Appendices

Academic teaching staff: developing equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values

The following appendices provide further information and background on the research presented in Academic teaching staff: developing equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values.

Background to the research

The research was undertaken for Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) and the Higher Education Academy (HEA) by Christine Nightingale, Caroline Law and Helen Webb.

The scoping study was conducted in three phases. Ethical approval was applied for and granted by the De Montfort University faculty of health and life sciences research ethics committee.

Literature review

A systematic literature search was conducted in order to explore what is already known about the development of equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values in academic teaching staff in HEIs, identify existing concepts and debates relevant to the topic, and identify gaps in the literature.

Online survey

The second phase was a national online survey collecting data from academic teaching staff working in HEIs across the four nations of the UK. The purpose was to identify the views and experiences of these staff on their equality and diversity perceptions, practice and professional development. A survey was designed to gather both quantitative and qualitative data.

A total of 963 responses were received. Of these, 557 participants visited each question of the survey, and it is data from these responses that were included in the analysis and have subsequently been cited throughout the report.

Quantitative data were collated into descriptive tables and qualitative data were analysed thematically.
Phase three involved recruiting and working with higher education institutions (HEIs) as case study sites. This was to identify organisational practices on the development of equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values among academic teaching staff.

Ten case study sites were recruited. Despite best efforts to recruit case study sites from across the four UK nations, nine sites were based in England and one in Scotland.

- The University of Bedfordshire
- The University of Bradford
- The University of Central Lancashire
- Heriot-Watt University
- Kingston University
- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
- Nottingham Trent University
- Oxford Brookes University
- Southampton Solent University
- The University of Worcester

Groups and networks to which details of the scoping study and invitations to participate were issued:

- ECU newsletter EqualityLink
- Personal correspondence from the ECU chief executive to vice-chancellors
- Personal correspondence from ECU to HEI equality and diversity leads
- ECU academic advisory group
- ECU Twitter posting
- Admin Equal Opportunities JiscMail
- Disability Research JiscMail
- HEA JiscMail
Data limitations

There are several limitations associated with the data collected in this study:

- Despite broad encouragement to participate in the survey, it is possible that individuals who perceive equality and diversity issues to be of importance are more likely to have completed the survey.

- Data for the case studies were collected from only a small number of individuals at each HEI and so findings are likely to be limited and partial.

- As with the survey data, it is likely that academic teaching staff who took part in the case studies are those who are engaged with the equality and diversity agenda.

- Despite publicising the study nationally, only one case study site was located outside of England.
Appendix 1: Literature review

This appendix contains a brief synthesis of literature found through a systematic literature search in Autumn 2013.

A separate thematic analysis was conducted on the papers before, during and after the investigative processes. The original aim of the literature search was to identify work which would inform the investigative process. This synthesis has been prepared following the analysis of the survey and interview data. From the point of view of the original investigation and aims of the task to explore how to support the equality and diversity expertise of academic staff who teach or support learning, there were many gaps in the literature. However, papers on cultural environments and leadership within the higher education sector, inclusive practices and inclusion were useful in pointing the way on matters of diversity.

Cultural environment

Writers have recognised the impact that the cultural and leadership environment can have on both staff and students. In considering how to raise student attainment Jabbar and Hardaker, (2012: 281) argue that organisations need to understand role they play in shaping and moulding the cultural climate in which the academic develops their teaching. They continue: ‘it is this environment that students interact with on a daily basis’.

Asmar (2005:300) in her Australian-based study of international and local Muslim students agrees that students are very aware of the cultural environment. She found that found that the students she was studying could draw a distinction between academic environment and the broader campus experience; finding the campus experience more challenging and lacking in appropriate opportunities to socialise. The students in Asmar’s study felt that they did not belong because of marked cultural differences and backgrounds. Fallon and Brown (2010) agree that when ‘cultural differences occur, cultural conflicts are likely to follow’, and suggest that discrimination can only be tackled when power dynamics are equal allowing for negotiation to occur.

