

Minutes of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee meeting

29 January 2018 10.00-12.00, 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)
Kristin Hadfield (KH)

Catherine Murray - notes (CM)

Apologies:

Chris Duffy (CD)
Philip Howard (PHo)
Peter Heathcote (PHe)
Janelle Jones (JJ)
Stuart Cadby (SC)
Apsana Begum (AB)
Christian Nielson (CN)
Georgia Tsagkogeorga (GT)
Temi Owoka (surname)

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

3. Matters arising and actions from the previous meeting

There were the following updates on actions from the last meeting:

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

FH looked into this, but the information the School collects does not include gender or title (only names). It was noted that people attending open days might not have put in a formal application so the College/School wouldn't necessarily have their information to be able to double check names against their record.

From the staff side, Natalie Holland and Chris Eizaguirre attend for PGT, as well as some of the other programme directors (all male). The School has a PHD open evening once a year which FH goes to with either David Clayton or Isaac Abrahams. It was noted that in its application, the School can mention that people in specific roles usually attend and say what the gender distribution of these people currently is. RWP suggested having an action to encourage more female role models to attend open days.

ACTION: Send details of who attends the School's open days and the roles these people have to AS (FH). Include an action in the School's action plan which says that in future, the School will get a minimum of one male and one female academic to attend open days.

Discuss the possibility of offering different subjects in psychology with Michael Pluess

AS emailed Michael Pluess about psychology subjects, discussing what could be done to attract more men to the psychology programme. Michael will discuss it at the next psychology departmental meeting (in about 2 weeks). AS also asked him if they could come up with some suggestions which the School could include in the action plan.

RWP asked whether it is just about offering different subjects or whether it is also about marketing and increasing the visibility of the current offering/making it more attractive to men. KH felt the current offering was pretty skewed towards male subjects of psychology already (more towards the biological) and noted that the data shows it is not offers or acceptances that differ that much, just that the applications are low.

ACTION: Discuss marketing and increasing the visibility of the current offering at the next Psychology departmental meeting (KH)

Decide whether the School wants SM to provide the benchmarking data (RWP/FM)

The School agreed to ask Sean to provide the benchmarking data.

ACTION: Ask Sean to add benchmarking data to the School's application (AS)

Complete table showing outcome data for PDRs (FH)

Update: FH has the data and will update when the application is uploaded.

Send RWP's academic staff chart to AS (CM)

There were a couple of errors in the data which need to be updated. The chart will be redone by academic year, not calendar year and then CM will send underlying data to Sean.

ACTION: Update academic staff chart by academic year and send data to Sean (CM)

Actions relating to outreach activity

RWP has received a fairly extensive outreach list from Steve Le Comber and Tippu. They suggested that he contact Isabelle Mareschal and Chris Eizaguirre, who has sent him something but it is very brief. Dave and Lesley haven't had time to back to him yet. RWP did ask them for composition of audience but that information is not retained on any of the spreadsheets he has seen. It will be possible to say something about the Schools though.

It was noted that PHe had some outstanding actions with regards to outreach too and that he, Mike and Natalie are heavily involved in Drapers Academy and St Paul's Way School. MR emailed PHe, Mike and Natalie asking them to forward any information to AS.

ACTION: Email details of outreach activities to AS (include frequency, composition of the audience, information about people participating, information about the school etc.)

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.

FM provided some suggestions on the document that was sent to her. There is a second document which AS will send to her.

ACTION: FM to look at the Athena Swan survey questions and see if she thinks they should be amended/adapted. After FM gives feedback, AS to work with KH to put together a survey.

Other matters discussed:

Missing data (particularly issues with recruitment data)

- The Committee discussed the issues with data and RWP asked SB if she had any suggestions as to how to deal with the issues with the recruitment data. SB asked AS if she would raise the issue at the GSAT meeting, as she has already raised it but Edmund needs to be made aware of it, as the Vice-Principal of the School.

ACTION: SB to come back with a solution on recruitment data. AS to raise the data issue at the GSAT meeting on the 12th February (SB to resend the invite to AS).

- AS mentioned that the Committee needs the SBCS data from the staff survey in order to write the culture section of the application. It was noted that this had previously been sent to the Head of School.

