

Minutes of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee meeting

14 December 2017 14.00-17.00, Fogg Seminar room 1.02

1. Attendance and Apologies for absence

Attendance:

Angelika Stollewerk (AS)
Richard Pickersgill (RWP)
Fiona Marsh (FM)
Marina Resmini (MR)
Sandra Brown (SB)
Francis Healy (FH)
Christoph Engl (CE)

Sean McWhinnie (SM)
Catherine Murray - notes (CM)

Apologies:

Maxi resigned from committee

Georgia Tsagkogeorga (GT)
Christian Nielson (CN)
Chris Duffy (CD)
Philip Howard (PHo)
Kristen Hadfield (KH)
Peter Heathcote
Janelle Jones (JJ)
Stuart Cadby (SC)
Apsana Begum (AB)

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

3. Matters arising and actions from the previous meeting

The Committee welcomed three new members – Francis Healy (who would be taking over as Lead of the PG student recruitment & career development work group), Christophe Engl (who would be taking over as work group lead for Organisation and Culture), and Kristin Hadfield (who would be taking over as work group lead for UG student recruitment & career support). Kristen was unable to attend the meeting due a prior commitment.

AS also welcome Sean McWhinnie to the meeting. Sean is a consultant who has been brought in to help the School with its Athena Swan application.

AS informed the Committee that Maxie Roessler had resigned and that Chris Duffy would take over the Work Life Balance Work Group lead.

It was noted that the following actions, with regards to outreach activities, are in progress:

1. RWP to follow up with Tippu Sheriff, Lesley Howell, Dave Hone and Steve Le Comber to get a summary of their outreach activities.
2. PHe to provide a summary of outreach activities to AB once she provides him with a clear steer on what information we need to gather.
3. PHe to follow up with Anne Setright.

RWP noted that there had been some kickback with regards to composition of audience. The Committee discussed how best to deal with this in the application. SM advised the Committee that although the School could say it didn't know this was a requirement, it would need to outline what it would do to address the issue going forward. The School is able to get data from the people who are invited to open days and this should be included in the application.

ACTION: FH to ask Natalie Holland to get data from people attending open days

ACTION: CM to carry forward the actions on outreach activities to the next meeting

The following actions were outstanding:

1. AB and FM to meet to discuss the possibility of having a separate survey for professional services and to think about other questions that would be more useful/appropriate to include.

Update: AB has been off work but she had been working on a survey for the technicians. AS asked FM if it would be possible to think about questions for the PS staff and to carry out a survey in January. FM said it would be possible.

2. CM to set up the April meeting

Update: CM was trying to find a suitable date in April, which fits within the timeline. As this was proving to be difficult, it was agreed that the date would be selected on availability of the Chair and Head of School and then whoever else is available at that time can attend.

Both actions will be carried forward until the next meeting.

4. Report from working group leads

To allow more time to review the data, no updates were given from work group leads.

5. Data review

SM and AS took the Committee through the draft application. The following points/ questions were raised/noted:

Section 2, 'Description of the department'

- The School needs to provide the staff data for 2016/2017 and the student data

Section 4.1, 'Student data'

- Figure 1 - SM recommended presenting data from the last 5 years if possible to strengthen the School's application. As programme delivery changed from 2013 (foundation courses were initially one year programmes), the Committee agreed to exclude the 2012/2013 data, as it would not be comparing like for like.
- Table 2 - the Committee agreed it made sense to simplify the data to make it clearer. It was agreed that the top 4 rows could be combined as 'Successful completion of foundation course', 'Resitting out of attendance' would be the next row and then 'Withdrawals' could be combined.
- Table 3 - SM asked for clarity on whether the UG data includes students on their foundation year. FM confirmed the numbers shown were only UG numbers

- Table 4 - it was noted that all the data tells us is that we don't really have part-timers so it doesn't add much value. Whether the School wants to increase the number of part-timers is something to think about, but there isn't a gender issue here because we don't have any.
- Looking at data by broad programme area, SM noted the School is high in the proportion of students who are women. The Committee felt one way this could be presented is to say what the School has done to attract more women (shows success). There needs to be an action point to attract a more balanced gender mix.
- Apart from Chemistry (which is national FTEs), SH noted that the benchmarking data used in the charts wasn't real.

ACTION: Decide whether the School wants SM to provide the benchmarking data

- SM recommended looking at the ethnic breakdown of our UG data, to see whether there is any ethnic diversity variation in programme to programme. It was noted that the School doesn't have to do this, but if it is not able to get this data it could be included as an action (to find out more and go into greater detail as to why there is variation here).

