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Glossary of terms used in this report

- **Allies**: Within an equality, diversity and inclusion context, ‘ally’ is used for an individual who – while not sharing the equality characteristic – is a declared supporter and advocate of those who have this characteristic.

- **BME/BAME**: ‘Black and minority ethnic’ or ‘Black, Asian and minority ethnic’. Wherever possible we have replicated the preferred usage from the original submissions. For the latest statistics on BME staff and student representation in higher education see Equality Challenge Unit’s (ECU’s) 2016 *Equality in Higher Educational Statistical Report*.

- **Disability**: HEIs use the term disability to refer to a range of impairments and long term health conditions including mental, physical, unseen and visible impairments. For the latest statistics on disabled staff and student representation in Higher Education see ECU’s 2016 *Equality in Higher Educational Statistical Report*.

- **DSA**: Disabled Students’ Allowance

- **E&D/ED/EDI**: Abbreviations for ‘equality and diversity’ or ‘equality, diversity and inclusion’ often used to identify a particular strategy or policy, or a particular team responsible for such work within an institution.

- **HEFCE**: Higher Education Funding Council for England

- **HEI**: Higher education institution

- **LGBT/LGBTQ/LGBT+**: Refers to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning. For this report we have endeavoured to use the terminology used by the submitting institution or group.

- **Professional services**: Used throughout to refer to a range of non-academic staff roles.

- **Reasonable adjustments**: The Equality Act 2010 permits institutions to treat a disabled person more favourably than a non-disabled person, and places a duty on them to make reasonable adjustments for staff, students and service users in relation to: a provision, criterion or practice; physical features; auxiliary aids. The extent of the duty to make adjustments will differ depending on context. There is an anticipatory duty to provide reasonable adjustments for students, which requires HEIs to take a strategic approach to addressing the barriers that potentially impede disabled students. This will involve institutions putting in place systems that can be activated as appropriate for disabled students, staff and/or visitors. Alongside this, disabled students and staff are entitled to individual reasonable adjustments for specific requirements. There is no anticipatory duty in the field of employment.

- **Specific learning difficulty/difference**: Used to refer to a range of conditions such as dyslexia, or dyspraxia.

- **STEM**: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics

- **Support services**: Used throughout to refer to a range of formal services, resources and personnel provided by the university to offer support and advice (usually related to welfare, wellbeing, health, or funding to a group of students or staff (or both).

- **Trans and transgender**: ‘Trans’ and ‘transgender’ are inclusive umbrella terms for people whose gender identity and/or gender expression differs from the sex (male or female) they were assigned at birth. The term may include, but is not limited to, trans men and women, non-binary people and dual-role people. Not all people that can be included in the term will associate with it.
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**Introduction**

In the Higher Education Funding Council for England’s (HEFCE’s) 2016 Grant Letter from the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills, HEFCE was asked to collect evidence of sector-leading and innovative practice in advancing equality and diversity across the higher education sector in England [www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2016/CL,162016/](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2016/CL,162016/).

HEFCE sees equality and diversity as essential pre-conditions for excellence in the higher education sector. Ensuring staff and student communities are diverse and representative is a legal obligation for institutions receiving HEFCE funding, as part of their public sector Equality Duty. It is also a matter of social justice and good business practice, so these principles should be hard-wired into universities’ missions and values.

The evidence received from 49 higher education institutions (HEIs) across England highlights the sector’s commitment to equality and diversity. Many of the examples received were exemplary and highlight that equality work in the higher education sector often has a much broader reach than a single institution. Examples have been received of partnerships between institutions, of institutions working with other agencies and of institutions working to embed their equality initiatives into the curriculum with the aim of raising awareness of equality issues and how to respond to them within future generations of the workforce.

The majority of examples received covered race, gender and disability highlighting the need for institutions to ensure that they are sufficiently meeting the requirements of the public sector Equality Duty of the Equality Act 2010 in relation to age, religion and belief, and sexual orientation.

During 2016 HEFCE also conducted a mapping exercise of equality objectives published by HEIs as required by the public sector Equality Duty. The aim of this exercise is to gain a better understanding of where institutions are focusing their equality and diversity resources and how they are meeting their legal obligation to publish equality objectives.

