

Equality Impact Assessment

PgCert Academic Practice as a method of Continual Professional Development aimed at current staff within the University of Edinburgh

Overview of EqIA

1. Reason for screening :

- Undertaking a review of an existing policy/practice

2. Person responsible for the policy area or practice:

Name: Dr Hazel Christie

Job title: Programme Director

School/service/unit: Institute for Academic Development &
Moray House School of Education

3. Screening Analysis - results

a. Does the policy or practice affect primary or high level functions of the University?

YES.

Current practice impacts on :

- *Teaching (directly by identifying and giving feedback on good practice; indirectly by role modelling and access to research in the area)*
- *UoE provision of CPD for staff (financial resources)*
- *College and Departmental staff workload models*
- *Probation practices across UoE for new lecturing / teaching staff*

b. Is the policy or practice relevant to the promotion of equality (in terms of the Public Sector Equality Duty 'needs' set out in the introduction above)?

YES.

The review of existing practice is being undertaken to ascertain/ensure no one with relevant learning and teaching associated work is excluded from this programme's provision.

c. Is the policy or practice one on which interested parties could reasonably expect the University to have carried out an EqIA?

YES.

Although it is not be expected for the UoE to carry out an EqIA on all/any academic programmes as there is quality assurance provision within the academic framework, this quality assurance provision is aimed primarily at academic content and consistency rather than equity provision. In addition, as a UoE training provider, we would like to ensure equality of provision for our staff development programmes. This academic programme falls within the overlap of the two and therefore a voluntary review or reflective process is a useful process to identify any equality differentials in provision.

4. Sign-off

Screening undertaken by (name(s) and job title(s)):

Emily Salvesen
Programme Manager , IAD.

Accepted by (name):

Date :

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) for Postgraduate Certificate for Academic Practice (PgCAP)

I. Overview

The PgCAP provides an accredited route for UoE members of staff to become Fellows of the Higher Education Academy. It aspires to support staff in thinking creatively and in developing areas within their academic practice, to develop practice in a scholarly way and to enhance the learning of students of those participating in this programme. (See PgCAP Handbook for further details of the programme)

The aim of the EqIA is to make initial strides in reviewing gender, nationality and age data associated with our matriculated students (3 of the protected characteristics of the Equality Act). The programme does not exclude any of the individuals within protected characteristics; this snapshot is to confirm from accessible data if there are unintended exclusions.

i) Matriculation figures

Over the last few years numbers of matriculated students have increased (note that the Postgraduate Certificate in University Teaching, an outgoing programme, is the predecessor programme for the PgCAP which was revalidated internally and reaccredited externally by the HEA (2010 and 2011 respectively) :

Date	Number of Matriculations*		
	PgCert Univ Teach	PgCAP	total
23jun2014	3	128	131
17sep2013	5	98	103
17may2012	25	36	61
2sep2011	37	23	60

*Note: Matriculations occur year round, so these represent snapshots at a specific point in time, rather than over academic session which is less relevant to this programme.

ii) Data related to Gender (PgCAP, started 2011) and Comparative to UoE staff as whole (data from UoE Equality and Diversity Monitoring And Research Committee Staff Report 2013/14)

	Session	Male (M%)	Female (F%)
PgCAP (n=105)	2013/14	45 (42%)	60 (57%)
UoE (n=8976)	2012/13	(48%)	(52%)

iii) Data related to Nationality (PgCAP, started 2011)

Session	Nationality (Nationality %)	
2013/2014	UK	58 (56%)
	EC (non UK)	29 (28%)
	USA	4 (3%)
	Other	14 (13%)

iv) **Data related to Age (PgCAP, started 2011) [UoE comparative data from UoE Equality and Diversity Monitoring And Research Committee Staff Report 2013/14]**