Educational theorists have explored both the barriers to cultural inclusivity and possible approaches for teachers to take in order to be more culturally responsive. For example, Devita, G. (2000) identified a number of barriers to effective classroom teaching including cultural diversity, communication and participation. Jabbar and Hardaker (2012:273) propose that ethnicity is a cultural construct, and that each interaction between academic staff and students is unique and personal. These cultural differences and...
unique responses, Jabbar and Hardaker (2012) suggest, can lead to inconsistency in dealing with ethnic diversity and a superficial approach to pedagogy. They go on to describe Villegas and Lucas (2002) theoretical intervention, consisting of six salient characteristics to underpin the behaviours of a culturally responsive teacher:

- Being socio-culturally conscious
- Having an affirmative attitude
- Being an agent of change
- Understanding how learners construct knowledge and promoting this knowledge construction
- Making a conscious effort to know about the lives of their students
- Using knowledge to design instruction that builds on what students already know while stretching them beyond the familiar.

Biggs (1999), referred to in Asmar (2005:294), criticises approaches and teaching strategies which only accommodate diversity as inadequate teaching. Biggs (ibid) recommends teaching which rejects stereotyping and focuses on similarities. Ofori-Dankwa, and Lane (2000) take this further, and explore what they identify as four possible underpinning beliefs or paradigms that teachers might have when dealing with issues of cultural diversity. These, they suggest, depend on whether teachers place a high or low emphasis on cultural similarities and cultural differences. The paradigms are:

- **neutrality paradigm** where teachers pay little attention to cultural similarities or differences
- **similarity paradigm** where teachers tend to emphasize how cultures are alike, rather than how they differ
- **diversity paradigm** which places great emphasis on cultural differences, and less to cultural similarities
- **diversimilarity paradigm** which stresses both cultural differences and cultural similarities equally
Inclusive approaches

With its origins in the Tomlinson report (FEFC, 1996) inclusive learning and teaching has been long associated with the requirements of learners with learning difficulties or disabilities. Fallon and Brown (2010) define inclusive education as the philosophy and set of teaching practices that support the belief that all students should be full and permanent members of the classroom community regardless of differences related to (dis)ability, race, language, religion and class. Kunc (1992) that inclusive education is the valuing of diversity within the human community. Sapon-Slevin (2007) defines inclusive education as a core belief and set of teaching practices that support the belief that all students should be full members of the community.

Ayers et al (1999) argues that universities are in the business of human development and that in doing so they should be enabling students to challenge their beliefs about racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, religious, and cultural differences and replace them ‘with a lifelong habit of open thinking and critical evaluation of previously held “truths” about human behaviour.’ They go on to challenge ‘whether any university can accomplish this advanced level of human development without including diversity issues in the classroom.’ Using a case study of teaching psychology, the authors propose that in embedding diversity into the curriculum, academics should consider: the curriculum process, that is the content and the delivery of the content, the language used by teachers in teaching and including diverse perspectives and alternative experiences and viewpoints.

More recently, Tisdell and Thompson (2007) report on a research study exploring the use of entertainment media by US adult educators ‘and how they draw on it in their teaching and learning particularly in regard to teaching about diversity issues’. One of the media examples cited was using the film Crash as a discussion point for students which ‘made them think about race relations in the US in even more complex ways’ and made white participants in adult education feel uncomfortable and ‘to look inward at themselves in different ways, and to look at some of their own prejudices’ (Tisdell and Thompson 2007:664). In concluding the paper the authors believed that some educators were using media to some degree to facilitate discussion of issues around diversity, and to help learners examine their prejudices.
Embedding inclusive policy and practice into higher education has become an increasingly important focus for institutions, the professional bodies and advice organisations around them.

Publications from the Higher Education Academy: Thomas and May (2010), May and Bridger (2010) and Wray (2013) all focus on projects and guidance on developing inclusive learning and teaching and inclusive policy and practice. This suite of expertise is supported by a detailed synthesis of inclusive teaching and learning in higher education by Hocking (2010).

