Equality and Diversity Committee  
Wednesday 4 March 2015  
Boardroom, Faculty Building, South Kensington Campus

Present:
Professor Debra Humphris  Vice Provost (Education) – Chair (DH)  
Ms Mary Bown  Head of the Disability Advisory Service (MB)  
Mr Joe Cooper  Managing Director – ICU (JC)  
Ms Kim Everitt  Deputy Director HR (KE)  
Ms Joanna Ivison  Minutes  
Ms Louise Lindsay  Director of Human Resources (LL)  
Mr Richard Martin  FOO – Faculty of Engineering  
Ms Leyla Okhai  Equality & Diversity Manager (LO)  
Ms Susan Parker  Unite, Branch Secretary and Equalities Officer (SP)  
Mr Dean Pateman  Academic Registrar (DP)  
Ms Sarah Shemilt  Chair of Able@Imperial (SS)  
Roddy Slorach  UCU Equalities Representative  
Richard Thompson  Senior Consul

Attending for this meeting:
Ms Katie Bayliss  Strategic Planning Officer  
Ms Kalpna Mistry  Staff Network Coordinator  
Ms Hailey Smith  Welcome Service Manager

1.0 Welcome and Apologies

1.1 The Chair welcomed the Committee to the meeting, and welcomed Roddy Slorach to his first meeting.

1.2 Apologies were received from Melanie Peter, Washington Ochieng, Abigail de Bruin, Denis Wright, David Cosgrave, Jo Haigh, Kani Kamara, Christopher Kaye, Zarine Khurshid, John Neilson, Tom Wheeler, Sky Yarlett and Mark Richards.

2.0 Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising not covered by agenda items

2.1 The minutes were deemed to be an accurate record of events.

2.2 Matters Arising

Disclosure Rate  
KE reported an improvement in disclosure as shown in the staff diversity snapshot carried out in November each year. In 2013, ethnic origin was not known for 18.5% of staff. In 2014 this was down to 9.1%. Disability disclosure had also increased to 3.4% from 2.8%.

2.3 Action Tracker  
The Action Tracker was considered. The following updates were noted:

Support for International Students/Under 18s (Oct 2014 3.6)  
The Imperial Success Guide had been launched at the beginning of the academic year. All undergraduate resources were now in one place, and students were engaging with the content. The next phase would be to extend this to postgraduate students.

Wellbeing Task Group Report (Oct 2014 7.1)  
The Student Wellbeing Working Group recommendations had been presented to Provost’s Board in November. All recommendations were endorsed. Those with no resource implications were implemented immediately. Those with resource implications, such as the Mental Health worker, would be included in the Planning round in April.

Meeting with Union Representatives (May 2014 3.7)  
This meeting was to be held straight after today’s E&DC.
Encouraging Disclosure (May 2014 4.2)
Heads of Departments were to be involved in adopting a more local approach to encouraging disclosure. It was hoped that this would engender more trust in the process and thus increase the disclosure rate.

3.0 Academic Careers and the Leaky Pipeline – main themes from Hailey Smith’s thesis – Paper 1

3.1 Hailey Smith presented the main findings of her Master’s thesis, looking at women’s experience of academic careers and the ‘leaky pipeline’ at the College. The gender split at postdoctoral level was decreasing over time, and while female representation in the more senior academic grades had slowly increased, at the lecturer level the number of women had decreased over the past ten years.

3.2 Interviews with female and male academics revealed that experiences were not very different across the grades. Staff understood that the leaky pipeline existed, the term was recognised and people were aware of what the College was doing to plug it. Women felt that it was still a male-dominated career path where ‘male’ traits were often rewarded. Women felt they were no less dedicated but considered that they were expected to undertake more administrative and teaching-based work, and often felt they were there to support male colleagues in the department. Even though they found the administrative and teaching work rewarding, as it often led to making connections outside of the department, it took time away from their research.