Session	Age	Number (Age %)	UoE comparative (2012/13)
2013/2014	50+	9 (8%)	(31%)
	41-50 yrs	13 (12%)	
	31-40 yrs	55 (52%)	age 35-49 (41%)
	30 yrs -	28 (27%)	age<35 (28%)

2. To which equality groups is the policy/practice relevant?

Protected characteristics : Age, Disability, Race (including ethnicity and nationality), Religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, marriage or civil partnership

The PgCAP aims to be offered and available to all current members of University of Edinburgh staff who have significant learning and teaching responsibilities. The application process is via an emailed form. The courses are on dates finalised at least 3 months in advance and provisionally scheduled about a year and a half in advance. Course delivery dates are set prioritising where possible non-teaching times for participants, avoiding main University shut-down periods and allowing for the majority of academic staff summer holiday/conference seasons. All (except one) courses have a face-to-face component. The majority of courses are delivered in Paterson’s Land, Moray House School of Education.

In terms of provision of the programme, the equality protected characteristics have been considered in light of teachability.

- The programme is open to all members of staff, irrespective of age, race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, marriage or civil partnership. The necessity of being significantly involved in learning and teaching responsibilities allows for the reflective work-based learning approach of the programme and its ability to offer practical as well as theoretical support to staff. The teaching team note that no participant to date has alerted staff to any issue related to programme timing, but we would hope to be approachable enough to be able of offer alternate options should an issue (eg Friday courses being held / Muslim traditions upheld) arise.
- Courses are delivered in Moray House School of Education as this programme is within the MHSE suite of academic programmes – the link is reinforced with geographical proximity. In addition, Paterson’s Land is an ‘accessible’ building, offering strict adherence to the University of Edinburgh’s policy on accessible and inclusive environments.
- The programme offers the same support for those with learning/reading/writing difficulties as any other academic programme; however, it is important for the teaching team to note that matriculation and formal registration is only carried out for those wishing to complete the programme, not those for whom there is limited auditing attendance for CPD/staff development purposes – there may be restrictions of support for the latter group of participants (Student Disability Service offers support to matriculated students only).

Classrooms used have microphones which the teaching team employ. It is noted by the teaching team that the majority of courses are run on a ‘workshop’ seminar type basis

with groupwork used extensively throughout the programme. Where this is potentially discriminatory, we have put in place alternative inclusive measures to support participants including one-to-one support, alteration to smaller group sizes, offering to read drafts and moving to a blended form of delivery; the programme is in process of moving one course to being delivered entirely online and this may result in further courses online in due course. This, we hope, may alleviate time constraining factors (either home or work oriented) that participants may have.

At least two courses currently utilise presentations within their course framework. One course uses small presentations as part of the independent study and formative learning ('Developing my Approach to Teaching') and another uses presentations as a key part of the assessment ('Course Organisation and Management'). Whilst this has the potential of being discriminatory, alternative options may be discussed with the course directors.

- One course in the PgCAP 'Engaging with Student Diversity' specifically tackles issues of equality for all groups in higher education.

The data shown in the overview is this programme's first attempt to look at the programme's participants in view of protected characteristics and diversity. It is unknown how well, for example, the nationality information reflects the UoE total staff information.

3. What evidence is available about the needs of relevant equality groups ? Where are the gaps in evidence?

Evidence has been taken from that available from matriculated student data. Participants who do not choose to matriculate have not given this data. No other evidence has been gathered deliberately in view of equality information, although the participants all have the opportunity in course delivery date of providing feedback both on content and in general terms in a confidential way – and any issues regarding the equality groups could be advised using this route.

The programme team does not have a current plan to ask participants attending the orientation days (the most widespread participant data for those who do plan to matriculate and those who attend for CPD or contractual need) to complete equality forms. It could be done for a 'snapshot' comparison at a future EqIA if this would be deemed appropriate.

