**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER**

**Faculty of Humanities Staff Equality and Diversity Working Group**

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 03 March 2016

**Present**: Andrew Mullen AM Deputy Director of HR & Head of Faculty HR 11111111111111111111111111111111111111111(in the Chair) 111111111111 Professor Claire Alexander CA School of Social Sciences (Sociology) Dr Carolyn Abbot CAb Senior Lecturer, School of Law

Professor Georgina Waylen GW School of Social Sciences (Politics) Professor Helge Hoel HH Alliance Manchester Business School (People 1 11 111 111 Management and Organisations Division)

 Sarah Mohammad-Qureshi SMQ Athena SWAN Coordinator

 Patrick Johnson PJ Head of Equality and Diversity

 Rosie Williams RW Head of School Administration for Environment, Education & Development (SEED)

 Jayne Hindle JH Head of School Administration for Arts, 11111111111111111111111111111111111Languages and Cultures (SALC)

 Victor Badilas VB HR Directorate Support Services Assistant

**Apologies:** Professor Colette Fagan CF Deputy Dean – Research

Dil Sidhu DS Chief External Officer, Alliance Manchester 11111111111111111111111111111111111111111Business School

Jared Ruff JR Senior Faculty Research Manager

1. **Apologies received and introductions**

AM noted the apologies received and clarified that Professor Helen Gunter (HG) has left the group and as SEED has not yet nominated a replacement, RW was representing the School.

AM introduced and welcomed SMQ as the group’s new Athena SWAN Coordinator.

1. **Minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2016**

The minutes were accepted as an accurate record.

1. **Matters arising and update on actions**
	1. Stimulating cultural change

 It was noted that AM and CF were to consider further how best to take this forward by building on the roll out of the unconscious bias training and that for gender equality, the qualitative information gathered as part of the Athena SWAN process would be important in informing this work.

**Action:** AM/CF

* 1. Interview panels to report on and consider profile of applicants and shortlists (by gender and ethnicity ) as part of recruitment process

As noted at the last meeting, it was not problematic for interview panels to receive information about the gender profile of applicants. However, the monitoring procedure did not currently report on candidates’ ethnicity details at this stage. Without a University level policy decision to change the current arrangements, this could not change. There was no reason, however, why panels should not review the current staff ethnicity profile as part of the process as a local practice. Further consideration would be given to how best to encourage this approach within the current policy and procedural framework.

**Action:** AM

* 1. Project Diamond 1

 AM highlighted the information on the gender and ethnicity profile of appointments made as part of the PD1 recruitment campaign and included in the meeting papers. The need to monitor, and be mindful of, the impact of such campaigns on the profile of appointments was noted.

* 1. Staff Survey-findings for staff with protected characteristics

 A copy of the presentation made by PJ to the University Staff Survey Steering Group on the findings from the 2015 survey was included in the meeting papers. This summarised the findings by gender, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity and caring responsibilities. Key findings were:

* All protected groups are more likely to feel more discriminated against at work;
* A significant proportion of disabled staff do not feel valued and appear to have a negative experience at the University.

 PJ noted that the University level action plan aimed to address these issues and they formed part of the University’s on-going work.

 AM noted that it had not been possible to obtain findings at Faculty and School level in a form that would be helpful to the WG and to Schools in taking forward Athena SWAN applications.

3.5 Web site development

 AM noted that the work on developing Faculty pages was progressing and it was planned that they would go live by the end of April. Arrangements would be made to preview the pages with members of the WG. The development of this site would also be helpful to Schools in developing their Athena SWAN applications.

**Action:** AM

3.6 Diversity in Focus newsletter

 PJ confirmed that members of the WG had been added to the circulation list of the newsletter and that the next edition would be published in March.

3.7 Professor Jill Blakemore – Visit in April/May 2016

As reported by Professor Helen Gunter at the last meeting, Professor Blakemore is coming to the University as a Simon Visiting Professor and is an expert in gender and leadership in education. HG has offered to help in organising a meeting of Professor Blakemore with the WG if there is sufficient interest. Members of the WG said they would welcome that opportunity and suggested the following topics for discussion:

* How to promote cultural change in Schools and Faculties
* Relevant initiatives taken at other institutions
* Developing positive action initiatives.

**Action:** AM/HG

 3.8 Nominees for ECU Charter Mark panels

 It was confirmed that details of how to apply to become a panel member had been circulated. It was noted that DS had applied and been appointed as a Race Equality Charter Mark panellist.

1. **Membership and terms of reference of Working Group**

As noted in 1 above, HG has left the WG and will be replaced in due course by the person appointed as lead for SEED’s Athena SWAN Self-Assessment Team (SAT). JH will also be stepping down when SALC appoints its Athena SWAN lead. The WG recorded its thanks to HG and JH for their contribution and support.

It was noted that the WG’s terms of reference required some revision to reflect the work that had been undertaken since the Group was formed in 2013 and to include reference to its overarching role in supporting Athena SWAN applications. AM will draft and circulate a revised version in advance of the next meeting.

**Action**: AM

1. **Athena SWAN Charter Mark applications**

School representatives provided updates on progress.

5.1 AMBS

HH noted that AMBS has an established group, which now also serves as a Self-Assessment Team. The working group comprises 10 members who are leading the project in preparation for the November deadline.