3.3 Possible solutions included increasing the quality of mentorship, as well as identifying sponsors for staff – someone who could proactively endorse progression. It was felt that many male academics already had sponsorship of this kind, and it was suggested that this kind of relationship mainly grew out of social networks. It was thought that, while in some departments the ‘old-boys club’ may have died, it had been replaced by a ‘lad-culture’, particularly amongst post-docs and lecturers. SP informed members about the regular discussions at the Juno Committee which revolved around gender imbalance; she said that critical mass is important and some women were isolated and without peer support. The Committee discussed whether sponsorship was something that was desirable enough to be replicated. Views expressed included that it engendered favouritism and was something that we wished to promote?

3.4 The Academic Promotions process was raised as a concern. Although there was a clear set of criteria, which were well communicated and recognised at College level, there was still a barrier as to how the criteria were interpreted at departmental level. The Committee agreed that the departmental barriers for promotion needed to be addressed. KE reported that these issues were being addressed by the Academic Gender Strategy Committee and RT said he would raise the issue with the other Consuls and Stephen Richardson.

3.5 Interestingly, staff reported that they had strong external and international networks, but poor internal networks.

3.6 JC reported that the ‘lad-culture’ had been recognised by students and there was a student-led campaign running on sexism at College; they were currently gathering evidence and a decision would be made as to whether it is taken on as a campaign by ICU.

3.7 Members thanked Hailey for speaking to her thesis and for providing the basis for a stimulating and useful discussion. The following actions were agreed:

i. To keep the Committee updated regarding the sexism initiative with a view to the Committee deciding how it might lend support - JC;
ii. To keep members informed of the proposed changes to the academic promotions process which will come into play for next year’s exercise - KE;
iii. In order to start to reveal any unfair distribution of administrative and teaching duties, an impact assessment of the distribution of these tasks should take place – KE;
iv. To assess the level of support available (Mentors/Academic Advisers/sponsorship) and what we might do to improve it – KE
4.0 **Disability Action Committee - oral report**

4.1 LO provided the report. The Committee had met on 18 February. The Terms of Reference and Membership were revised and Roddy Slorach would be joining the Committee.

The Action Plan was updated and had been streamlined to focus on five main areas:

1. Increasing disability declaration for staff and students
2. Consultation with disabled staff and students
3. Training and learning and development
4. Learning and Teaching Experience
5. Communications

4.2 The Committee commended the work to provide a consistent College-wide PEEP.

4.3 SP reported an issue raised by some support staff who felt excluded from some of the ‘careers’ advice/events promoted to staff, as they felt they had a ‘job’ rather than a ‘career’. It would be helpful to change the terminology to be more inclusive to the College as a whole.

**Action: LO to discuss with the LDC**

4.4 RS reported that the Mental Health First Aid Training had been very useful and asked if there were any initiatives to promote general awareness as mental health issues amongst staff and students were increasing. The Chair confirmed that the Student Health & Wellbeing Review recommendations had gone into the Planning Round to better support students. There had also been a discussion at Provost’s Board last week about the health and wellbeing of staff. LL reported that the Mental Health Lite, half day course, was designed to help raise awareness. The College was also going to participate extensively in Mental Health Awareness Week in May.

4.5 LO reported that the latest Time to Change health check report had just been received and would be submitted to the next DAC. There were some helpful recommendations.

5.0 **Equality and Diversity Unit – report on activity Paper 2**

5.1 LO spoke to the paper which outlined the Unit’s project work and events that had taken place during the Autumn term, and which highlighted priorities for the Spring term. The Committee thanked LO and the team for the support they provided to the networks. SP said that she had attended the ‘Time to Change’ cafe and it had been a very positive event.

5.2 The Committee asked that, in future, “non-academic women” be changed to “professional services women” in the sentence “Exploring ways in which to support non-academic women through a variety of staff development opportunities and key events (Objective 2 and 7).”

