

# GSA SUMMARY REPORT OF EQUALITY CONSIDERATION AND ASSESSMENT OF EQUALITY IMPACT

Date of Assessment:	July 2017	
School or Executive Group Area:	School of Design	
Department:	Communication Design	
Lead member of staff: e-mail:	Dr Donna Leishman Head of Communication Design d.leishman@gsa.ac.uk	
Area of decision making/title of policy, procedure, programme or relevant practice:	BA (Hons) Communication Design (Glasgow)	
Please indicate if this is:	New	X
	Existing/Reviewed	

## 1. Summary of how equality, diversity and participation have been considered and due regard given to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED):

The approach taken in this Equality Impact Assessment Report deploys both statistical analysis of PMAR data, School Wide Staff and Student Equality data and the discursive in the form of academic staff and student level discussions in order to identify how equality and the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) are considered and implemented across this programme of study. The programme works on the premise that for our students, discrimination-free education is a right.

This process and the resultant report seeks to make explicit the existing ethical platform and non-discriminatory studio ethos from which this programme has been developed and considers all aspects of the programme, it seeks to establish areas that might require more attention.

## 2. Evidence used to make your assessment:

### Quantitative

\*Programme level specific PMAR data for academic sessions: 2013/14, 2014/15, 2015/16

\*Institutional Student Equality and Monitoring reports for academic sessions: 2013/14, 2014/15, 2015/16, 2012/13, and 2012/11.

\*Institutional Staff Equality and Monitoring reports for academic sessions: 2013/14, 2014/15, 2015/16, 2012/13, and 2012/11.

\*National Student Survey (NSS) from 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016

Analysis of quantitative information indicates the following:

#### i) Age

	16-17	18	19-20	21	22-24	25-39	40+
13/14	0.7%	3.9%	36.2%	21.1%	23.7%	13.8%	0.7%
14/15	0.7%	6.0%	30.5%	23.8%	25.2%	13.2%	0.7%
15/16	1.2%	8.0%	<b>35.8%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>25.9%</b>	9.9%	1.2%
Average	0.86%	5.96%	34.1%	20.9%	24.9%	12.3%	0.86%

Summary: Age profiles over the three academic sessions show little variance, however worth (a modest) note is a sustained trajectory of gradual increase in 18 year olds and a decrease in 25-39 bracket. Comparing the recent data of 2015/16 the majority of the students in the UG programme are between 19-24 equating to **79.6%** in line with GSA UG overall **77.2%** for the same period (Student Benchmark Data 2015/15) with 16-18 years equating to **9.2%** again inline with GSA statistics of **9%** and 25+ years at **11.1%** once again in line with GSA UG **10.7%**. The Equality monitoring Report 2015-16 report also states "The age profile at GSA has remained relatively consistent within the five

year period from 2011/12 with the number of 18 year olds showing a slight increase following a dip in 2014/15." Which is an observation also seen within the programme.

## ii) Disability

Instance	0	8	51	54	55	57	96	Total
13/14 %	71.7	6	14.4	0.6	5	0.6	0.6	100%
14/15	73.5	9	13.2	0	2	0.6	0.6	100%
15/16	77.1	8	11.7	0	2.4	0	0	100%
Average %	74	8	13.1	0.2	3.1	0.4	0.4	

Summary: Instance 0: 'No known disability' has shown as a consistent majority (over three academic sessions 13/14: **71.7%**, 14/15: **73.5%**, 15/16: **77.2%**) with an average of **74%** over the three year period. GSA's equality monitoring report by comparison shows a higher disclosure of No known disability with 14/15: **83.4%** 15/16: **82.3%** thus it can be deduced that this programme as approx. **10%** more of the students studying with declared disabilities.

