

# Equality analysis form

1. Name of the activity (strategy, policy or practice etc)

Work Load Model – System And Process Improvement project (WLM-SAPI)

2. What is the aim of the activity (objective or purpose)?

By April 2013, the UWE Academic Workload Model is supported by an adaptable, single, web-based, multi-user software solution that can be accessed by all UWE academic staff on national academic role profiles up to and including NARP5.

3. If amending a current activity, what changes are proposed?

The WLM-SAPI project aims to implement a web enabled database solution to support the UWE Work Load Model, in order to eliminate the limitations of the current spreadsheet system.

It should be noted that this is just a system replacement project to support the existing UWE Work Load Model (WLM). The WLM policy and guidelines remain under the governance of the existing UWE Workload Governance Group (chaired by John Rushforth).

Proposed Changes (resulting from the new system implementation):

- The 17 departmental WLM spreadsheets will be replaced by a single online, web-based, multi-user solution
- Greater flexibility for devolved work load allocation
- Improved efficiency for TRAC-TAS returns
- Improved workload transparency for academic staff to access their own workload summary online

4. Who is responsible for developing and delivering the activity?

The WLM-SAPI project has been set up with a Project Delivery Team reporting up to a Project Board (chaired by John Rushforth).

The UWE IT Services Academic Technologies Group will be developing the software solution in collaboration with business representatives (planning partners, Heads of Department, Associate Heads of Department, Finance, HR, CETTS).

5. What measures will be used to assess whether the activity is successful?

A UWE departmental pilot run of the software solution will take place early in 2013 to test the effectiveness of the solution and identify any problems prior to a site-wide phased deployment. The pilot group will be surveyed and invited to respond to a number of questions. Any concerns or issues will be addressed prior to any site-wide deployment.

A project closure meeting will determine whether the project objectives (as set out in the Project Initiation Document) have been met.

A post-implementation review will take place 6 months after the deployment to identify any operating problems and system enhancement opportunities.

6. Does the activity have a potentially adverse impact on equality groups, in terms of employment issues and/or service delivery for students and/or staff? In the table below, please give evidence to support your yes or no answers. If the answer is not known, indicate how you will source evidence.

Meeting the public sector equality duty

Please also use the table below to demonstrate whether the activity has the potential to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations.

	Yes	No	Not known	Public sector equality duty
Women, men, trans people		No, there is no evidence to suggest any of these groups would be less able to access or use the technology proposed		
Black and minority ethnic groups		No, there is no evidence to suggest any of these groups would be less able to access or use the technology proposed		
Disabled people			There may be issues related to visual impairment involved in an increase in screen work and an increase in reliance on on-screen information.	Engage with visual impairment staff groups as appropriate
Younger or older people			It has been suggested that some older people may be less familiar with IT and will find this change more challenging. This could lead to increased levels of stress unless, as for all groups, adequate support is readily available in transitioning to this system.	System training will be made available
People of different religion and beliefs		No, there is no evidence to suggest any of these groups would be less able to access		

		or use the technology proposed		
Lesbian, gay, bisexual people		No, there is no evidence to suggest any of these groups would be less able to access or use the technology proposed		
Marriage and civil partnership		No, there is no evidence to suggest any of these groups would be less able to access or use the technology proposed		
Pregnancy and maternity		No, there is no evidence to suggest any of these groups would be less able to access or use the technology proposed		

7. Please give evidence of how you have engaged equality groups in the equality analysis process. Is further engagement required?

The intention would be to engage with relevant staff groups as appropriate.

8. What action can be taken to mitigate any potential negative impacts or address different needs? Please comment and then complete an action plan (see appendix 1).

UWE Web Guidance Policy and Standards:

<http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/webguidance/policiesandstandards.aspx>

As the replacement web solution will only be used internally for UWE Staff, a more tailored approach will be taken to make sure assisted technology is in place as required and best practice is adopted so that access is in line with the disabilities discrimination act 1995 (as amended 2005).

**Equality relevance: High** ☐ **Medium** ☐ **Low** ☒

9. Equality analysis completed by:

Name	Bill Ferrier
Post title	Project Manager
Faculty / service	IT Services
Date	

10. Confirmed by the Equality and Diversity Unit:

Name	Andrew McLean	Date	July 2012
------	---------------	------	-----------

# Equality analysis - action plan

Appendix 1

Name of activity:

Plan completed by:

Service / faculty:

Issues	Actions required	Responsible Person	Resources required	Target date	Success Indicators	What progress has been made?
<b>Information/data required</b>	None					
<b>Consultation</b>	None, although engagement with relevant staff will take place if required.	Bill Ferrier	None		Discussions taken place	
<b>Monitoring and review arrangements</b>						
<b>Publication</b>	Final draft uploaded to E&D site	Andrew McLean	None		EA present on website	
<b>Other actions</b>						