The programme team have received feedback from participants relating the following:
(related to impaired hearing)

- Microphone system for presenters allows presenters to be heard but there is difficulty hearing contributions from individuals within the 'seminar-style' workshops that are run within the PgCAP.
- Those that have difficulty participating in group sessions of more than 4 participants may struggle with the groupwork activities
- For those with severe hearing loss, presenters need to be helped to be aware that the participant has this issue and then enable placement so that lip reading is supported.

(related to lighting levels/type of room lighting)

- Large rooms enable lighting above participants to be altered depending on need however not all rooms and class sizes may have this availability.

(related to back issues)

- Alternative seating has been provided for participants with back problems.

4. Might the application of this policy/practice lead to discrimination, harassment or victimisation? Might it result in less favourable treatment for particular equality groups or give rise to indirect discrimination?

If there are technological or other methods that can overcome the problems experienced to date then we would hope to do this. In addition the programme team are adding courses and changing current courses to ensure provision for those who choose not to declare issues (such as limited hearing) may be supported (eg online delivery of 'Designing Courses' and other new courses).

5. Are reasonable adjustments built in where they may be needed?

Yes – alternative solutions where needed are offered as previously mentioned in this paper.

6. Does the policy/practice contribute to advancing equality of opportunity¹? Will it help to:

- **remove or minimise disadvantage**
- **meet the needs of different equality groups**
- **encourage increased participation of particular groups**
- **take account of disabled people's impairments?**

The programme team staff and other contributors aim to advance equality by demonstration and provision of research-led teaching that provides evidence of good practice. In this way it aims to remove and minimise disadvantage. There are some gaps (previously described) in our ability to eliminate disadvantage and, utilising our own programme team sharing practice and School reporting systems, such as the quality assurance annual reports, we hope to continue to reduce disadvantages.

By the introduction of the Edinburgh Teaching Award and University's CPD Framework, the Institute for Academic Development would hope to encourage our former participants and future goals for onwards development, enabling the 'not just new lecturers' or 'early career' researchers support, which it may be interpreted that the PgCAP aims only to support.

7. Is there an opportunity in applying this policy/practice to foster good relations between people in any protected group and those who are not²? Will it help to tackle prejudice and/or promote understanding?

There are opportunities within the programme to enable more colleagues who are participants on the programme to recognise and support understanding of those in protected groups. The programme team would like to consider the possibilities of enacting promotion of understanding within the good practice of delivery we hope worthy of emulation, so we will discuss this at the next team meeting. The programme's option course 'Engaging with Student Diversity' very explicitly aims to foster good practice and understanding within the academic and pastoral environments of higher education.

¹ This question does not apply to the protected characteristic of marriage or civil partnership

² This question does not apply to the protected characteristic of marriage or civil partnership.

8. Is there evidence (or an expectation) that people from different equality groups have different needs or experiences in relation to the policy/practice? If so, what are they?

No. There is evidence that people from different academic disciplines and different stages of academic careers may have different needs and expectations of the programme. This may be related to the age characteristic but indirectly and not exclusively.

9. Is there evidence (or an expectation) of higher or lower uptake by any equality group(s)? If so, give details of the differences and the reasons for these (if known)?

From limited evidence shown above, there might be an expected higher uptake of those aged 31-40 years and a lower uptake by older participants compared to the normal distribution of staff in the University.

10. Is any equality group excluded from participating in or accessing the service or functions? If so, why?

It is unknown if there are any severely sight or hearing impaired personnel ; it is possible that these physical characteristics may feel prevented from accessing the PgCAP programme, such as the challenge of groupwork; the programme does offer a range of possibilities to support participation by participants who advise of this or other types of need, such as one-to-one support, increasing the quantity of blended learning and online delivery, feedforward for assignments.

11. Does the policy/practice create any barriers for any other groups? For example, because of the time when the service is delivered or because of restricted income? Is the communication of the policy/practice accessible to all groups?

