THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

**Equality and Inclusion Delivery Group**

Via Teams: Tuesday 11 May, 14:00-16:00

|  |
| --- |
| **Attendees:**   Co-chairs- Louise Bryant (LB) and Iyiola Solanke (IS), Caroline Ackroyd (CA), Stephanie Amor (SA), Louise Banahene (LBa),Helena Brown (HB), Louise Bry John Chesledine (CJ), Clare Coleman (LC), Laila Fletcher (LF), Daisy Forster (DF), Antonia Frezza (AF), Dave Golding (DG), Ian Holdsworth (IH), Fiona Gill (FG), Joao Goncalves Faria Martins (JGFM) Sue Green (SG), Lisa Hill (LH), Yasmin Hussain (YH), Catherine Long (CL), , Kate Nash (KN), Gillian Neild (GN), Shelagh Prosser (SP), Shereen Robinson (SR), Daniel Rosenzweig (DR), Paul Taylor (PT), Chris Warrington (CW), Luke Windsor (LW), Kerri Woods (KW), Laura York (LYor), |
| **Apologies received:**  Ruth Buller, Kate Hardy, Anne Tallontire and Lorraine Youds. |
| **Introductory Business** |
| **1. Welcome**  LB and IS welcomed attendees to the meeting. |
| **2. Notes of previous meeting and actions**  The notes from the previous meeting were agreed by the group. The actions were reviewed and where appropriate additional actions have been tabled for discussion. The group was updated on the following activities:   * The Race at Work Charter Task and Finish Group has now become the Advancing Race Equality Working Group. The group continue to hold regular meetings. The members have been interviewed to gain a better understanding of racism within the University and their responses will be analysed and used to inform a related action plan. * The Advancing Race Equality Working Group has a meeting on 20 May to discuss their future priorities and has been asked to provide an update for the next EIDG meeting. * An updated version of the Domestic Abuse guidance went to the HR Leadership Team. The next step is for the guidance to be taken to the trade unions on Wednesday 12 May. * At the end of April a paper written by Louise Banahene and Nina Wardleworth was taken to the Taught Student Education Board (TSEB) that set out the University’s Decolonising Framework. TSEB members were asked to consider and if appropriate endorse the principles and the proposed implementation of the framework. * A Disability Task and Finish Group (DTFG) has been established to progress the priority actions agreed during the development of the Disability Equality Framework. The Group will meet on a monthly basis. The first DTFG meeting took place in April to agree the terms of reference and group membership. The Group will report progress to the E&I Delivery Group and consult with key stakeholders (including TU’s and staff networks) at relevant stages of the Group’s activity to support the progress of the priority actions. * The UK’s first Black Inclusion Week will take place from Monday 10 - Sunday 16 May 2021. An article has been published on the EIU website with additional information. <https://equality.leeds.ac.uk/events/black-inclusion-week-2021/> * A working group for Black History Month has been set-up and EIU plans to work with Leeds 11 to develop this year’s programme of events. * To mark International Day Against Homophobia, Transphobia and Biphobia on 17 May 2021 the EIU has created and published a webpage. <https://equality.leeds.ac.uk/events/international-day-against-homophobia-biphobia-and-transphobia-idahobit2021/>   **Action:** Louise Banahene to provide an update on the University’s Decolonising Framework at a future EIDG meeting.  **Action**: DF to add to notes of previous EIDG that it was Professor Steve Scott’s last meeting as the Chair of the EIDG and all members thanked him for his contribution over the last 12 months.  **Action**: Advancing Race Equality Working Group to provide an update at the next EIDG  ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------   1. **Introducing the new Deans: EDI**   Professor Louise Bryant and Professor Iyiola Solanke introduced themselves to the group.  Professor Solanke is Chair of EU Law and Social Justice within the Law School at Leeds, with an outstanding research track record in the fields of EU and anti-discrimination law. Alongside research, she’s an international advocate for anti-discrimination, diversity and equality, within and beyond the University, including being Chair of [Leeds 11](https://equality.leeds.ac.uk/staff-networks/bme-staff-network/), the University’s Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) staff network, as well as a founder of the [Temple Women’s Forum North](https://www.innertemple.org.uk/your-professional-community/temple-womens-forum/) and the [Black Female Professors Forum](https://blackfemaleprofessorsforum.org/).  Louise Bryant is a Professor in Psychological and Social Medicine, Associate Dean for EDI in the School of Medicine and the University’s Academic Lead for Gender Equality. Professor Bryant’s played an integral role in the [School of Medicine’s Gold Athena SWAN Award](https://forstaff.leeds.ac.uk/news/article/6874/medicine_leads_the_way_in_latest_athena_swan_achievements) in 2019 – the first medical school in the UK to receive the accolade. She also led the recent [institutional Bronze Award](https://equality.leeds.ac.uk/initiatives/leeds-gender-framework/athena-swan/) submission with colleagues across the University. Professor Bryant continues to raise the profile of equality, diversity and inclusion through her roles, and through research that challenges health inequalities experienced by people with a learning disability. |
| |  | | --- | | **Strategy and delivery** | | |  | | --- | | **2. Update on the Gender Pay Gap**  The key discussion points from this item were:   * The group was provided with an update on the University’s Gender Pay Gap (GPG). The GPG refers to the average salary of all women employed by an organisation, compared to the average salary of all men employed by that organisation, in this case, the University of Leeds. * The GPG differs from the Equal Pay Gap which refers to the legal right to be paid the same for the same work. The University of Leeds mean ranked in the middle of other Russel Group Universities for their GPG. * Our overall data show:   + an average mean gender pay gap of 18.5%   + an average median gender pay gap of 13.6%   + an average mean bonus pay gap of 5.4% (for bonuses awarded by the University). The bonus pay gap excludes bonuses awarded by the NHS for Clinical Excellence. | | |