HH noted that although the SAT would focus on gender and Trans equality issues in line with the Charter Mark’s requirements, it would aim to also consider issues associated with other protected groups such as race and sexual orientation.

5.2 Social Sciences

CA confirmed that a SAT had been formed in accordance with Athena SWAN requirements and that it had met three times to date. The committee is comprised of 15 members. CA is leading a sub-group looking at policy provision and GW is leading a sub-group examining data. They are planning for a November submission.

AM to send CA details of the policy review undertaken last year.

**Action**: AM

5.3 SEED

RW reported that although a small group has met four times in SEED, it is not yet constituted as an Athena SWAN SAT. The School is developing a role description for SAT lead person so that it can seek expressions of interest. RW expressed concern that the School did not have the skills to review and analyse the data sets. She also expressed concern about the School’s ability to prepare and submit its application by November 2016 and noted that it may be more realistic for the School to aim for the April 2017 deadline.

AM will arrange to speak to the HoS in order to discuss how best assist the School in progressing the formation of a SAT so that the prospects of a November submission could be further assessed.

**Action: AM**

5.4 SALC

JH advised that the School had an established WG which needed to be reconstituted as a SAT. Its members will be starting the project work before Easter and it will be chaired by the Interim HoS. The School was in the process of appointing a lead person who will become a member of the Faculty WG. Although it is expected to be a challenging task, the School was working to meet the November deadline.

5.5 School of Law

CAb reported that the School has been making good progress, but has recently taken the decision to defer its submission until November having originally aimed for an April 2016 submission. The new version of Athena SWAN requires more contextual data. The changes in the application process and format meant that previous applications did not provide a helpful precedent or template (e.g. the need for more consultation with students).

Cab noted that although the application work is challenging, it is also rewarding.

The School is currently working through the quantitative data. A Research Assistant has been assigned the role of analysing the data and supporting the preparation of an application more generally.

There was a group discussion regarding the possibility of other Schools assigning a Research Assistant to perform similar work. It was agreed that CAb would send the job description prepared for the Law Research Assistant to AM who will then circulate it to members of the WG.

**Action**: CAb

CAb mentioned that the School has also created two online staff questionnaires, one for PSS staff and one for academic staff. The School had adapted the previous STEM questionnaires and considered the version they had devised to be very helpful. The response rates were higher than 90%. Cab to send send AM the surveys to share with WG members.

**Action**: CAb

The response rate and the associated volume of qualitative data from the staff questionnaire is another reason that more time is needed than the April deadline would have allowed.

1. **Unconscious bias training - feedback**

There had been some mixed feedback regarding the training, though most was positive. There were some negative comments about the assumptions made by the trainer. PJ will be considering next steps in relation to evaluation, follow up and potential roll out of the training.

**Action:** PJ

1. **Equal Pay Audit 2015 update**

The full report and the headline report were published on StaffNet and highlighted in eUpdate in February as planned. A link was included in the meeting agenda. AM noted that it was challenging to convey the difference between an overall pay gap and a pay gap within a grade.

AM noted that the Government’s planned regulations on equal pay reporting may mean some changes to the way the next audit is conducted in 2017, though it would make it easier to benchmark with other universities and organisations in other sectors.

1. **University Research Strategy – briefing on discussions of equality and diversity metrics and governance**

 AM noted that the paper had been co-authored by CF and PJ and was considered by the University Research Strategy Group in February.

 It was noted that:

* The report included REF2014 inclusion by gender, ethnicity and disability compared to sector average;
* Inclusion rates compare favourably to the sector, though there were significant differences by ethnicity (-10% BME v white) and disability (-13% disabled v non- disabled);
* The report included information on grant applications and success rates by gender and disability for each Faculty;
* Application rates for protected groups in Humanities are in line with their representation, though success rates for BME and disability are not.
* The report included recommendations for actions in response to findings.
1. **Monash University,Melbourne-academic promotion arrangements**

AM noted that HG had referred the arrangements for the WG’s attention. Specifically, she had highlighted the section which provide for the possibility of a reduction in the normal level of achievements for promotion for a range of personal circumstances.

WG members agreed that it would be useful to consider whether an adapted version of this approach could be incorporated into Faculty procedures. AM and CF will give this matter consideration as part of the review of Faculty’s promotion arrangements in advance of the 2016/17 round.

**Action:** AM/CF

1. **Children on campus policy**

It was noted that the University’s Child Protection Policy and Guidance had been relaunched in February by the University’s Risk and Compliance Office. Although the policy now included reference to the University’s family friendly provision to give some balance to the predominantly risk focus in the policy, WG members believed that there was too great an emphasis on children as a risk. AM will convey this view to the Director of Compliance and Risk.

**Acton:** AM

1. **Dean/FoFO core brief and presentation by CF/AM**

AM highlighted that the presentation made on 17 February to senior Faculty and School managers. This highlighted targets, achievements and plans in relation to equality and diversity matters.

1. **BSI Code of Practice on Diversity and Inclusion**

HH to circulate a brief update to the WG.

**Action:** HH

**13 Draft University level Objectives for 2016-20**

 AM noted that these had been circulated to WG members and any comments should be forwarded to PJ by Friday 11 March.

**Action:** PJ

**14 Date of next meeting**

Thursday 23 June 2016, 15:30-17:00