---

The findings of the call for evidence not only serve to highlight good practice in advancing equality and diversity beyond the higher education sector, they also serve to raise awareness of initiatives among HEIs. Many of the initiatives or elements of them are likely to be replicable. One of the criteria used for selecting initiatives was transferability.

When considering the viability of an initiative HEIs will need to consider their context and that of the institution that developed the initiative. For example, initiatives to ensure Black and minority ethnic (BME) representation on recruitment panels are likely to be viable in institutions that have an existing pool of BME staff. In institutions with few BME staff, such an initiative is likely to overburden existing BME staff. Instead such institutions may need to look at attracting BME staff and ensuring that progression and promotion processes are fair, transparent and free from bias.

Consideration can also be given to the transferability of an initiative to a different equality area. Again this will depend on institutional context and appropriateness – a mentoring scheme designed for female staff could be extended to other groups, including BME and disabled staff but elements of the scheme, e.g. how mentors are identified, mentees and mentors are matched and the training provided to mentors, will need to be reviewed.
Key findings

HEIs are making varied and creative efforts to tackle issues of equality and diversity within their workforce, student body and community as a whole. The decision as to where to focus time, money and resources was often specific to the needs of the particular institution and related to this, their equality objectives under the Equality Act 2010. However we identified a number of themes common to the most successful interventions, processes and policies.

Collaboration

Many of the initiatives involved collaboration and consultation with different bodies within the HEI (students, alumni, academic staff, professional support staff, unions and equality networks). The strongest initiatives often looked beyond the institution and involved collaborative working and information sharing with external organisations including charities, support agencies, the police, the NHS, employers, and primary and secondary schools.

Communication

The efficacy of new policies and practices often relied on meaningful efforts to communicate and raise awareness of the work. Some initiatives went beyond the use of webpages, newsletters and mailing-lists to use videos, social media and web-based software. These communication methods were often at the heart of the piece of work, either serving as resources of information, tools for reporting or monitoring, or dedicated efforts at active campaigning. In ECU’s experience, consideration of accessibility and usability of such tools at the outset is key to the success of the initiative.

Data

Evidence-based initiatives made good use of available data to identify equality challenges, investigate details, and monitor progress and success. Evidence was provided of innovative use of data ‘dashboards’ and data collection to assist with this. High level commitments towards achieving key targets and requirements for regular, transparent reporting also helped to ensure accountability and to track progress of change.

Leadership

In many of the initiatives selected, there was often a high level of visible leadership balanced with an ‘embedded’ approach ensuring a certain amount of ‘local’ ownership of cultural change within a department, faculty or team.

Networks

The networks referred to in the initiatives serve multipurpose functions. Many, understood as ‘equality’ or ‘liberation’ networks served to provide a ‘safe space’ with the aim of promoting inclusivity, connectivity and support for individuals with common challenges based around shared characteristics. Other networks acted more as information and knowledge hubs, disseminating information from the institution to affected individuals, and providing a forum for communicating to and from other areas of the HEI. Networks also served as tools for sharing best practice, advocacy, consultation and celebration. A key message for senior management arising from the examples received is to actively demonstrate support for and engagement with existing networks to demonstrate commitment to equality, diversity
and inclusion (EDI); and to ensure networks are included in consultations on new policies and practices, as a key source of knowledge, resource and enthusiasm for the EDI cause.

**Research**

Most initiatives were informed by consultation and research (qualitative and quantitative) at the outset and there are useful examples of the varied ways stakeholders can be engaged: not only through formal consultation exercises, but also by reviewing feedback forms, surveys, and focus groups as well as seeking knowledge from existing staff or student networks. We also received examples that demonstrated consideration of a broader or more specific spectrum of stakeholders and the communities that HEIs operate in, for example local charities, local support and campaign groups, the police, students’ parents and alumni.

**Resource**

There was a real mix of heavy financial investment from HEIs (for example, through the provision of central funds for research leave, or equalising pay gaps), investment in people (for example through hiring dedicated personnel for administrative support or leadership), and ‘low resource/high impact’ support through utilising existing projects (or networks) and maximising impact through existing communication platforms.