| **3. Update on gendered violence reporting**  The group was provided with an update on gendered violence reporting. The key points from the discussion were:   * Student Support and Student Cases have been working together to address how complaints are dealt with and the corresponding procedures. * For the academic year 2021/22 there will be increased staffing support and new positions will be recruited to. These roles will build on existing knowledge in the Student Support team. * The Student Support team is currently exploring the potential to buy an additional web resource used by many other HEI’s. The resource provides a single point of contact for students wishing to report an incident of sexual violence and those looking for information and support. |
| **4. Review of EDI Governance structure**  The group was informed about the upcoming work the Deans of EDI will undertake to develop a new E&I strategy. The new strategy will build on the existing E&I frameworks. An initial scoping exercise will be carried out prior to the launch of a new framework. This will enable LB and IS to gain a better understanding of how EDI officers work in faculties and the resources that are available to them. The Deans of EDI will also be seeking to gather the opinions from EIDG members on   * How they see EDI working within the University. * What the EIDG deliver and how should we deliver it * The current EIDG structure and if it effective for delivering strategy   **Action**: EIDG members will be sent a survey and responses will be discussed at a future EIDG meeting. |
| **5. E&I Commissioning Framework**  Please see Annex 1. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Annex 1** | | | |
| Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 |
| **What type of E&I training is happening?**  This is very mixed.   * Staff in IT and the Library had had nothing except the mandatory training and access to optional modules in Minerva. * Student Counselling had ongoing training as part of away days and specialist training for all colleagues. * LUBS had proactively arranged training sessions for their staff including webinars, Unconscious Bias and Active Bystander training. Some staff had attended Gendered Intelligence. They have identified gaps, particularly in disability training, and are currently looking at training regarding race equality. * A question was raised about whether it is up to individuals to seek out training.   **How is the decision made on what training to do, and how to source a provider?**  This tends to be fairly ad hoc.   * LUBS have a list of providers. They are also sometimes approached by providers, and will consider them. They also use internal provision. There is no official process as such. * Student Counselling make decisions on what to do if a need is identified or anyone has a gap. * It was suggested that an institution wide list of approved suppliers would be useful and efficient.   **How is training evaluated to see if it has met needs?**   * Feedback is collected from participants after the session. However, it is difficult to know at this point whether the training will have a long term effect, so it would be useful to have some follow up a few months later.   **How can EDI be embedded in the wider procurement process?**   * The whole procurement process needs to be ethical. The Stonewall equality index includes a section on procurement. * Need for consistency and supplier evaluation * Training needs to be real – evidence needed that it is making a real difference * Training needs to be a continuous process, not just a one off – to build upon previous training. | **Q1: what E&I training is currently happening in your area?**  Kate: not nearly enough, this academic year not much, a couple of small activities related to Athena Swan. Most of the time we don’t know who to approach, but we would love to do more  Susan: we did theatre based training and with HR and an external provider we have developed a booklet within FD. HR did the most of it and we only fed in it but don’t know how HR looked at different companies  Fiona: not much, but we could use the Network (W@L) to publicise it  Some areas not a lot happening, other areas specific/targeted work (and training booklet). However, there was a general feeling of ‘don’t know’ around what needs done and who should be doing it (ie, central or faculty/school/service).  **Q2**  Kate: (the theatre based training) was effective, this was determined via a lot of feedback during and after the session (stimulated a lot of discussions)  Kate : It needs to start with why  Paul: I agree we would need a lot of data  and people need to feel that we are trying/ to explain what we are doing  Iyiola: to have EDI principles and letting the University community know we are making a difference and making EDI everybody’s business  There is a link between Sustainability  Paul: Digital Education has a tendering method in place where providers need to meet requirements before we see them  Iyiola: trying to change external culture that adheres to our internal culture  Kate: having a subgroup to work on this within OD&PL  Kate: no training is provided to E&I Coordinators- we volunteer in the role but no training is provided and we make it up as we go  Generally a lack of clarity – approach ODPL, HR, other colleagues, or use who has been used before?  Q3  Feedback sheets (recognition these don’t have much validity in terms of impact). Also, a feeling feedback is skewed as participants tend to be self-selected and so already ‘on page’.  