**York St John University**

2016/17

**Inclusive learning, teaching and assessment framework**

**Guidance for completion**

This framework[[1]](#footnote-1) contains four sections – before teaching, after teaching, assessment and quality assurance. Within each section there are three elements (A, B & C). Subject Directors are asked to complete the form indicating a score of 1 – 5 on each element with **1 being the lowest** rating and **5 the highest**.

**Rating criteria.**

**Instructions**

Please rate the A-C statements, which appear on the left in each section, from 1 to 5 and use this information to prioritise your action planning. Examples of indicative good practice are provided on the right for further information and to generate some ideas about how you may wish to proceed.

**5 We do this very well now and will continue to maintain this level of activity during the next two academic years**

**4 We have made a good start on this and will continue to progress activity over the next two academic years**

**3 We don’t know but will find out and build activity into the action plan this academic year**

**2 We don’t really do this well enough and need to develop this aspect over the next two academic years**

**1 We don’t address this and will develop this aspect of the strategy over the next two academic years**

Each section also contains items down the right hand side which pertain to suggested practice. Please note that at this stage of implementation the framework **only** refers to inclusion of disabled students. Further discussion and explanation of this can be obtained **here** (link to underpinning website).

If you are viewing an electronic version of the form you will be able to click on the elements and items which will open up the relevant pages on the ILTAF website. Further explanations of key terms, suggested practice and explanation of elements will be available.

Underneath each suggested practice box are two further boxes – ‘details of current practice’ and ‘action points’. If an element is scored 4-5 on the self-appraisal, a note must be made in the ‘details of current practice’ of evidence which can be obtained relating to this practice. Similarly, any elements which are scored 1-3 should be accompanied by an action point.

It is suggested that the views of a range of teaching staff are sought in order to decide upon the overall ratings for the programme. It is envisaged that this would be done at a programme delivery meeting or similar forum. You may wish to do this by asking module directors to complete the form separately. However, the completed form should contain aggregated scores. If necessary, action planning may be done at module level and documented on the aggregated form.

Please return completed forms by the 24th October 2016 to your Head of School along with the AMR.

**Before Teaching**

A: Staff make arrangements to deliver teaching and learning which is accessible and inclusive.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

 **Indicative good practice**

Explore inclusive pedagogic approaches e.g. using the ‘flipped classroom’ as a way to allow students to engage with material and prepare for sessions in advance.

Issues of accessibility of field trips and placements have been considered and resolved.

Students will have access to an overview or teaching and learning content and appropriate materials before the teaching session, so that students can fully engage.

The programme encourages staff to access training and to further develop expertise in inclusive teaching and learning.

Learning outcomes and assessment methods for all modules are made available to all students from the outset of the programme.

Students are encouraged to proactively seek out services based on individual requirements (e.g. maths help ,study skills) and accessible information about support services is widely available.

  **1 2**

  

 **3 4 5**

   

B: Academic staff work with central services to facilitate individualised support mechanisms.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

 **1 2**

  

 **3 4 5**

   

Details of current practice

C: Teaching, learning and assessment is designed in such a way as to allow for multiple means of delivery and engagement.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

Action points

**During Teaching**

 **Indicative good practice**

A: Our andragogy encompasses a variety of teaching strategies, activities and methods to accommodate a range of learning preferences.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

  **1 2**

Barriers to accessing teaching delivery are removed (e.g. subtitled multi-media resources are provided or transcripts when not available). Programmes work collaboratively with support services to ensure this happens (Student Services and ILS in particular).

Learning outcomes stated at the outset of each session.

Allow for some kind of recording of teaching sessions (e.g. notetakers, mobile devices, lecture capture).

Utilise strategies to ensure that all students engage in class activities in equitable ways.

Allow students preparation time when asked to contribute to class discussion.

Multi-sensory presentation to appeal to multiple learning preferences.

References to literature written down as well as given verbally and names of authors spelt out if not written down.

  

 **3 4 5**

  

B: Students are given access to teaching and learning delivery which is accessible and inclusive.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

 **3 4 5**

   

Details of current practice

C: Academic staff work with central services to implement individualised support mechanisms.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

Action points

**Assessment**

A: Assessment methods are sufficiently diverse to accommodate a range of learning preferences, to assess a range of learning outcomes and to develop a range of skills.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

 **Indicative good practice**

When assessing students’ learning, whether through formative or summative assessment, a range of approaches, where practical, are offered.

Programmes utilise appropriate and balanced methods to assess learning outcomes.

The institution offers a choice of assessment, thus reducing the need for adjustments to the methods.

The programme provides clear information to students on the assessment methodologies used and the marking schemes employed.

The programme provides students with timely information on assessment (e.g. when and how) and in an accessible format.

Regular formative assessment opportunities are provided so that students can receive feedback on their progress well in advance of summative assessment. These could include self- and peer-assessment opportunities.

  **1 2**

  

 **3 4 5**

   

B: Assessment methodologies are appropriate for the stated learning outcomes and must allow for reasonable adjustments.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

 **3 4 5**

   

Details of current practice

C: Assessment of competence standards have been thoroughly considered to ensure inclusive assessment can be implemented.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

Action points

**Quality Assurance**

A: The programme has quality assurance procedures that capture the voice of disabled students.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

 **Indicative good practice**

Include representation of disabled students at validation or re-validation events.

Ensure there is representation of disabled students at Faculty Forums and in the Programme Representatives population. If this is not happening then utilise specific focus groups.

Teaching staff and programme administrators have access to Learning Support Plans and processes are in place to ensure that this occurs.

Programmes embed notions of inclusivity within their curriculum design.

Programme approval documentation is shared in advance of validation/re-validation events with Student Support and/or the ADD, and/or members of these teams are invited to attend validation/re-validation events to advise on inclusivity.

  **1 2**

  

 **3 4 5**

   

B: Validation processes facilitate inclusive curriculum design.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

Details of current practice

C: The curriculum is designed and delivered in a manner that respects that everyone learns in different ways and that learning outcomes can be achieved in many ways.

SELF-RATING 1- 5 🞐

Action points

1. This framework is based on a similar document which was written by Chantler, S., Else, P., Inns, J., Jackson, V., Madriaga, M., Martin, M., Nind, R., Turner, P., and Tylsley, A. at Sheffield Hallam University. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)