In terms of the characteristics of the disability in descending order of statistical significance is instance 51: 'A specific learning difficulty such as dyslexia, dyspraxia or AD (H) D' which has shown a stable pattern (13/14: **14.4%**, 14/15: **13.2%**, 15/16: **11.7%** over three academic sessions) with an average of **13.1%**. These students will be offered support via the GSA student support team and where deemed necessary / appropriate will draft an Individual requirements form (IRF) which is shared with their studio contact tutor which will in turn detail what adjustments to their programme should be put in place.

Next in scale of declared disability instance 8: 'Two or more impairments and/or disabling medical conditions' which has shown a similarly stable pattern (13/14: **6.5%**, 14/15: **9.9%**, 15/16: **8%** over three academic sessions) with an average of **0.8%**. Students with instance 8 / 'Two or more impairments and/or disabling medical conditions' - will be offered access to the Individual IRF procedure – however the academic staff team who are designated contact tutors have noted that the scope and impact of multiple disabilities can depending on the nature of their disabilities require more careful monitoring in terms of support.

This is followed by instance 55: 'A mental health condition, such as depression, schizophrenia or anxiety disorder' which has shown a slight reduction over the three year period- 13/14: **5%**, 14/15: **2%**, 15/16: **2.4%** over three academic sessions with a summary average of **3.1%**.

Instance 57: "Deaf or serious hearing impairment" combined with Instance 96: "A disability, impairment or medical condition that is not listed above" with Instance 54: "A long standing illness or health condition such as cancer, HIV, diabetes, chronic heart disease, or epilepsy" together make up the rest at an average of **0.4%** of the programme.

By comparison to the above GSA Equality Monitoring report 2015/16 which data shows 13/14: **83.1%**, 14/15: **83.2%**, 15/16: **82.3%** with an average of **82.8%** (compared to our average of **74%**) this reveals we have approx. **8.8%** more students identifying with some form of disability.

## iii) Ethnicity

Hesa Ethnicity	10	13	19	34	39	41	43	49	80	90	98	Total
13/14	71.7	17.7	0.6	3	1.3	0.6	1.3	0	0.6	0.6	1.9	100%
14/15	56	34	0.6	1.9	1.3	0.6	1.3	0.6	0	0.6	1.9	100%
15/16	51.8	32.7	2.4	1.2	3.7	0.6	3.0	1.8	0.6	0	1.8	100%
Average	<b>59.8</b>	<b>28.1</b>	1.2	2	2.1	0.6	1.86	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.86	

Summary: The majority of students has consistently over three years of PMAR level data have identified as White (coding frame 10) and White Scottish (coding frame 13) making up approximately **88%** of the overall student group with BAME making up the remaining **12%**, I note the next ethnic group of significance in size is Chinese (coding frame 34), Other Asian (coding frame 39) and Mixed White Asian (coding frame 39). By comparison all our current staff are White and White Scottish – this disproportionality is partially offset by the enhancement benefits we gain from our Singapore GSA undergraduate programme, which requires the same staff team to travel and teaching into an Asian context as well as design and deliver a three week Overseas immersion programme in Glasgow, each cycle strengthens and broadens the teaching teams cultural sensitivities.

Some members of U/G teaching team also benefit (in terms of extended cultural awareness) from supervision roles in our two Masters programmes both of which have a much larger Ethnic diversity (2015/16: MDes Communication Design **40.9%: BAME** and **59.1%: White**, MDes Graphics / Illustration / Photography **60%: BAME** **40%: White**).

As Head of Department (in post since January 2016) I have sought to set up learning opportunities that both Masters and undergraduate student cohorts can share and thus in turn have the opportunity to form a more extended community above and beyond their studio context.

A good example of this the live collaboration with BBC Scottish Symphony Orchestra (Sept-Dec 2016), which ran as an optional project across undergraduate and Masters. We also ran a three day intense music design themed workshop in January 2017 which saw mixed groups of Masters and undergraduate students work in groups of varying sizes with visiting alumni/designers/musicians. Lastly we also included stage three Masters in the all day professional practice event 'Working Day' (March 14<sup>th</sup> 2017) which had ten invited speakers (5 female and 5 male designers) in attendance.