Few papers tackle how equality and diversity are specifically embedded into organisational strategy or leadership. As demonstrated above, a dialogue exists about inclusive teaching and learning, which of course implies understanding diversity, but very little on how equality and diversity is represented and embedded into the organisation. Deem and Morley (2006), prior to the current Equality Act (2010), conducted qualitative case study research of staff experiences of equality policies in six English, Scottish and Welsh higher education institutions. They found that most of the senior interviewees appeared reasonably knowledgeable about equality matters, but could not discern from the interviews whether these same staff held values that supported the pursuit of equality. Deem and Morley (2006) go on to reference earlier work which suggests that bilingualism or trilingualism in managers across different discourses about education is inevitable, and from their own research felt that senior staff in their research cohort, while holding strong views about the need to eradicate inequality among students and staff, had the least comprehensive equality policies. Likewise, Carpenter (2009) wrote that ‘it is not enough that leaders are committed, they must communicate that commitment through a vision for diversity and through the prioritisation of diversity efforts.’

The call for systematic change and review of organisational structures was a common and recurring theme or recommendation in the papers reviewed. Caruana and Ploner (2010) believed that joined-up organisational structures and processes which were specifically designed to embed synergy across institutions can help to alleviate tensions at policy and practice levels. May and Bridger (2010) also recommended wholesale review: ‘change is required at both an institutional and individual level,’ for developing
and embedding inclusive policy. They continue: ‘attention to one requires attention to the other and changing one has implications for the other’. Berry and Loke (2011), in focussing on improving degree attainment of black and minority ethnic (BME) students, suggest that institutions reflect on their structural, organisational, cultural and financial foundations in relation to the BME student experience and outcomes.

### Staff development

In identifying papers that addressed staff equality and diversity development needs and practices it was noted that writers referred most frequently to lack of confidence and lack of understanding by academic staff, often leading to resistance to change in teaching and learning practices. For example, in writing about higher education institutions (HEIs) and international students, Kelly and Moogan (2012) suggest that the reason that HEIs do not change or adapt their resources to meet the needs of overseas students is because they don’t understand their cultural diversity. In a study designed to identify the advantages of building on the intersection between internationalisation and equality and diversity in higher education, Caruana and Ploner (2010) identified the need for ‘readily accessible research-informed and evidence-based practice to raise awareness, build confidence, promote engagements and inform future direction within cross-disciplinary and cross-institutional contexts’.

Beacham and Rouse (2012) in a study of student teachers attitudes and beliefs about inclusion and inclusive practice, referred to work by Forlin (2004) who proposed ‘that teachers’ knowledge and skills, together with their attitudes and beliefs, are crucial in the development of inclusive practice and that in many cases teachers feel ill-prepared to deal with matters of diversity in their classrooms’. Beacham and Rouse (2012) argue that to improve inclusion and address social justice teachers must individually and collectively accept responsibility for improving the learning and participation of all children.

Smith (2010), in investigating attitudes of higher education staff to inclusive practice and providing reasonable adjustments for disabled students, referred to the ‘resistance’ to the equality agenda in higher education. Quoting Brink (2009:9), Smith (2010) notes that that there is the fear, ‘that by engaging in the equality agenda something valuable will be lost, such as educational
standards, institutional prestige, strategic focus or a slice of the budget.’ By contrast, Smith’s research did not uncover much resistance to inclusive practices: a majority of teaching staff in her survey believe in the principle of providing equitable education to students with disabilities and are open to learning how to deliver inclusive practice. What she did discover was a lack of clarity about what is legally required and what inclusive practice actually is. Her recommendations for staff development were fourfold:

- general diversity awareness training
- specific support, advice, and training for teaching staff to enable them to meet the learning and teaching needs of students with specific disabilities. This should include a range of modes of one-to-one and group support or training to staff on an ad hoc basis. There should also be input into the postgraduate teaching certificate attended by most new academic members of staff
- information, advice, and training to support the incorporation of accessible and inclusive approaches to learning, teaching, and assessment into individuals’ academic practice
- support for programme teams as they design new or review existing programmes of study in order to increase the amount of new courses designed with inclusive practice in mind (Smith 2010:225).

In a similar vein Rickinson (2010:27), in a synthesis of research into disability equality in higher education, highlighted staff development as one of the target areas for higher education institutions, in particular training and support for understanding diverse needs and making changes to curriculum, pedagogy and assessment.