ACTION: AS to ask Monique to extract ethnicity

- Table 6 – should say Pharmaceutical Chemistry, not Chemistry with Pharmaceutical
- It was noted that the action to encourage more women onto MSci programmes would be challenging as the School is aware this is to do with the fact it has a very high proportion of Muslim girls. SM noted it is important from an Athena Swan perspective to present this kind of data. The School needs to explain why this is, or have an action to try to change it. The School's action to try to change this has been to have better role models and more role models, as well as to think about the staff the School recruits and the people it invites back to talk to students. MR noted that this also has something to do with career choices in the sense that usually in chemistry you need an MSci to do a PhD but a lot of students now prefer to do a BSc and a taught MSc which gives them career options in a particular area.
- With regards to applications, offers and acceptances for UG programmes, SM noted it isn't necessary to include the charts as the table (8) is more informative, but it might help the panel understand. The Committee agreed to include figure 8, as figure 7 only shows the female trend (and the point we want to make is the ratio is the same for men and women). SM noted it is important to look at whether the data is showing the same pattern every year. If it is, this is something the School needs to be aware of and say in the action plan it will keep an eye on it.
- Table 9 - SM highlighted a discrepancy between acceptances and those who actually sign up (52% of acceptance FTE have been female but the proportion of students on UG course who are female was 58.5%). It was noted that this was most likely due to the higher percentage of successful foundation students that come up (female students are more likely to succeed and come automatically onto the course) but could also be to do with the fact men don't show up. SM reminded the Committee to look at ratios. If every year females get more offers than men, this is something the School needs to be aware of.

- With regards to Psychology, it was noted that the application proportion of females has been rising and women are more likely to receive offers than men and it is statistically significant. There needs to be an action here. That might mean working more closely with Heads of Psychology. There is also an Athena Swan Psychology network. SM suggested looking into offering subjects that might be more attractive to men, such as behavioural economics. The action here is to encourage more applications from men, analyse why men are less likely to receive offers, with a view to increasing the offer rate and encouraging more men to accept offers

ACTION: AS to discuss with Michael Pluess

- Table 11 - it was noted there were some errors in the data (totals for 11/12 are wrong)
- Table 20 shows overall figures for the subjects (combined 5 year data)
- Table 21 outcome data for PDRs is missing

ACTION: FH to complete table showing outcome data for PDRs

- Figure 23 - SM noted that one of the drivers for Athena Swan is progression from one level to another, so if there is an imbalance, the School is interested in seeing whether that imbalance continues. MR noted that there isn't a leaky pipeline in Chemistry, the School has an anomaly at UG level. Sean suggested that doesn't stop the School from looking at its UG destinations to see if there are any gender/ethnic differences in what students do. MR noted there are difficulties collecting data on destination, but had examples from students who are happy to be named that could be included in the application.

Section 4.2 Academic and Research Staff

- Figure 24 - RWP confirmed grades and job titles were correct. The Committee agreed it is a good idea to show grades against job titles
- Figure 26 - SM commented that grade is what the School should be looking at here. Grade 7 is going up, which is positive. Although grade 8 is low, it was acknowledged that it would only take a couple of appointments to get that to go right up. As a promotion doesn't necessarily mean a change in grade, the Committee agreed it would be useful to show role too.
- The Committee agreed to include the chart presented by RWP which shows a positive story and a nice impact. The chart shows the School is recruiting more Lecturers and there is a very definite trend in SL and readers (they will be our future professorial). It was noted however, that the chart looks at year and not academic year, so it is not consistent with the rest of the data.

ACTION: CM to send the chart/data used to AS

- Table 27 - the School is being asked to plot the data in lots of different ways. SM felt this was a waste of time because fixed term staff tend to be research only. The questions are about those in other career paths, so the School might want to say why there are some FT in T&S and T&R roles (they might be doing a maternity cover for example). SM suggested the School might also want to look into why there are some researchers on open ended contracts

- Table 30 - SM reminded the Committee that one of the principals of Athena Swan is reducing the use of FT contracts. SM said his question to all Universities is why do you automatically put your post docs on FT contracts? After 2 years the School would still be required to pay redundancy anyway.

Section 5.1 Key career transition points: academic staff

- Table 33 - SM noted a complete absence of shortlisting data. The Committee discussed how best to get the shortlisting data for the posts that were advertised during this five year period. Shortlisting data for each role is captured on a spreadsheet which is uploaded onto igrasp. There was frustration expressed that the School was not able to get this data from the central HR team. SM noted the gender was included in the application data, as well as the candidate ID. The Committee agreed that the School could try to extract the data manually by getting the application data and cross referencing with the shortlisting data, using the candidate ID. As this would take a considerable amount of time, the Committee agreed the School would focus on the 3 year period 2014-2017.

ACTION: FH and Sunita to look into getting the shortlisting data

- Table 35 - SM asked for clarity around who was eligible for promotion. RWP confirmed that probationary lecturers were eligible and anyone could be promoted at any time after a year. It was noted that women are more successful and men are underprepared/not good enough so the action might be more around making men more aware of their likelihood of success so they are better prepared. There might also be women who are more open to be encouraged to apply, because men are more likely to apply (this is the same nationally). RWP noted he had done a lot of encouragement in this promotion round.

Section 5.3 Career development academic staff

- With regards to training data, it was noted that many departments don't have this so it is positive that we do. SM noted that women undertook more training and that might be due to the fact that women are on lower grades than men.

