**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER**

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

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 23 June 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 Helge Hoel | HH | Manchester Business School (People Management and Organisations Division) |
|  | Jane Hallam | JHa | Head of Faculty Planning & Compliance |
|  | Dr Helen Ryder | HRy | Athena SWAN Coordinator |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Apologies** | Professor Claire Annesley | CAn | School of Social Sciences (Politics) |
|  | Professor Claire Alexander | CAl | School of Social Sciences (Sociology) |
|  | Professor Helen Gunter | HG | School of Environment, Education & Development (Education) |
|  | Jayne Hindle | JH | Head of School Administration for Arts, Languages & Cultures |
| **In attendance** | Natalie Thompson-Vassel | NTV | Human Resources |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** |  | **Minutes of the meeting held on 15 May 2014** |  |
|  |  | The minutes were accepted as an accurate record. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **2** |  | **Matters arising** |  |
|  | 2.1 | Athena Swan Action plansIt was noted that by the end of June HRy will provide for inclusion in the Working Group’s (WG) interim report:* a summary of the Athena SWAN framework;
* a list of which Schools participate;
* their level of attainment;
* plans for obtaining further accreditation.
 | **Action:**HRy |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.2 | Disaggregation of BME staff dataIt was noted that as requested the WG had received a copy of the staff profile dashboards for Schools with the BME category disaggregated into sub-classifications. It was believed that the categories were BME UK, BME EU (excluding UK) and non-EU BME. HRy stated that she would clarify this with Heather Walker, the Equality and Diversity Unit’s Data Analyst.  | **Action:** HRy/AM |
|  |  | It was agreed that given the small numbers involved it would be helpful if the data for academics could be aggregated across Schools and recirculated to provide the Faculty picture. | **Action:** HRy/AM |
|  |  | It was agreed that an aggregate version of the data for PSS staff in the Faculty, including the Faculty Administration, would also be circulated.  | **Action:** HRy/AM |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.3 | Draft Working Group ReportCF updated the meeting that work on the report was progressing and comments from the group would be added before it was circulated again. CF and AM to meet in order to progress further work. | **Action:**CF/AM |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.4 | Academic promotionsAM noted that the data that had been produced for the University Promotions Committee (UPC) for its annual meeting on 19 June could now be circulated to the group. This showed by reference to the eligible pool, the profile of applicants at each level by gender and ethnicity as well as the success rates for cases going to FPC and beyond. AM also plans to consult with HR Partners and HoSAs to obtain the profile of cases considered and rejected at the SPC stage. | **Action:**AM |
|  |  |  |  |
| **3** |  | **Chair’s report** |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.1 | Update at HPRC and Presentation to Dean/DoFO core brief meetingCF noted that the WG’s interim report was favourably received by HPRC at its meeting on 22 May and that the group was congratulated on its work so far and asked to proceed with planned actions. CF and AM had also made a presentation to the Faculty Core Brief meeting on 11 June about the work of the WG so far as well as plan for further work. (A copy of the presentation was circulated with the agenda for the meeting and has been posted on the Faculty intranet). The meeting comprises of members of Faculty SMT as well as the so called Tier 4 academic Managers and HoSAs. The presentation generated discussion about, and interest in, the work being carried out. There were also two expressions of interest from colleagues in getting involved in the group. These were from Dr Ursula Tidd in SALC and Dhil Sidhu, Chief External Officer in MBS. **Agreed:** Colleague’s expressions of interest about getting involved will be notified to the relevant School lead so that they may follow up as appropriate for the stage 2 school action plan work.**Agreed:** Dhil Sidhu be co-opted onto the Faculty Steering Group, for his particular expertise in BME issues. It was agreed that exptheir involvement would be beneficial to the WG. | **Action:** All**Action:** AM |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.2 | University eventsCF noted that she had attended the inaugural meeting of the Women's Professorial Network (WPN) on 12 June which was attended by the President and Vice-Chancellor. The President and Vice-Chancellor is also hosting a lunch for BME Professorial staff and senior BME PSS staff. CF stated that as announcements on such events are made it would be helpful to circulate details to members of the WG so that they are aware of the different events being held and can publicise them to colleagues. | **Action:** All |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.3 | Children on campusCF informed the meeting the University’s policy and practice relating to staff bringing their children on to campus was discussed at the WPN event. As a result NTV will invite Dr Melanie Taylor, The University’s Safety Adviser to speak to a meeting of the WG as there is confusion about the operation of the policy and evidence of inconsistent practice. CF noted that a particular issue related to bringing children into the office when childcare breaks down and how this can be authorised at a local level. At the meeting evidence was cited of more progressive practice at Edinburgh which has Gold Athena SWAN accreditation. FLS had also been cited as having a process for obtaining approval for brining children into certain parts of the Faculty.AM informed the meeting that he had spoken with Jonathan Winter (JW), Head of HR, FLS who has confirmed that any process in place for FLS is not under the auspices of HR. JW is investigating further and will report back to AM who will feedback to the group in due course. | **Action:** NTV**Action:** AM |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.4 | University childcare provisionA discussion took place regarding the nursery provision for the University and the perception that:* priority is given to students over staff in the University nurseries;
* the waiting list for places is long and, as a result, many eligible staff don’t even consider using the University nurseries as they know they are unlikely to get a place.