**Action: LO**

6.0 **Trans Policy for Staff – for information**

6.1 Kalpna Mistry tabled the Trans Policy for Staff, launched in February.

6.2 The policy had been drafted following a review of the gaps in what was available to trans staff. Staff had been consulted widely and the draft had been discussed externally to ensure that the policy reflected the views of trans people in the community. Section 9 detailed what support should be given to staff who wanted to transition. A toolkit was available on the website in addition to the policy. HR had requested more guidance on name-change and confidentiality, so specific training would be set up and this would be added.

6.3 A policy would now be developed for students and there would be close, collaborative work with ICU. KM had talked to members of 1600 and it was suggested that an effective way to gather information on issues that trans students face would be a drop-box in the Student Hub. DP said he was happy to advise if there were specific student issues around disclosure.
6.4 The Committee discussed the merits of there being a trans sub-group within Imperial 600. It was thought that this could potentially identify individuals who might not be ready to be identified. If formed, it would need to be promoted in a careful way. DP said that he would be consulting members to find out what they wanted.

6.5 DC asked about managerial discretion over time off for medical appointments etc. KM confirmed that time off for medical procedures could be taken either as sick leave, via TOIL or unpaid leave - the decision should be made after a discussion with the line-manager.

6.6 SP recommended that guidelines should be specific, otherwise they remain open to interpretation by managers. LL said that HR would be able to advise managers of approaches across the College to ensure a consistent approach, but they would consider if more clarity could be brought to the guidelines.

   Action: KM/HR

7.0 E&DC’s 11th Annual Report - to discuss possible content and format

The Chair reported that although there was so much work taking place in the equality and diversity area, and many interesting and positive trends were highlighted in the 10 year review, more could be done to showcase and promote this work. The Chair cited ICU’s Impact Report as a good example of a concise, eye-catching publication. JC advised that ICU had separated the more anecdotal evidence from the statutory element required for their formal annual report. The Committee agreed that it was important to be more celebratory about the improvements and positive changes taking place and agreed to look into the options for creating a new-look publication.

   Action: KE

8.0 Harassment and Bullying – Activity following the Staff Survey - oral report

8.1 LL reported that the 2014 Staff Survey results had been disseminated at College, Faculty and Department levels. Specific areas had been highlighted e.g. responses to the equality and learning and development-related questions. All data had been interrogated as much as possible whilst protecting anonymity. All the local results had been posted online and showed the current and previous data for departments. Action Plans at department level were also on the website.

8.2 In terms of harassment and bullying, there was a lot of support available from HR but departments needed to move towards owning the issue; following through on the Action Plans, and staff training to raise awareness would all help. The Faculty of Engineering had arranged a confidential telephone line for staff to report incidents and talk through their experience with counsellors. The Faculty would then receive anonymised feedback.

8.3 The survey found that where bullying had taken place, it was also being carried out by colleagues, not just managers as might have been thought. There was lots of work being undertaken connected to the Respect for Others initiative. The model of Imperial Expectations would be broadened to define the College’s expectations of how people should behave towards each other. The Harassment and Bullying policy was being revised and consultation was wide. Other support included the Harassment Support Contacts. A booklet of all support available to staff was being produced by HR.

8.4 A new training programme with the working title ‘Imperial Essentials’ was being formed; this would give key training to those with specific jobs, especially where those jobs included supervising and managing duties. SP asked if this was going to be mandatory and LL replied that there would be core skills, which would be, and then specific skills which would be applicable only to certain jobs e.g. specialist health and safety.

8.5 RS raised the point that culture was an important factor. This was agreed. LL was asked if the results were different from last time. LL confirmed that there was no real change in the staff survey results since the last survey three years ago even though the data was not like for like. She said that it was disappointing that more progress had not been made. DP said that it was important for staff to feel they had a voice and to know how concerns would be responded to.