There is a need for   long term impact evaluation. However, this can only be gleaned if there are clear baselines and outcome/expectations up front. Again, generally a feeling of ‘don’t know’. Who has carried out an EDI self-assessment to set baselines? Faculty/school/service – who does this evaluation work, and where does it report through to? Centrally - do OD&PL report on evaluation of training/development, and if so, who do they report through to? (governance structure)  Q4  A need for EDI Principles that feed directly into Procurement (especially expectations related to culture). Learn lessons from Sustainability. DES have Tendering process around Accessibility – embed this. A wish for a sub-group to support this process. Questions raised about who pays for training/development, especially as there is disconnect between central plans and faculty/school/service budgets. Who is mapping these central requirements to faculty/school/service needs? And who determines the budget/funding allocation to secure these requirements? | **What E&I training currently happening in your area?**  Antonia Frezza – in the SU we have a learning management system, with a range of online E&I training for all staff that includes a basic suite of courses. This is part of the staff induction and monitored so there is an expectation for all to do it, but not mandatory. We then have specific in person or virtual commission depending on the topic e.g. trans awareness training.  **How to people identify what training they need?** We have that challenge at the moment, where do you start at looking at the gaps in knowledge and **what training might want before we commission it.**  Colin Challinor – who does assess that, anyone internal?  Sarah Ward – it varies area to area, e.g. medicine faculty is very forward thinking with  menopause training so there are pockets of specific practice.  Colin – no consistent approach across the organisation.  Yasmin – I’m from the school of sociology and social policy and involved in teaching around EDI. So we know the gaps where more training is needed. Teaching we provide students with training around unconscious bias and white privilege in house. So do in our school but could do wider. We have a **centre for Race and ethnicity studies**, an example of pockets of expertise. Racial illiteracy need training on this. so managers know what to do when staff come to them with race issues. **We do have the training expertise n house but not branching out wider outside the school.**  Colin – **map out what already have in place internally and what can be shared wider?**  Vania – In my faculty there are issues with gender, we need a bottom up approach for who tells us what is needed, **needs come from ground up**. Schools indicate what issues are. We have external people like engineers but they can’t access the E&I training module. Broader needs are that the faculty is ethnically diverse and we have specific needs training e.g. transgender, LGBT+ communication using right words. **If training imposed from above not it’s not embraced because it’s seen as a tick box exercise. So need a middle out approach (not top down or bottom up).**  Stacey – IT a special case 80% male, 90% white and a lack of EDI awareness. Need a s**calable set of provision, beginner, intermediate and advanced. So that those starting from a place of no knowledge can start and progress.** Suite of options centrally with levels of content.  Antonia – **what is centralised and what is devolved is not clear. There is the m**andatory online E&I module but there clearly lots of teams wanting to do other specific things but there is **no certainty about the central provision and what we are expected to commission or provide ourselves.**  Colin – mixed bag, unclear, where to go to.  Vania – call for E&I training for research as this is also a specific culture. E&I training for PGRs needs to be bespoke e.g. giving credit to people, acknowledge contributions, very specific to research and not covered by general E&I training. | **Faculties and schools seem to have:**   * Individual work happening at school level on D&I (lends itself to some areas of research and incorporated in roles) * All have knowledge of the introductory module (D&I induction) – not massively impressed with quality/scoring   **Knowledge of PSL of trainers:**   * Who has approved the list? * What is the criteria? * How often is this reviewed? * How do we measure success?   **Terminology may need developing:**   * Rather than “training” moving to “education” or “development” language – could enhance engagement   **Variation of trainers:**   * Needed to show representation (race, sex, intersectionality)   More information/education about Intersectionality needed too  Q4.  Just a brief follow up on q 4 from breakout group on procurement of EDI training. I can see efficiency reasons for standardising and for creating a list of approved EDI providers, and, as I said, I was surprised not to be able to find this when I approached EPU, but... I am actually a bit worried about a levelling down if we move to a more standardised model. It's been helpful (I think - we'll see how the session goes) to be able to have a quite detailed conversation with the trainer that we're bringing in to really tailor the session to specific issues and the specific audience that we want to engage. If it's helpful, I can send on the proposal - I'm expecting a revised version of it towards the end of this week.  I agree with the concept of extending a commitment to E&I to procurement and think that the model with sustainability offers a useful parallel.  It feels to me that there are some things that are potentially more important than others so I wonder if we should consider what these are.  I can see how requiring suppliers to demonstrate a commitment to E&I could become a bit of a tick box exercise where they send their equality policy and we give them a green light.  However in some areas the commitment is more important so we might consider that it doesn’t matter so much who we buy paper from but it does matter if they are delivering recruitment services, training or something else that is more critical to our E&I work. Another example would be where people are to be present on campus carrying out work, contractors etc. so that we can be assured that they will work within our values etc.   I’m not opposed to the former (tick box style) under some ethical purchasing type policy but think the latter is of more interest. |