As AM is a member of the University Nursery Committee for the Dryden Street Nursery, he undertook to check the current position on waiting lists and report back after the committee’s next meeting on 25 June. | **Action:** AM |
|  |  |  |  |
| **4** |  | **Recruitment data** |  |
|  |  | It was noted that recruitment data for the period January to December 2013 had been circulated with the agenda. This was disaggregated into School/Faculty Admin. by gender and ethnicity for each level. AM noted that where data was labelled as Senior Lecturer/Lecturer it was because the post was advertised across two levels.AM noted that even with the use of new software the production of the data had still been difficult and time consuming. As the data would be required on an on-going basis, it had to be both timely and reliable. As such, if the production of the data continued to be problematic, the University would have to explore alternative options.It was agreed that the data would be aggregated across the Faculty all Academic and PSS staff and recirculated, so that the group can look at the broader picture. | **Action:**AM/HRy |
|  |  |  |  |
| **5** |  | **Professorial equal pay audit** |  |
|  |  | It was noted that equal pay audit data for professorial salaries in Humanities as at 1 May 2014 had been circulated with the agenda. This showed average pay and pay gaps at zones E, D and C by gender and ethnicity. At no level was the gap greater than 4.66% (male > female at zone C). Otherwise, the gaps ranged between 0.47 and 2.13%. AM noted JNCHES guidance on the subject that any gap less than 3% was of no concern and gaps of 5% and over required scrutiny and action. The guidance also stated that gaps of 3% or more, but less than 5% should be kept under review. It was agreed that the following additional information would be added:* The overall pay gap for professors for gender and ethnicity (i.e. regardless of zone);
* Reference to the numbers (and % of male, female and all professoriate who are paid in zones B and A;
* A footnote explaining that any market pay supplements or allowances for managerial positions were excluded from the figures. The footnote to include the number (%) of male and of female professoriate in receipt of market pay supplements.
 | **Action:** AM |
|  |  |  |  |
| **6** |  | **Policy review – verbal report on progress** |  |
|  | 6.1 | CA informed the meeting that she had taken notes at the meeting in the School of Law which she will circulate to the group. There were various points raised but they had noticed that there were lots of policies that are hard to find or there are older policies available and that it was felt this required attention. | **Action:** CA |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CA stated that it was felt that the University of Manchester does not sell itself well to prospective international candidates.  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CF stated that the review work was due to be completed by the end of June, or end July at latest for those with competing deadlines, and that the summaries were to be sent to CF and AM via NTV. Further guidance was included in CF’s email of 18 June to members of the WG.CF explained that one of the first actions following the policy review will be to develop an effective communications plan for Humanities to raise staff awareness of the existing Equality and Diversity policies. | **Action:** All**Action:** CF/AM |
|  |  |  |  |
| **7** |  | **Development of local Action Plans**  |  |
|  |  | CF reminded WG members that by mid-July they should have developed and scoped arrangements for local action plans and have agreed priorities and timescales with HoS/Senior Leadership/DoFO (as appropriate) for progression in September. | **Action:** All |
|  |  |  |  |
| **8** |  | **Next steps** |  |
|  |  | The WG would meet again in September to review action plans and progress. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **9** |  | **Date of next meeting** |  |
|  |  | NTV to send a Doodle poll to establish availability for a meeting in September. | **Action:** NTV |