#### iv) Sexual Identity

	Male	Female	Other	Total	Male	Female
13/14	47	105	n/a	152	31%	69%
14/15	48	103	n/a	151	32%	68%
15/16	41	121	0	162	25%	75%
Average					29.3%	70.6%

All students identified as Male or Female and none as 'other', please note in academic sessions 13/14 and 14/15 this was not a formal category. These PMAR statistics show a small increase in Female students, which could in the future be further scrutinized as change relative to overall student growth within the U/G programme.

This data reveals that the programme has slightly more female students in comparison to data in the GSA wide Student Benchmark Report which reveals an approximate ratio to **39%** in relation to our **29.3% Male** to **61%** in relation to our **70.6% Females**. Notably at school wide level there was also similar pattern of increase in overall numbers and Female students and decrease in Males students during Academic Session 2015/16 (**36.9% Male**, **63.1% Female**). Whilst it is too early to check (in terms of robust evidence base) this pattern may suggest that as we increase student numbers we are also uplifting the volume of female students.

#### v) Sexual Orientation

	Bisexual	Gay M	Gay F	Hetero	Other	Refused	Total
13/14	4.6%	4.6%	2.0%	68.4%	0.7%	19.7%	100.0%
14/15	4.6%	6.0%	1.3%	68.9%	1.3%	17.9%	100.0%
15/16	6.8%	4.3%	1.9%	67.3%	2.5%	17.3%	100.0%
Average	5.3%	4.9%	1.7%	68.2%	1.5%	18.3%	

A consistent (over three academic cycles) majority identified as heterosexual yielding an average of around **68.2%** within the UG programme, the next largest grouping was those who chose information refused with an average of **18.3%**. In terms of specific categories it worth a note that those students identifying as 'Bisexual' is slightly up, averaging at **5.3%** with those identifying as 'Gay Man' averaging at **4.9%** and 'Gay woman/lesbian' **1.7%** followed by 'Other' at **1.5%**.

In the GSA Student Equality Monitoring Report 15/16 (which reviews the 4 years worth of student data) summarized that "**71.6% of students at GSA identified as heterosexual in 2015/16, a slight and gradual drop of 3% since 2012/13. In the same period the percentage of students identifying as Lesbian, Gay or bisexual increased by 5.5%. The percentage of students who prefer not to say, or refuse to give information, continues to be relatively high but has decreased steadily over the last four years.**"

Thus Communication Design undergraduate programme is modestly more diverse in sexual orientation with **68.2%** as heterosexual compared to **71.6%**, however this is offset by a higher return

in our information refused note GSA average is **17.7%** compared to our **18.3%**. **Action:** It would be elucidating to consult with new intake students to discuss the possible rationale behind choosing not to declare information (e.g. uncertainty, fear of discrimination, fear of data being in the public domain).

#### vi.) Religion and Belief

	None	Buddhist	Church of Scotland	Roman Catholic	Christian Other	Hindu
<b>13/14</b>	59.2%	2.6%	2.6%	9.2%	2.0%	0.0%
<b>14/15</b>	52.4%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	19.0%	0.0%
<b>15/16</b>	59.9%	1.2%	0.6%	11.7%	6.8%	0.0%
<b>Average</b>	<b>57.1%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>0%</b>

	Muslim	Sikh	Spiritual	Other	Refused
<b>13/14</b>	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	1.3%	18.4%
<b>14/15</b>	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	2.4%	9.5%
<b>15/16</b>	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	3.1%	12.3%
<b>Average</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>2.26%</b>	<b>13.4%</b>

