above).</p>
<p>11. Is it likely that 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><u>Y</u></p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Please explain The University recognises that a key inequality exists for people who cannot afford to come to university if they have these responsibilities but recognises also that its powers to minimise the potential adverse impact are limited. Professional bodies (such as the Royal Colleges) and their regulations may add to this adverse impact but there is little the strategy can do in this case except to keep bringing this to their attention through the appropriate channels.</p>

<p>12. Is it likely that 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><u>Y</u></p>	<p><u>N</u></p>	<p>Please explain There may be occasions where somebody cannot engage with its full range of activities due to being transgender or transsexual and that this could become increasingly an issue due to the change in legislation. The University recognises that it has a proactive duty to 'educate' staff, students and visitors on this matter.</p>
<p>13. Is it likely that 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><u>Y</u></p>	<p><u>N</u></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><u>Y</u></p>	<p><u>N</u></p>	<p>The University's desire to increase the diversity of staff and students has potential to adversely affect some students in cases where, for example, student expectations cannot be met due to certain subjects attracting disproportionate numbers from a particular ethnic group. Where reasonable adjustments are made for students, there is potential for these to be perceived as being at the expense of non-disabled students but this is justifiable under the Equality Act 2010.</p>