8.6 LL confirmed that a paper had been discussed at Provost’s Board which considered what support should be available to those going through informal process performance management, and that the report would soon be available to all staff for their views and feedback.
8.7 The Chair confirmed that there was full support and commitment at a senior level. LL was asked to update the Committee further at the next meeting.

**Action:** LL

9 Advisory Groups and ICU – oral updates

9.1 *Able@Imperial*
- SS reported that the events during the Disability Action Month (22 November to 2 December) had attracted a reasonable, improved turnout.
- A consultation on Disability Sickness Leave was in train.
- Good feedback had been received following the profile of the Networks in Reporter.
- An Equalities Away Day was being held in May around Communications generally.
- The December HR training day had focused on equality and had included a 45 min section for the Networks to promote their activities.
- SS had been in touch with the National Association of Disabled Staff Networks (NADSN) to offer to host their next meeting at the College, and the Calibre leadership programme for disabled staff would be promoted at that meeting.

9.2 *I600*
LGBT history month events had achieved reasonable attendance. Some staff had signed up but did not show. A short survey would be circulated to find out what people would like from the network. The social side of the network was being reviewed. The most popular sessions had been the Informal drop-in lunch sessions.

DP, together with the I600 Executive Sponsor (Muir Sanderson) and colleagues from HR, had attended a meeting with Stonewall to get feedback on our Workplace Index submission. There was some useful feedback about how to rise up the index, including through training, wider staff engagement, and reverse mentoring - particularly at management level. The College suffered in the ratings because it did not have good policy engagement with third party suppliers and a priority need was to review the procurement arrangements. DP said that the Stonewall feedback was to be shared with I600 in order to prioritise actions.

Muir Sanderson and LO had attended a Stonewall Straight Allies session.

9.3 *ICU*
JC said that support was being given to Liberation Officers for student-led campaigns and which the majority were on equality-related issues e.g. sexism, Out in Sport – looking how welcoming sports teams are to LGBT participants. Some practical results had already taken place – a campaign against tax on women’s sanitary products was taken on by ICU and these items were now sold in the ICU shop without a mark-up.

9.4 *Imperial As One*
LO reminded the Committee that the ‘Walk Around the World Exhibition’ was opening in the Blyth Gallery on Monday 23 March, with a social event on Thursday 26 March.

10. **REF and Equality – overview Paper 3**
The Chair requested that this item be held over to the next meeting.

11.0 **AOB**

11.1 **Access Agreement**
Katie Baylis explained that, each year, the College submitted a statement to the Office of Fair Access setting out its commitment to Widening Participation and Fair Access for students. Part of the submission is a statement on the Equality and Diversity Committee and its activities: what it does to
support students and how it monitors the impact of activities on different groups. The main activities were outreach and bursaries for those students from lower income households.

Outreach collected data on the gender, ethnicity and disability of their participants. So far they were more ethnically diverse and more likely to be female than the College’s home undergraduate population. There were only a few disability disclosures.

Bursary recipients, compared with the College’s home undergraduate population, were slightly more ethnically diverse, there was no difference in the gender balance, and they were slightly less likely to declare disability.

The Chair confirmed that for 2016/17, to level the pool of support, bursaries would be slightly lowered for students from households of 25k or less, and slightly increased to those from households of between £40 and £60k. This was a deliberate decision, made in consultation with ICU, as the students from lower income families had access to full grants and supplements.

The Committee agreed that, although outreach work took place within targeted specific London boroughs, more work needed to be done on geographical diversity across the UK, targeting urban conurbations.

The Chair reported that as part of the Education Strategy, Lorraine Craig had been working on a successful but small scheme to support students going back to their schools to promote the College, where there had been no recent applicants, but this needed more support to help it grow.

It was agreed that, next year the Office of Fair Access statement would be brought to the Committee to scrutinise before being submitted.  

**Action: Secretary**

---

**Date of Next Meeting**

10.00 -12.00 Boardroom Faculty Building South Kensington Campus

**Tuesday 12 May 2015**