The majority of students identify as 'no religion', averaging (over three academic cycles) of **57.1%**, this is proportionally followed by students with information refused averaging at **13.4%**, the next largest group is 'Christian Roman Catholic': average **11.7%**, followed by 'Other Christian': **9.2%**, the small remaining numbers identify as 'Spiritual': average **3.3%**, 'Other religion/belief': **2.26%**, followed by 'Buddhist': **1.9%** and 'Jewish': **0.65%**. Regarding the information refused category (averaging at **13.4%**), by comparison GSA Student Equality Monitoring Report 15/16 states "*The percentage of students at GSA who preferred not to say, or refused information, on their religion/belief fell from 22.4% in 2013/14 to 10% in 2015/16. The percentage of students indicating no religion rose by 15% in the same period to a high of 62%.*" This confirms we are tracking well with the School wide trajectories but as discussed in section V. Sexual Orientation I note a slight increase in 'refused information' and decrease in the majority 'non religion' category. **Action:** future consideration of language/ images used in all communications during the pre admission period to ensure where possible that a non-discriminatory / supportive tone is used to help foster declaration of student data.

#### Qualitative Evidence

- \*Head of Department and class representative meetings (from Jan 2016 onwards)
- \*Staff Workshop: programme level academic teaching staff group EIA workshop session
- \*Student Staff Consultative Committees
- \*NSS 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016
- \*Undergraduate Quality Enhancement Student Questionnaire (Term 2, inaugural year 2016/17)
- \*External Examiners Reports (2013/14, 2014/15, 2015/16)

It is recognised that the qualitative evidence would be further strengthened by gaining more insight into the student experience as it specifically pertains to the programmes PSED remit this will be addressed in Section 4.

Analysis of qualitative information indicates the following

#### vii.) Class Representatives

As Head of Department, I have held termly private student class representative meetings organised in year groups across the programme. Whilst these meetings tended to be reflections of their student experience focusing on teaching, workshops and studio provision a few subjects pertaining to the scope of this report were uncovered. That being: the year 3 and year 4 student class reps brought to my attention the issue of generalised class experience of stress and anxiety, they believed often as a direct result from failing to manage competing/clashing hand ins from different courses within their programme of study, it would seem clear that as the student cohorts grow that these core timetabling issues need to be better resolved with more advance planning and made public would benefit all students. We also had interesting discussions regarding the small minority of year 4 students who were managing via the IRF process 'Two or more impairments and/or disabling medical conditions' and their particular challenges in maintaining good performance in what is their most academically and creatively challenging honours year of study, the year 4 class representatives feedback was that the programmes studio culture was a very supportive peer environment, inevitably more intimate than the traditional university sector offer and that in some instances this peer to peer support extended outwith studio hours and into supporting each other out of hours, they discussed the merits and

downside to this (e.g. students are not trained counsellors, mature students tended to shoulder more of this type of support, students may/could depending on circumstances be made vulnerable or will in turn become develop additional stress depending on what was being disclosed and the potential impact on their own individual studies). I discussed this with the staff group and they felt that most instances of this overspill of peer support is picked up within the close pastoral dialogue between lecturer and student but mainly through the framework of considering their academic performance (so only if and when issues presented) **Action:** we discussed that we could potentially consider a peremptory briefing and year / level specific induction or training session co-led by Student Support to help better delineate institutional roles and responsibilities alongside indicative examples of what could be deemed normal for high / sustained demanding stressful academic environments and discuss potential student behaviours that indicate extra support maybe required. Outwith these subject topics there were no issues raised about Age/Sex/Gender/Race/Religion/Sexual Orientation which is positive indicator that we are delivering a non-discriminatory studio environment and learning experience.