Timing of delivery may affect some participants due to demands in day-to-day workloads. The delivery is scheduled to avoid most main teaching times, formal shutdown periods and main vacation periods but inevitably participants find that some teaching duties (particularly exam boards in the summer) clash. For this reason the programme tries to set teaching dates at least 6 months in advance. No known problems have been caused in terms of religious needs but it is possible that participants may have clashes with religious needs on Fridays when teaching is done. Programme staff are requested to give one-to-one support in this instance.

Fees are waived for current UoE members of staff; there are eligibility criteria for doctoral students who do some teaching (partly to allow them the unusual circumstance of being on two credit-bearing programmes at one time and partly to ensure they have the relevant experience and current work profile to enable them to engage fully and usefully for their benefit in the programme) – doctoral students who are on the ‘Principal’s Career Development Scholarships’ do not receive staff waivers but may be asked to do some teaching as part of the Scholarship – they may choose to spend some of the Scholarship monies on CPD, including this programme.

Communication of the availability of the PgCAP (and any eligibility criteria) is on the PgCAP web pages. These are to be checked for accessibility. The PgCAP uses a virtual learning environment called LEARN and this is standard for academic programmes in the University of Edinburgh. Although no participant has noted accessibility issues, the programme team should check this.

12. How are relevant equality groups or communities involved in the development, review and/or monitoring of the policy or practice?

All participants, regardless of their 'groups or communities', are given the opportunity to give feedback and this is used in the review, development and monitoring of courses and the programme as a whole.

The programme team may consider what steps might make this process more deliberately inclusive in student engagement, for all students.

13. Are there any other points to note regarding the potential or actual impact of applying the policy or practice, with regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality and promote good relations? If so, note these here.

No further comments.

Equality Impact Assessment Outcome

There is a legal obligation to take account of the results of the EqIA in the development of a new or revised policy or practice. This requires considering taking action to address any issues identified, such as removing or mitigating any negative impacts, where possible, and exploiting any potential for positive impact. Clearly any unlawful discrimination must be eliminated.

Having considered the answers in the section above, the option below indicates how the development/review of the policy/practice will be progressed :

Option 2: Adjust the policy or practice – this involves taking steps to remove any barriers, to better advance equality and/or to foster good relations. This may involve removing or changing the aspect of the policy/practice that creates any negative or unwanted impact. It may also involve introducing additional measures to reduce or mitigate any potential negative impact.

The steps noted within the EqIA above are to be taken, namely

Programme team to :

- Discuss further deliberate inclusion of participants for student engagement including seeking commentary on equality of practice in the programme.
- LEARN and PgCAP webpages to be checked for teachability/accessibility.
- Timing of course deliveries to continue to be carefully considered in the light of known clashes for participants.
- consider the possibilities of proactively promoting understanding of protected groups within the delivery of the PgCAP at the next team meeting.
- Continue to consider different modes of delivery and assessment to suit purpose of courses but also provide other alternative options for protected groups. Courses to consider formalising alternative substitutions to provide further equity.
- Programme to ensure consideration of mainstreaming adjustments (such as advance information provision for powerpoint presentations) wherever possible and appropriate.
- Review again, giving comparative data and any trends.
- Consider single snapshots of any other data towards information related to 'protected characteristics'.

Next review to take place :

Summer 2016

(This is timed to be just in advance of the programme's needs to be re-accredited with the external professional body – The Higher Education Academy)

Note that the PgCAP is one offering of continual professional development for personnel working within learning and teaching roles (predominantly academic staff) within the University of Edinburgh's CPD Framework. The CPD Framework is likely to have a separate Equality Impact Assessment in a future academic session.

Can this EqIA be published in full, now?

YES – has been approved by Programme Team and IAD Director.

Sign-off

EqIA undertaken by (name(s) and job title(s)): Emily Salvesen, Programme Manager, IAD

Accepted by (name): Dr Hazel Christie, Programme Director (PgCert Academic Practice)

Date: 23-Oct-2014