**Scale**

Some initiatives started at the departmental level, or were piloted within a specific operational or subject area before being implemented across an institution. This has provided an excellent opportunity for learning and development on a small scale before implementing larger scale interventions. Where a project was initiated by a department rather than at the institutional level, there was clear evidence of successful impact first. In ECU’s experience, methods for measuring impact are often not considered at the outset of a project and yet to secure ongoing support and funding, the ability to demonstrate impact is usually key.

**Strategy**

The best initiatives were clear in their aims and objectives, and demonstrated an awareness of an institution’s wider objectives and how they fitted into an institution-wide framework of equality and diversity. They also considered the realities of other institutional strategies around resource planning, programme offerings, internationalisation and recruitment.

**Summary of submissions by equality characteristics**

Over 120 individual submissions were received from 49 institutions. The largest percentage of submissions (29%) covered equality in general. There were noticeably very few submissions on age (0.8%), gender identity (4%), religion and belief (0.8%) and sexual orientation (5.6%); 21.8% of submissions covered gender and there was reasonable coverage of disability (14.5%) and race (12.9%).

While ECU is aware that many institutions have specific initiatives in place covering age, gender identity, religion and belief, and sexual orientation, the lack of submissions in these areas is concerning and highlights the need for institutions to ensure that they are sufficiently meeting the requirements of the public sector Equality Duty of the Equality Act 2010.
Note that whilst the Equality Act 2010 refers distinctly to ‘gender reassignment’ (trans identity) and ‘sexual orientation’ as separate protected characteristics, many of the examples received of equality work, particularly around networks, referred to LGBT or LGBT+ together. Where this is the case we have coded as ‘LGBT’ below, with ‘Gender Identity (Transgender)’ reserved for initiatives focussing on trans specific issues.

‘Socio-economic disadvantage’ is not a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010. However many HEIs are increasingly focussing on understanding the disadvantages faced by students (and staff) from lower socio-economic backgrounds, as well as investigating the intersection of socio-economic disadvantage with other equality characteristics. For further information see the Social Mobility Advisory Group report *Working in Partnership: enabling social mobility in Higher Education* (2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Characteristics</th>
<th>Number of submissions</th>
<th>% of submissions received (rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All/General</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No defined equality characteristic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability and socio-economic disadvantage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity (Transgender) Trans identity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Gender and Disability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Gender and Disability and Socio-economic disadvantage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Belief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation (LGB/LGBT)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

On the basis of HEFCE’s call for evidence www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2016/CL.162016/ circulated in July 2016 and a workshop organised by HEFCE, to determine what was meant by sector-leading and innovative practice, ECU developed criteria for selecting the examples received for publication in this report (see Annex A).

Evidencing practice

The HEFCE call for evidence required institutions to provide the following information:

- description of the aims and objectives
- explanation of the origins and any consultation activity undertaken
- description of the practice
- results of any formal evaluation (qualitative or quantitative).
- explanation of why it would be of benefit to other institutions

It also encouraged practice which had:

- taken an intersectional approach to enhancing equality and diversity (supporting staff or students with more than one protected characteristic)
- had a demonstrable impact on diversifying governing bodies or senior leadership
- taken a collaborative regional approach, or involved co-working with external partners (such as other public authorities or businesses).

What is ‘sector-leading’ and ‘innovative’ practice?

On the basis of discussions at the practitioner workshop organised by HEFCE, ‘sector-leading’ practice was defined as practice that:

- Has a positive and sustainable impact on equality and diversity
- Could be practically adopted by other institutions

‘Innovative’ practice would be either:

- A new way of tackling an identified equality and diversity issue, or
- A more effective way of tackling an identified equality and diversity issue

For the purposes of this work, practice was considered broadly as ‘initiatives, interventions, policies or processes’. Practice covered all levels of study, all sections of the higher education workforce (technical, professional, academic and leadership) and all institutional functions.

Practice could meet individual (e.g. empowering individuals and developing confidence) or aggregate (e.g. reducing attainment gaps and increasing workforce diversity) level objectives. Practice included discreet initiatives (e.g. equality training) or changes to process (e.g. developing a centralised fund for reasonable adjustments).
Assessing examples

The 124 examples received were considered separately by two of ECU’s senior policy advisers using the criteria developed. Where the two assessments were significantly different, a third member of ECU’s senior policy team undertook their own decisive assessment. The third assessor also quality reviewed a random selection of 20% of the assessments. Where insufficient information was provided to determine if an example did constitute sector-leading or innovative practice, ECU requested further information.