#### **viii.) Staff Workshop**

12 out of 14 academic teaching staff group attended a workshop on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2017 exploring the scope/remit of the Equality Impact Report minutes were taken as record of our debate and discussions. This was a very useful session which in teaching staff clearly considered that the programme had a strong pre-existing ethical platform and non-discriminatory studio ethos which has been inculcated and developed throughout its existence, they felt that adjustments have been made as student profiles have changed (become more diverse and internationalised). We discussed in terms of negatives we discussed that programme with its very embedded non-discriminatory approach could do more to better evidence the best practice that occurs for reporting purposes as well as check the assumption that students and staff are being well supported. We also discussed opportunities for enhancement in light of incoming changes and trends e.g. potentially more students under 18, protected characteristic related absence from the programme. Please see **section 4 for actions** to foster better positive impact.

#### **ix.) Student Staff Consultative Committee (SSCC)**

Complimenting my experience of class representatives (and as discussed in section vii.) Class Representatives) I reviewed all available archived SSCC minutes and can report that there have been no issues formally noted, the nearest comment related to the remit of this report was a suggestion by a year 3 representative (on our SSCC conducted on 18.4.17 ) to further discuss mental health support issues from the student perspective this will be followed up as part of the termly Head of Department – class representative meetings scheduled for academic session 2017/18.

#### **x) National Student Survey (NSS)**

I reviewed free comments and data for the 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016 NSS reporting cycles. Whilst the NSS primarily focuses on the institutional/programme organisation, technical resourcing and teaching experiences of the graduating student cohort on review it does offer an insight into how well integrated the inclusive non-discriminatory studio culture is within Communication Design, the quotations below illustrates the strength of critical freedom on offer in within our curriculum and studio culture, it also evidences the close pastoral dynamic between student and lecturing staff as well as the flexibility staff have in making curriculum adjustments/delivery to support students with equality related needs.

NSS, free text commentary 2014/15:

*“The course encourages inquisitive and critical thinking which I think is a valuable thing in 2015. I am also grateful for the willingness and enthusiasm of the staff (tutors and technicians). They offer a range of opinions on work, which I feel, is invaluable to the development of my practice.”*

*“Wonderful teaching. Freedom and encouragement to break boundaries and expectations. If this is inherent in the briefs, tutorials, workshops and lectures (in the Communication Design Department).”*

*“The tutors have been amazing, really giving you space to breathe but also really nurturing each pupil. I have formed some great relationships with my peers that will last after university and the studio environment has definitely helped this. I have had a few personal issues since being at unit, family relations, my flat was burgled, knocked of my bike, and when these things happened my tutors were they to help, support and advise me, which I really appreciated.”*

*“The tutors were particularly understanding with my commitments outside of the course. They encouraged me to continue with this in conjunction with my studies and were always clear, fair and honest with how it affected my marking.”*

I note there were no instances of negative comments related to either identity based experience on

the programme or needs/barriers related to a protected characteristic.

#### **xi.) QEQs**

I reviewed the first round of undergraduate Quality Enhancement Student Questionnaire in Term 2 (inaugural academic session 2016/17), there were no instances of negative comments related to any of the protected characteristics discussed in this report nor any salient positive comments due to the nature of the current questions. **Action:** opportunity to better use this mechanism to capture feedback on Equality and Diversity issues, this requires discussion across all School of Design undergraduate programmes.

#### **xii.) External Examiners Reports**

There were no instances of negative comments related to any of the protected characteristics discussed in this report. I below sampled quotations provide external verification of the student NSS feedback around the critical freedom, resilience in problem solving and diversity of creative subject matter we offer.

Report 2014/15 *“8.1 Identified areas of Good Practice > I am very pleased to see within the work of the graduates an attitude that is unconstrained by narrow notions, of what communication design can and should encompass. The programme encourages original enquiry and diversity of outcomes whilst underpinning these with craft and industry skills.”*

Report 2014/15 *“Again I can report that students presented themselves professionally and enthusiastically described their project journeys when selected for sampling. I was reassured that they did not feel compelled to describe everything in overly positive terms, and were honest about moments of confusion and difficulties they experienced. It was good to see these new young designers learning how to depersonalise problem solving and find creative solutions. GSA students appear to be energised and resilient.”*