ACTION: RWP to check if he still has the SBCS data from the staff survey. If not, let SB know and she will re-send.

- AS noted that Sunita had highlighted that she was missing from the adoption data. The Committee felt the most likely explanation is that whoever requested the data had only requested maternity data. This needs to be updated in the table.

ACTION: Send email to SB outlining what data we need (in terms of Parental/adoption leave) and she will follow up with HR. Update table when we have the correct data.

Technical staff sections

It was noted that Phil Howard was supposed to write the section on technical staff (Phil has now left the Committee). FM suggested that we ask Petra to help writing this section.

ACTION: RWP to ask Petra if she can help with the technical staff sections.

4. Review application sections/re-assign sections for drafting

Section owners

Due to people leaving the Committee and issues with data, it was necessary to review the timeline and re-allocate sections. The document attached below has been updated to reflect the new section leads.



The updated document is also available via the Athena Swan Dropbox folder, which all Committee members have been given access to.

Review of sections completed

The following sections were completed prior to the meeting and sent to the Committee for review:

Section 2: Description of the department

Section 3: Describe the self-assessment process

Section 5.2 Key career transition points: Professional and support staff

Section 5.3 Career development: Professional and support staff

The following comments were noted on these sections:

Sections 2 & 3

- MR noted that it was important to clarify that we are not a department, we are a School. For example, in table one, members of the department should be members of the School.

ACTION: Change all references of 'Department' to 'School' in the application

- RWP noted that we should make the complexity of the School clearer by adding the fact the School delivers 5 programmes in London.

ACTION: Add the fact the School delivers five programmes in London (AS)

- In section 3 MR felt it was important to add what the GESAT group does, this would give context to the EDI Committee and show it doesn't work in isolation but is part of a much bigger driver. SB noted QMUL got an institutional silver and they have the organogram that they used in the application so the School could use that and show how we fit into that.

ACTION: Describe what the GESAT does and its relationship to the School's EDI Committee. Use the organogram from the College's silver application (SB to send to AS)

- The Committee agreed it would strengthen the School's application to mention links to outside groups, for example MR is part of the Inclusion and diversity committee at the Royal Society of Chemistry and JJ is on the psychology diversity committee. This should be included in the narrative upfront to show links between the School's EDI Committee and the outside world.

ACTION: Send information about links to outside diversity groups to AS (ALL)

Sections 5.2 & 5.3

- It was noted that these sections should also include information on technical staff and there hadn't been any progress on this as Phil Howard has left the Committee. RWP will ask Petra to sit on the Committee for the duration of the application for guidance, advice, a bit of writing and some help with the survey.

- AS noted that the School needs to include something on promotions for technical staff. The Committee noted some examples, such as Phil Howard acting up to cover Monika's maternity leave and then getting a secondment and Joanna moving from the Lab Manager role to Teaching Technical Manager. The Committee felt Petra would either know this or could help the School get this information from the other departments.

Other general points about the application

- AS felt it would be helpful to circulate the comments the School got from ECU so that when people write their sections, they can try to address these

ACTION: Circulate the comments that the School got from ECU so that people can address these when they write their sections (AS)

- RWP will update his letter of endorsement once the rest of the application is complete
- AS will handle the section on student data with input from MR (for Chemistry) and KH (for Psychology)
- Anything that is not statistically significant will be removed from the final application
- As CE is new to the Committee, AS will support him to write the culture sections. AS to get information on external committees by writing to the women in the department directly. JJ has done the survey analysis from the School Athena Swan survey and AS will look at this with the College wide survey data.
- It was noted the School needs a new photo of the Committee as the gender balance doesn't look good and some members in the old photo have now left
- With regards to work life balance, Chris Duffy was the workgroup lead and the Committee had agreed that AB and Temi would cover that section. In their absence, SB agreed to help with this and will look at the section to see what is needed. It was noted that the School's **Policy on maternity, sick, and shared parental leave for T&R staff** was never discussed or signed off. It was noted that this is a very generous policy and it might be helpful to communicate this to staff so they understand how the financial model works.

ACTION: In Apsana's absence, SB to look at the work life balance section and see what help is needed

ACTION: Circulate the School's **Policy on maternity, sick, and shared parental leave for T&R staff** to the Committee. Send any comments to RWP by the end of the day so it can get signed off and uploaded onto QM Plus.

