**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER**

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

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 5 March 2014

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present** | Professor Colette Fagan | CF | Deputy Dean – Research (in the Chair) |
|  | Andrew Mullen | AM | Deputy Director of HR & Head of Faculty HR |
|  | Dr Carolyn Abbot | CA | Senior Lecturer, School of Law |
|  | Professor Claire Alexander | CAl | School of Social Sciences (Sociology) |
|  | Professor Claire Annesley | CAn | School of Social Sciences (Politics) |
|  | Mariam Attia | MA | Research Development Officer |
|  | Dr Helen Dutton | HD | Athena SWAN Coordinator |
|  | Professor Helen Gunter | HG | School of Environment, Education & Development (Education) |
|  | Jayne Hindle | JH | Head of School Administration for Arts, Languages & Cultures |
|  | Professor Helge Hoel | HH | Manchester Business School (People Management and Organisations Division) |
|  | Jane Hallam | JHa | Head of Faculty Planning & Compliance |
| **In attendance** | Natalie Thompson-Vassel | N T-V | Human Resources |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 |  | **Introductions** |  |
|  |  | CF opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and thanking them for their attendance and participation in taking forward the Faculty’s agenda in this important area. Members introduced themselves and gave some background regarding their expertise and experience in the field of equality and diversity.  HD noted that the University was initially awarded the Athena SWAN Bronze Award in 2008 and was renewed in November 2011. There are currently five award submissions pending; each takes six months to go through the process. Assuming these submissions are successful, the University will have up to 13 awards in STEM Schools. There are a mixture of awards at bronze and silver level.  CF noted that notwithstanding Athena SWAN accreditation was confined to STEM subject areas, the Faculty aimed to adopt the key principles associated with it. However, the scope of the work in Humanities would focus on race as well as gender and would cover PSS staff as well as academic and research staff.  It was noted that with the papers in advance of the meeting, colleagues had received copies of:   * Humanities Staff Equality and Diversity Action Plan document * Data sets for each School on staff and student profile by gender and ethnicity for academic and PSS staff * List of, and links to, employment-related University policies and procedures * Links to: * Equality and Human Rights Commission’s (EHRC): “An employer's guide to... Creating an inclusive workplace” * Business in the Community’s (BITC) *Opportunity Now* Exemplar employer best practice * BITC’s *Race for Opportunity* Getting Started with Race Diversity * Equality Challenge Unit’s (ECU) gender equality and race equality charter marks * Faculty APR data for 2012/13 * 2013 Staff Survey RAG report for the Faculty of Humanities   CF informed the meeting that the Humanities Planning & Resources Committee (HPRC) is the group to which the Working Group would report and to which it is accountable. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | **Approach to developing action plan** |  |
|  | (a) | CF noted that there are to be two stages of process for the Group in undertaking its work.  For stage one CF proposed that Group members examined the following in relation to the operation of policies and practices within their areas as they impinge on matters of equality and diversity:   * Are they working? * Are they being implemented? * What’s currently in place? * Whether any current policy needs to be updated or abandoned? * Are they fit for purpose?   In so doing, it was acknowledged that the Group would need to be frank in its assessment of what is and isn’t working, and in judging whether or not we are operating good practice.  In addition to the above, Schools should provide a bullet point summary commentary on the data for their areas and proposed priority issues (see also 6 below) based on the current staff profile and levels/areas in which there was a gender imbalance or an underrepresentation of BME staff.  Stage two will be defined and taken forward within the group based on the work done at stage one. Once an action plan is developed at this stage, School and Faculty representatives will be asked to implement it within their areas. |  |
|  | (b) | CAl stated that it would be interesting and helpful to disaggregate the data for BME academic and research staff into UK and non-UK nationals. It was noted that this issue had been highlighted previously with colleagues in the Equality and Diversity Unit and attempts were being made to ensure the ability to report data in this way. Progress would be checked and reported back to the Group as soon as possible. | **Action: AM/HD** |
|  | (c) | HH stated that it would be helpful to receive recruitment data showing the profile of staff at application, shortlisting and appointment stage. This would help to identify the stage at which underrepresented groups tended to “fall off. “  AM noted that, as highlighted on the meeting’s agenda, work was currently in progress to generate this information in suitable reports. The University gathered such information via its Jobtrain on-line staff recruitment system, but had recently invested in new software to improve its reporting capability. The software would allow the University to generate reports showing the progress of candidates through the recruitment cycle by gender and ethnicity. It would also be possible to show this information by vacancy, occupational group, level and School. It was recognised that this information was necessary to ensure the devising of the most appropriate positive actions initiatives. It was noted that subject to successful introduction of the software and training of staff, the information would be circulated to members of the Group in advance of the next meeting. | **Action: AM** |
|  | (d) | CAl stated that as well as numbers percentage scores for BME in the data sets would be helpful, as it would be easier to make comparisons. HD undertook to recirculate the data accordingly. | **Action: HD** |
|  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  | **Timescale, milestones and reporting** |  |
|  |  | CF stated that in accordance with University APR requirements, the Faculty was required to report to the University via the HR Sub-Committee on progress on E&D metrics and initiatives in May as part of a mid-year review. An end of year review would be undertaken by the University in November.  CF stated that by then the Working Group should have devised action plans and begun to implement them.  CF stated that the Heads of Schools were aware of the Group’s work and members should apprise their Heads of School of any work being carried out by the group.  It was agreed that the information submitted to the group was not at this stage to go beyond the relevant School Leadership Team. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  | **Review of data and any additional data requirements** |  |
|  |  | HD provided the Group with an overview and explanation of the data sets circulated.  HD informed the meeting that we would look at one year and then the trends and that whilst percentages are important we need to look at the numbers as well as they can show the reality in terms of National data, which may help put it into context better. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | **Audit of policies** |  |
|  |  | CF noted that there would be merit in reviewing the University level policies at a later stage and considering any gaps in the University framework by reference to the approaches recommended by ECU and EHRC. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  | **School/Faculty Admin. work** |  |
|  |  | Each representative should examine and analyse the data in their area and submit to AM by **Wednesday 7 May** a 1-3 page bullet point document of observations of the issues that need to be addressed. These would be reviewed by the Group at its next meeting.  All to look at the operation of policies their area against the questions set out in 2(a) above and to highlight issues to inform a discussion at the next meeting.  Each area’s designated HR Partner will contact the relevant representative to offer support with the work. | **Action: School/Faculty Admin. reps**  **AM** |
|  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  | **Confidentiality** |  |
|  |  | CAb stated that information raised in the meeting had potential to cause issues within Schools and asked whether or not the meeting discussions were to be confidential. CF confirmed that apart from briefing of Heads of Schools and necessary communication to achieve agreed actions, the discussions within the Group were to be treated as confidential. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  | **Dates and frequency of future meetings** |  |
|  |  | CF stated that at the next meeting the frequency of future meetings will be addressed. NT-V to establish a date everyone can attend another meeting. **N.B. Meeting arranged for Thursday 15 May 2014 at 2.30p.m. in the HR Boardroom** | **Action: NT-V** |