#### **Teaching Staff Profiles**

Off the core contracted lecturing staff delivering into the U/G programme (removing myself as Head of Department from the calculations) we have 6 Female, 6 Male and no ‘Other’ gendered staff, all of whom are on lectureships delivering into the U/G programme – with 7.5 FTE in total (and equating to **48% Female and 52% Male** in terms of FTE) however in terms of planning / curriculum responsibilities i.e. extra internal administrative time being allocated within workload for first year, second year and specialisms (Graphic Design, Illustration and Photography) development - we see only one female with 4 males fulfilling these roles. **Action:** within the career review process I will look to offer staff mentoring or additional development training to ensure that equal opportunity in these activities within the department and rotate these responsibilities where appropriate this will also reduce the possibility for unconscious bias within the student group or externally.

Teaching teams from A/S 2017/18 onwards are generally well balanced between genders with historic issues in a gender imbalance located within year 2 (which has in the past academic session been all female teaching team) and Photography (single Male academic staff member and male technical specialist for multiple academic sessions).

I also note that during A/S 2016/7 only male lecturers applied and accessed the Staff development or research development funds. **Action:** both within staff meeting and the career review process I will look to investigate why this was and look to better support female staff so they can benefit from these funds. Lastly, with regards to the full profile/ characteristics of this academic team (i.e. Age, Disability, Ethnicity, Sexual Orientation, Religion), at time of writing this report I have been unable to access specific programme level data as evidence and as such am unable to review and comment.

### **3.Outline any positive or negative impacts you have identified:**

#### **Pre- admissions**

As Head of Department I deliver two scheduled lectures to approx. 200 persons as part of GSA’s U/G Open Day, in which the inclusive approach to advancing equality is demonstrated by real examples of student work, the studio culture and the type of extra curricular environment we have within the programme, I also give example to the types of flexibilities that can be considered for applicants: experiential learning / professional experience in lieu of academic qualifications.

#### **Admissions**

The department works a process of reviewing of all online portfolios to establish a generous long list for invitation to in person interview (this is approximately 75 persons), with a view that in interview is

an experience in which more nuanced appraisals can be undertaken as above and beyond the formal combination of academic attainment, references and online portfolio alone. During the on campus interview process we acknowledge that students ability to perform in interview can be relative to age and experience, cultural background. Where possible the interview is conducted with mixed gender (key given the proportion of female candidates). We offer all interviewees direct and private access to students so they can connect and ask any key questions and or air any concerns with their potential peers. We also offer Skype interview so those students Overseas so they can also benefit from an interview.

### **Curriculum Design**

As evidenced above via our NSS free comments, external examiner reports, the programme is intrinsically a culturally critical and diverse programme that allows all personal lived experience of the protected characteristics discussed in this report to be examined and discussed in an academically support studio environment, this can often become the subject of the honours year personal project (see Examples of Student Projects below).

This freedom in explore personally important subject matter is built into most of the flexible project briefs in the programme this is also complimented by a space for students to self initiated their design practice. Teaching methods scale across the year levels to build confidence in group work to foster excellent inter/cross cultural discussion, student presentations, peer review freedom to voice independent thought is vital. Communication Design as a practice has to consider audience and cultural contexts and thus staff utilize the student cohorts primary experiences (varying backgrounds, family histories) with key critical secondary sources to help totalise and ground their development knowledge of the world towards becoming ethically grounded creative identities.

### **Examples of Student Projects**

Photography/Communication Design Graduate 2017: 'Intersect' publication final year project looks at what it means to be a 'Person of Color' who also identifies as LGBTQ+ in Scotland. The graduates project consists of a series intimate portraits as well as frank discussions with individuals who tell the story of queer PoC in contemporary society.