- SB asked if the School was still working towards the deadline of 16th March for Caroline Wardle to review our application (SB to contact and make sure she is available). AS confirmed we were.

ACTION: Contact Caroline Wardle to confirm she can review the School's application mid-March.

- FM asked if the Committee felt the School should include Michelle Restarick's case study (a bullet point summary had been included in the professional services section for the Committee to review prior to the meeting). RWP had also asked Magda if she would be willing to do a case study and she had agreed if someone could write it for her (she will edit it). The Committee agreed it would be beneficial to include three case studies.

ACTION: RWP to draft a case study for Magda.

- FM told the Committee she spoke to Bryony last week about getting some additional support due to cover the work Apsana was going to do. They would like a sense of how many additional days the School thinks it will need for Sean to cover any outstanding work. The Faculty had agreed to pay £2,500 (which pays for 3.5 days of Sean’s time) and the School had agreed to pay £800 in addition. The School is already up to 6 days (which covers what Sean has done so far, plus reviewing the first draft – it was felt it would be useful for him to review an additional draft). The Committee felt an additional 3 days of Sean’s time was needed. It was noted that this also depends on what happens with the recruitment data.

As all Schools are facing the same issue with recruitment data, RWP suggested it made sense to try to solve the issue collectively not individually. SB felt it would be helpful if RWP could speak to Edmund.

ACTION: RWP to email Anne Parry and Edmund (from a SEMS and SBCS point of view) about finding a collective solution to the data issues.

- FM asked SB how the Committee could get hold of the staff bonus scheme information. SB confirmed there is an intern working on this and she will send it on as soon as she can

ACTION: Send staff bonus scheme data to FM (SB)

- In the career development section (for academic staff), MR noted it was important to mention specific examples, such as unconscious bias training and fair interview skills training, which are mandatory.

Next steps – revised timeline

The original plan was to send Sean the School’s draft application by the beginning of February to review, but the Committee agreed it didn’t make sense to do this until it had a complete draft.

The timeline was revised (below):

| Task | Who | Deadline |
|--|----------------|---|
| Write sections | Section owners | 22 nd February |
| Review all sections | All | 23 rd -27 th February |
| EDI Committee meeting – discuss and comment on application | ALL | 27 th February |
| Send draft to Sean | AS | 2 nd March |
| Receive comments from Sean | AS | 7 th March |
| Committee to review comments | ALL | 7 th -13 th March |
| EDI Committee meeting – agree how to address comments and update application | ALL | 13 th March |
| Send application to Caroline Wardle for review | SB | Mid-March |

5. Staff Excellence Award Scheme (Christoph Engl)

CE spoke to the Committee about the Staff Excellence Award Scheme that was introduced at the last University he worked at. The Scheme had six categories: delivering excellence, team of the year, achieving ambition, outstanding leadership, community impact, and lifetime achievement. Anyone could be nominated and individuals could be nominated by line manager, peer nominated or self-nominated. The shortlist would be made public so that people would know they had been shortlisted and were acknowledged for their contribution. It finished with quite a prestigious awards ceremony, where people received an award and acknowledgement. CE noted that the Scheme boosted moral, after a period of restructuring.

This Scheme was delivered at university level. CE asked the Committee whether they felt this was something which could be done, on a smaller basis at School level and whether the School could include this in its current application as a future perspective, or include it in a future application.

It was noted that there are already a number of schemes in existence, such as the Faculty Awards, which celebrate excellence in research, teaching and professional services and outreach awards; the student union awards for teaching; and a new award scheme that started today in the School – the 'golden ticket' in H&S in JP, which is open to anyone and is awarded to individuals who help change the H&S culture.

The Committee agreed it would be worth exploring whether something else could be done at School level, although it should be careful to avoid duplication. AS noted it was one of the action points in the previous application to explore more recognition and to look into having staff awards, so suggested leaving this in the current application. The Committee could then think about something which would be appropriate for the School. FM thought it would be a good idea if any scheme could feed into the Faculty Awards

The Committee agreed to postpone a discussion on this until after the application has been submitted.

ACTION: Get photos from the Faculty Award ceremony for our Athena Swan application (FM)

6. **AOB – none**

7. **Next meeting – 27th February 2018**