ACTION: Sean to investigate this further by examining training data by grade

- SM queried whether training data for research staff was correct as it appears that research staff are not doing training. The Committee felt this was probably right if we are talking about professional development courses offered by the College. AS noted that the School could talk about the various training/workshops it runs, like grant writing workshops etc.
- Table 39 - SM noted there was something wrong with the appraisal data. The Committee agreed that either the data was wrong or the system didn't work. RWP commented he would be very surprised if someone hadn't have an appraisal (and that it is compulsory). If the School is sure we have a 100% completion rate we can say that.

Section 5.4 Career development: professional and support staff

- Table 40 - it was noted staff do some training, but not a lot. The School can say something about CAPD courses here because they offer a lot. Women look more likely than men to do training courses, again this might be role related. It was noted there aren't many role specific courses on offer for PS staff and most are generic, like time management.

Section 5.5 Flexible working and managing career breaks

- Table 42, SM noted a problem with the data. Where someone had maternity leave in 2 academic years, it may have been double counted so he went through individual staff records and eliminated double counting. It was also noted that the database doesn't record when people return to work, so for a large extend he has made some assumptions to produce the data. AS suggested showing the data to Sunita who may know if it is correct. Sean noted that in general, professional support staff are more likely to leave than academics, but that doesn't seem to be happening here

ACTION: AS to ask Sunita to check the data

- Table 43 - the question here is whether the School is confident that everyone who is entitled to paternity leave takes it? As the School can't insist people take it, the next question is what is the School doing to publicise it and did staff know about it and turn it down. RWP noted that there are a couple of recent examples of shared parental leave. SM said it is important to include those in the application

Section 5.6 Organisation and Culture

- Table 44 - the Committee data is included as it was sent to SM. AS noted that we haven't had a School Committee from about 2013 onwards, so we can say it has been discontinued. Things to highlight here are appropriate M/F representation, getting more junior staff to have experience and looking at admin staff who have heavy committee roles. SM noted there are some clear, stereotypical gender patters in the School's Committee data – the EDI Committee and TLC have high female ratio, while RSG is male dominant. AS noted that the 2016/2017 will present a more balanced picture of the EDI Committee. It is important to point out in the narrative that there are more women in T&S roles and this is reflected in the make-up of the teaching committees.

ACTION: CM to check the date the School Committee became the SBCS School Staff meeting

SM highlighted some general points:

- Try not to include data, unless you are going to comment on it
- Try not to state the obvious because of limit on word count, just pick up on key action points
- Under the new scheme, it is explicit that where men are under-represented, the School needs to think about this and say what it plans to do
- The School doesn't have to cover intersectionality, but he recommends in our context we should

- Impact wise, the School needs its survey data to show its staff are happy, as well as being promoted. AS noted we have two surveys as well as the college staff survey (from which we can extract the SBCS data)
- It would be a good idea for the School to think about holding some discussion groups to explore the issues that affect small numbers of staff, such as maternity leave, new starters (need to be recent) and possibly promotion. This detail won't be picked up by surveys

6. Assigning application sections for drafting



Working group
leads and write-ups

AS highlighted the document which had been circulated prior to the meeting, outlining the working group leads and proposed writers for each section of the application (attached above).

The deadline for individuals to complete their draft sections is 26th January. This gives AS and AB time to compose a complete draft to go to Faculty and gives SM time to review.

The School hopes to be able to include the student data in February so that by mid-February it will have a complete first draft ready to be reviewed by an external and internal reviewer. Jane Hill, University of York, has agreed to be the external reviewer (the Biology department at York achieved a Gold award) and Caroline Wardle will be the internal reviewer. The School hopes to have the reviews back by mid-March to have time to review and act on comments.

ACTION: Write draft sections by 26th January (all)

ACTION: AS to send SB the timeline so she can let Caroline Wardle know when the School will need her to review its application (she has 5 applications to support)

FM asked for some clarity around the sections relating to professional and support staff because the application is written from the point of view of academic staff members and PS staff don't get promoted. Sean suggested talking about grade reviews, development opportunities, opportunities for coaching, work shadowing or secondments. Sean also highlighted the fact that if opportunities are advertised internally first that also shows that the School is providing opportunities for progression/promotion. SB noted that the school can get a breakdown of bonuses for professional services staff and that can be used in the application.

ACTION: FM to get bonus information from Temi Owoka.

With regards to the section about culture, SM noted that there is a slightly different emphasis this time, so it important to refer to the handbook when drafting the section.

ACTION: AS to discuss School Committees with CM

AS asked SM whether it was appropriate to use the same case studies as last time. SM recommended the School doesn't use a case study of someone who has left. The School can still use Beth Clare as a case study. RWP noted the case studies were linked and tell a story. Sean suggested incorporating elements of the PhD case study into Beth's case study, or including it in the PhD narrative. Suggestions for case studies included Yannick Wurm (shared parental leave) and Michelle Restarick (Professional Services). SM suggested including some bullet points for each in the draft application and then making a decision on what the Committee feels is the strongest when they review the application. It was noted that the form is predominately about academic career path, so that is something to bear in mind when deciding who to include

7. Next meeting – 29th January 2018