Conclusion

This literature synthesis found that there is a wealth of literature on inclusive practice. However, policy and inclusion within higher education which focuses on specific knowledge and integration of equality and diversity knowledge, skills, values and practice is indeed sparse.
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## Search terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>and</th>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "staff development" or 
"staff training" or 
"staff education" or  
"professional development" or 
"professional training" or 
"professional education" or 
"teacher development" or 
"teacher training" or 
"teacher education" or  
"teaching" or 
"teacher* attitudes" or 
"teacher* beliefs" or 
"teacher* perceptions" or 
"teacher* values" or 
"teacher* practice" or  
"teacher* knowledge" or 
"staff attitudes" or 
"staff beliefs" or 
"staff perceptions" or 
"staff values" or 
"staff practice*" or  
"staff knowledge" | and | "post-16 learning" or 
"post-16 education" or 
"post-16 training" or 
"post-compulsory learning" or  
"post-compulsory education" or 
"post-compulsory training" or 
"adult learning" or 
"adult education" or 
"adult training" or  
"vocational learning" or 
"vocational education" or 
"vocational training" or 
"higher education" or 
"university" or 
"tertiary learning" or 
"tertiary education" or  
"HE" | and | "inclu*" or 
"equality" or 
"divers*" or 
"equal opportunit*" or 
"age" or 
"old*" or 
"young*" or 
"disab*" or 
"impair*" or 
"gender" or 
"men*" or 
"women*" or 
"marri*" or 
"civil partnership" or 
"pregnan*" or 
"maternity" or 
"mother*" or 
"father*" or 
"parent*" or 
"race" or 
"ethnic*" or 
"religion" or 
"faith" or  
"belief*" or 
"sex" or 
"sexual orientation" or  
"gay"
## Databases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database type</th>
<th>Databases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education databases</td>
<td>Education Research Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERIC (Education Resource Information Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science databases</td>
<td>ASSIA (Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences Citation Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PsycARTICLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PsycINFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBSS (International Bibliography of Social Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary databases</td>
<td>Academic Search Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scopus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Location of national online HEI survey participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Survey participants</th>
<th>Case study participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple UK countries</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>548</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>answered question</th>
<th>skipped question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey participants</strong></td>
<td>548</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case study participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data published in the annual *Equality in Higher Education Statistic Report 2013* (ECU 2013) shows that 82.6% of staff are working in English HEIs and 17.4% of staff are in Northern Ireland, Scotland or Wales. This indicates that the survey participants based in England were 5.9% proportionately more represented than the other three nations.

The percentage (based on headcount of under 100) of participants employed in each country was determined by using the headcount and HEI location of participants in the case study interviews.
Job titles

Job titles were reported by 481 survey participants. 76 gave no response.

- 20 associate professors
- 104 lecturers
- 20 principal lecturers
- 73 professors
- 24 readers
- 27 research fellows, associates and assistants
- 112 senior lecturers
- 11 teaching fellows
- 90 described other job titles not easily categorised

Job titles as reported by 42 case study participants:

- 1 associate dean
- 1 dean
- 1 director of learning
- 1 director of student services
- 1 doctor
- 1 equality and diversity adviser
- 2 heads of academic departments
- 1 head of employee relations and reward
- 2 heads of higher education practice programmes
- 1 head of learning and development
- 2 hourly-paid lecturers
- 1 human resources business partner
- 1 learning architect
- 4 lecturers
- 5 principal lecturers
- 2 professors
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Participants were asked which HEA UKPSF descriptors best fit their role in teaching and supporting learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Survey participants</th>
<th>Case study participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff member new to higher education teaching and supporting learning, or with only a small range of teaching and learning responsibilities</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff member with substantive teaching and learning responsibilities</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced staff member with responsibility for leading, managing or organising programmes, subjects and/or disciplinary areas, or who supports the development of newer teaching staff, or who has HEI advisory responsibilities in relation to teaching and supporting learning</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly experienced staff member with strategic leadership and/or policymaking responsibilities in relation to teaching and supporting learning</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>skipped question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Participants were asked if they were HEA teaching fellows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Survey participants</th>
<th>Case study participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I am a Teaching Fellow of my HEI</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I am a National Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I am not a Teaching Fellow at present</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses were allowed, so response count does not total the number who answered the question*
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### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Survey participants</th>
<th>Case study participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered question</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Disability status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Survey participants</th>
<th></th>
<th>Case study participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No disability</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific learning difficulty or disability (eg dyslexia)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General learning disability (cognitive)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/communication impairment (such as Asperger’s syndrome or other autistic spectrum disorder)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term illness or health condition</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health condition</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory impairment – Deaf or serious hearing impairment</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory impairment – blind or serious visual impairment</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical or mobility impairment</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other disability</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>541*</td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses were allowed, so response count does not total the number who answered the question*
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### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Survey participants</th>
<th>Case study participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian British Indian</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian British Pakistani</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian British Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian background</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British African</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British Caribbean</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Black/African/Caribbean background</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy or Traveller</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mixed background</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic origin</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 542
Skipped question: 15

Answered question: 82
Skipped question: 1
## Gender identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Survey participants</th>
<th></th>
<th>Case study participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the same gender identity as assumed at birth</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a different gender identity to the one assumed at birth</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Religion or belief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Survey participants</th>
<th></th>
<th>Case study participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian (including Church of England, Catholic, Protestant and all other Christian denominations)</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other religion</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Survey participants</th>
<th></th>
<th>Case study participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 541
skipped question: 16

### Sexual orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Survey participants</th>
<th></th>
<th>Case study participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
<td>Response %</td>
<td>Response count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 540
skipped question: 17
## Appendix 4: Topic areas for the study

### National online survey question topic areas

The survey for academic teaching staff asked participants:

- The importance they place on academic teaching staff having equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values, and their reasons for this.

- How they would rate the quality of development and support offered by their HEI, with regard to both equality and diversity and more generally.

- How they would rate their level of competence to take account of equality and diversity considerations.

- How they would rate their level of confidence to successfully deal with an equality and diversity challenge.

- Their experiences of equality and diversity related challenges and successes.

- The ways in which their professional or personal experiences have impacted on their approaches to equality and diversity within teaching.

- Their HEI's practices with regard to requirements to record evidence of developing equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values and of incorporating these into teaching.

- Their HEI's practices with regard to incorporating equality and diversity questions and measures within professional development or review processes.

- Their HEI's practices in recognising and rewarding staff for additional equality- and diversity-related roles and responsibilities.

- Their suggestions for how academic teaching staff can best be supported in developing equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values.

### Case study topic areas

**Academic teaching staff**

The case study focus groups for academic teaching staff asked participants:

- The importance they place on academic teaching staff having equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values, and their reasons for this.
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- Their experience and perception of specific policies, practices, initiatives, processes, etc as described in their HEI’s expression of interest form.

- How they meet the duties of the Equality Act 2010 in teaching and supporting learning and what challenges they come across in this area.

- How their HEI has helped develop equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values and what was good and what was bad about this. How effective this was in influencing practice and if they feel there are any omissions or areas for improvement.

- Their awareness of the UKPSF and how this is used in their training and development. How equality and diversity has been incorporated into this.

- How they take account of equality and diversity when designing and planning learning activities and/or programmes of study, teaching or supporting learning, assessing and giving feedback, and developing effective learning environments. How their HEI has helped them to do this.

- How knowledgeable they feel about the way in which equality and diversity links to their subject material, appropriate teaching learning and assessment methods, and how students learn.

- To consider methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching, quality assurance and quality enhancement and how their HEI helped to develop this knowledge.

- How individuals feel equality and diversity links to their values around respecting learners and learning communities, promoting participation and equality of opportunity, and using evidence-informed approaches. Ways in which HEIs helped individuals to develop equality and diversity related values.

- How individuals keep or record evidence that they use equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values in their teaching and supporting learning.

- How individuals are measured on equality and diversity performance in their annual professional development/review process.