Graphic Design /Communication Design Graduate 2016: 'British-Born Chinese' project researched the British Chinese community in Glasgow. Through conducting interviews and volunteering at a Chinese arts and culture center, the graduate experienced a much wider scope of experiences and views than their own. The information gathered fed into using objects as a way of articulating the variety of individual opinions within the collective group. The graduate used chip forks and chopsticks and morphed these forms to represent the spectrum between identifying as completely British and completely Chinese. The series of objects becomes an interactive and subjective system as the viewer is invited to consider where they would place themselves on the scale.

### **Student Experience**

Flexibility - Academic staff and students discuss and plan around any commitments i.e. family circumstances, medical needs, and caring commitments. This is done through mutual discussion where students are invited to notify their teaching staff of any issues in accessing the timetabled programme, this means very little change to their educational experience. Terms dates, and teaching weeks are provided via an introduction presentation allowing for Q&A's from the student cohort at the beginning of each academic year allowing students. For students who might find public group based context challenging they are invited to set up one to one meetings. **Negative Impact / Future Actions:** not all timetabled areas on the programme pre-published as finalised in advance of the academic session starting (rather this in some units in the programme in introduced/finalised before student induction). We should commit where possible to resolving all timetables earlier so students with additional needs can foresee and pre plan.

Student Example: A mature student asked permission to bring their 12 year daughter into the studio as part of the national 'Sons and Daughters To Work' Day on Thursday 5th May 2016, the student requested support from the department in terms of risk assessment and supervision on campus for their daughter, we were able to deliver this and actively show our support for family commitments.

### **Learning and teaching pedagogy**

As evidenced in the NSS the group critique (staff and a groups of students) alongside peer led group discussion both provide an environment in which the complexities (including intersectionality) of equality, diversity and power can be explored in relation to students' work and its development. This provides a learning and teaching situation in which the mainstreaming of equality is in evidence. These situations also become a forum for fostering good relations between protected characteristic groups as students are able to expand their knowledge and understanding of each other (please note

section vii.) Class Representatives).

### **Assessment and Feedback**

Assessment is undertaken on the programme in line with GSA assessment code of practice, in addition a variety of feedback/formative learning approaches are employed in order to enable all students to demonstrate they have met the learning outcomes and standards required for progression. This promotes equality of opportunity. I also note have good levels of student participation in the Mitigation/Good Cause process (4 students in Academic Session 2016/17, 6 in 2015/16).

## **4.Actions you have taken or planned as a result of your findings:**

(Please complete the action plan in this section)

### **1. Programme documentation**

**a.** The programme handbook will be revised to both make plain / clarify the key information (It is noted that international students, although many are competent speakers of English, may not yet have practiced their language skills to the extent that they are familiar or comfortable with academic terminology) for new start students, including more explicit the various lines of support to follow if they have any concerns. Close consideration of language/ images used in all communications during the pre admission period to ensure where possible that a non-discriminatory / supportive tone is used to help foster declaration of student data.

**b.** The handbook should be complimented by key academic contact staff delivering visual presentations as part of the inductions / year level introduction process. This could in the instance of year 4 be additionally focused on managing stress and peer to peer relationships and better clarify what / how pastoral support works and what students can do if they feel its not working for them (see vii. Class Representatives section above).

### **2. Peer/Student Support.**

We will consider via a pilot (for Academic session 2018/9) the merits of running a student buddy system for new students (year 1 and direct entrants in year 2 or 3) to help students settle into the new structure of learning with the programme.

### **3. Student Consultation**

Head of Department will consider a method of student consultation to explicitly discuss issues of equality and diversity with class reps. E.g. Internal insight in required into internal perceptions on gender and Illustration practice (which staff have noted a diminishing number of Males choosing to specialise in Illustration) and discuss with new intake students the possible rationales behind those who choose not to declare information (e.g. uncertainty, fear of discrimination, fear of data being in the public domain). While this may be satisfied with new data garnered by GSA plans to launch a cross GSA quality enhancement questionnaire, which will offer students the opportunity to comment on their identity based experience, ongoing consideration of equality related issues with student reps at local level will be valuable.

### **4. Organisation/Curriculum**

**a.** We have successful models of flexible delivery and good use of the VLE providing accessibility of materials and resources and timetabling, however we could ensure that we have earlier (summer period) publication of finalized timetables which should enable students to better meet needs related to a protected characteristic, for example, family responsibilities or religious commitments.

**b.** Staff will be briefed to be minding of the need to record/adequately document any intrinsic to the core curriculum content (including out of hours lecturers / guest speakers) and make this available on the VLE.

**c.** Review all reading lists aligned to projects to consider if any more inclusive texts / examples of practice could be added to support a diverse range of influences.

### **5. Staff Support**

**a.** Within the career review process Head of Department should look to rotate where appropriate and or offer staff mentoring or additional development to create equal opportunity in offering internal curriculum planning / leading activities within the department.

**b.** Regarding the inequality in gender access to either the GSA staff development fund or the Research Development fund - Head of Department to investigate why this is the case and look to

support female staff in applying for these funds.

Action	Equality Impact	Person responsible	Time frame
1.(1 a and b above) Revision of Programme documentation and inductions to include clarification of support systems at programme level.	Positive impact for all students regardless of protected characteristic.	Donna Leishman and core academic staff team	In advance if Academic Session 2017/18
2. (above) Enhancing Peer/Student Support.	Positive impact for all students regardless of protected characteristic.	Donna Leishman and core academic staff year 1 / 2	September 2018
3. (above) Enhancing Student Consultation	Advance equality and foster good relations through student involvement in enhancing anticipation of the needs of a diverse student cohort in programme delivery and design	Donna Leishman in consultation through next academic sessions class reps. Including DSMT discussion on School wide system	System decided and installed for September 2018
4.(4a-c above) Organisation/Curriculum	Advance equality for students who need to access learning and teaching in a range of ways as a consequence of e.g. disability, caring responsibilities, learning styles, religious commitments.	Donna Leishman and core academic staff team.	September 2018 *Note Semesterisation will impact this goal being achieved for Summer in advance of September 2017 - aspects .b and .c can be progressed.
5. (above) Staff Support	Advance equality for female academic staff in relation to career development	Donna Leishman	August 2017

**5. Where/when will progress and the outcomes of your actions be reported and reviewed:**

Actions will be included in the Programme Quality Enhancement Plan and progress will be reported through Boards of Study and in the Programme Monitoring and Annual Reporting process (PMAR).

**6. How will your actions and intended outcomes contribute to the delivery of GSA's equality outcomes:**

Staff will better make explicit how they consider the age, gender, ethnic and cultural profiles of our students, visiting lecturers and continue to celebrate diversity in the discursive environment in which students engage in the exchange and development of ideas, opinions and knowledge in order to further advance equality and foster good relations.

Actions will therefore contribute directly to the delivery of:

GSA EO 1: An organisational culture in which respect for self and others is understood and practiced and where identity based ignorance or prejudice is challenged and confidence promoted.

GSA EO 2: An inclusive and accessible learning environment in which the diverse needs of students are systematically anticipated and provided for.

GSA EO 4: A fair pay and progression framework which underpins equality of opportunity for all, actively works towards reducing the gender pay gap and addresses occupational segregation.

**The outcome of your assessment:**

- No action (no potential for negative or positive impact)
- Action to remove barriers/mitigate negative impact X
- Action to promote positive impact X

**Sign-off, authorisation and publishing**

**Review Lead**

Name	Donna Leishman
Position	Head of Communication Design
Signature	
Date	30.8.17

**Executive Lead**

Name	Barbara Ridley
Position	Head of the School of Design
Signature	Barbara Ridley
Date	30.08.17

**Equality Lead (Head of Student Support and Development)**

Signature	Jill Hammond
Date	30.08.17