- How equality and diversity has been considered in their experience of promotion and progression or performance management.
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- To explore the ways in which individuals keep their equality and diversity knowledge up to date.
- The things that have had the most positive impact on their confidence to deal with equality and diversity issues.
- Their suggestions about how HEIs can support the development of equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values of academics who teach or support learning.

**Lead on academic teaching staff development**

The case study interview for the lead on academic teaching staff development asked participants:

- How they use the UKPSF in academic teaching staff development policies and/or practices.
- Their experience and perception of specific policies, practices, initiatives, processes, etc as described in their HEI’s expression of interest form.
- How the staff development or curriculum framework for academic teaching staff who teach or support learning was developed or decided upon.
- How the Equality Act 2010 duties are embedded within programmes, courses or other development opportunities for academics who teach or support learning.
- The different programmes of activity for the development of activity, knowledge and values within the UKPSF. How equality and diversity is embedded within each of these three areas.
- To describe the methods by which they assess the impact of staff development programmes on the equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values of academics who teach or support learning. Different method used for assessing staff members’ skills, knowledge and values.
- The UKPSF descriptors for academic teaching staff, which relate to their role and level of experience. How they determine the level and content of equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values needed for each descriptor, and what they determine this level should be.
- To describe the relationship (in terms of both policy and practice) between their academic teaching and learning development programmes and their annual professional development review processes.
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- To describe the relationship (in terms of both policy and practice) between their academic teaching and learning development programmes and staff progression and promotion.

- To describe the relationship (in terms of both policy and practice) between their academic teaching and learning development programmes and performance management.

- The role of students in designing or feeding back on the impact of academic (teaching and learning) development programmes.

- The successes of their institution in developing equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values in academics who teach or support learning.

- The challenges for their institution in developing equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values in academics who teach or support learning.

- Their suggestions for academic teaching staff development departments that would enable them to support the development of equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values of academics who teach or support learning.

The case study interview for the lead on academic teaching staff development review, promotion or progression, performance management policies and processes asked participants:

- Their experience and perception of specific policies, practices, initiatives, processes, etc as described in their HEI’s expression of interest form.

- The UKPSF descriptors for academic teaching staff, which relate to their role and level of experience. How they determine the level and content of equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values needed for each descriptor, and what they determine this level should be.

- How the UKPSF descriptors of skills, knowledge and value are communicated and measured in the recruitment and selection processes for academic teaching staff who teach or support learning.

- To describe the relationship (in terms of both policy and practice) between their academic teaching and learning development programmes and their annual professional development review processes.
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- To describe the relationship (in terms of both policy and practice) between their academic teaching and learning development programmes and staff progression and promotion.

- To describe the relationship (in terms of both policy and practice) between their academic teaching and learning development programmes and performance management.

- The successes of their institution in developing equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values in academics who teach or support learning.

- The challenges of their institution in developing equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values in academics who teach or support learning.

- Their suggestions for staff responsible for staff review, progression and promotion and performance management that would enable them to support the equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values of academics who teach or support learning.

**Student representative**

The case study interview for the student representative asked participants:

- How the students’ union is involved in university decision making about teaching and learning policies and practices.

- The extent to which the students’ union is involved in university decision making about academic teaching staff development of policies and practices.

- Their experience and perception of specific policies, practices, initiatives, processes, etc as described in their HEI’s expression of interest form.

- How students provide feedback to the student’s union about equality and diversity issues within teaching and learning situations. About the mechanisms students can use to raise issues.

- The type of feedback (positive and negative) that the students’ union has had from students about how equality and diversity issues are handled in teaching and learning situations.

- Ways in which the students’ union manage, and report to the HEI, positive feedback from students on how academics who teach or support learning demonstrate good equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values.
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- Ways in which the students’ union manage, and report to the HEI, negative feedback from students on how academics who teach or support learning demonstrate equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values.

- Their suggestions for how HEIs can support the development of equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values of academics who teach or support learning.

- Their suggestions for how the students’ union can influence and support the development of equality and diversity skills, knowledge and values of academics who teach or support learning.
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