Based on information gathered at the workshop to define sector-leading and innovative practice and the level of information that institutions were asked to provide, practice was shortlisted by evaluation against four indicators.

1. Positive impact: Has the practice had a positive impact on the employment/educational/social experience of staff and/or students?
2. Sustainable: Is the positive impact of the practice likely to be sustained after initial investment/resource?
3. Transferable: Is it practical for the practice to be transferred to another institution in the sector?
4. Transformative:
   a. Has the practice transformed existing ways of working?
   b. Is the practice different from practice routinely adopted by other institutions?

Evaluation concluded with an overall review of all selected examples of innovative and sector-leading practice to ensure a balanced but representative spread of equality practice by protected characteristic, provider type, and functional/subject area or issue.

Assessors did not analyse examples of impactful practice from institutions where a potential or actual conflict of interest has previously been declared (specifically in relation to the assessor being an account manager of, or delivering any ECU service to, an institution that submitted examples). In such instances, assessments were conducted by alternative staff. Furthermore, any reference to pursuing ECU’s equality charters in themselves in the submissions was disregarded, albeit that activities developed in pursuing the charters may be relevant.
Institution-wide initiatives to embed equality

Equality champions

A number of institutions use staff to champion their equality, diversity and inclusion work, either at an institutional or departmental or faculty level. The remit of the champion and the time, training and resources provided to the role will vary by institution and the requirements of the role. Institutions may use champions to provide support to staff and students, disseminate information on equality and diversity policy and practice, identify local needs and ensure that equality and diversity are actively considered in the work of a committee, division, department or faculty. The example below demonstrates how equality champions can effectively work to identifying and address local needs.

Manchester Metropolitan University: Equality Champions

The Equality and Diversity (E&D) Champion role was first introduced in the Services Group in 2012. The champions aim to celebrate successes relating to equality and diversity and encourage communication of policies and practices, serving as a ‘first point of contact’ on equality and diversity issues in their area.

Champions also identify and support local needs by assessing the equality and diversity training needs of their particular faculty or division, as well as supporting equality monitoring and ensuring diverse representation of their staff and students.

This proactive and collaborative approach to incorporating equality and diversity into all aspects of the work that Services Group undertook was such a success that in 2014 the Diversity and Equal Opportunities Committee decided to expand the champion scheme to all areas of the university.

Thirty-five diversity champions have now been selected from within the staffing body, with a remit to communicate, promote, and mainstream the institutional equality and diversity objectives into their local areas of influence and responsibility. The diversity champions are in place across professional services as well as academic faculties.

Outcomes: Josie Elson, Associate Director of HR, Valuing and Engaging People said, “The dedication, input and contributions of our E&D Champions is crucial to the university’s success”.

Link to submission

While many HEIs will have institution-wide networks of equality champions, they can also have faculty or department specific initiatives to champion a particular cause often specific to equality challenges in their field of focus. The following example highlights a faculty approach to championing the increased representation of women in engineering.

University of Sheffield: Championing women in Engineering

Following an equality analysis of staff and student representation across the seven departments of the Faculty of Engineering, in 2011 the university created a high level position with a remit to increase female participation. The Faculty Director for Women in Engineering (FDWIE) is a member of the main decision-making committee in the faculty in order to ensure a ‘top down’ approach and to ensure equality issues were embedded in all major faculty decisions. In 2015
the FDWIE’s remit was expanded to all equality and diversity issues, though ‘Women in Engineering’ is still the primary focus.

The FDWIE was provided with a working budget, and is now supported by a ‘Women in Engineering’ team, including a Deputy Director, and two part-time positions of Project Manager and Support Officer. These work in conjunction with departmental ‘diversity champions’, meeting approximately six times a year to share good practice and discuss key activities.

**Outcomes:** The Faculty has seen improved staff survey results, particularly in relation to feelings of cultural inclusivity: 96% of people in the 2016 survey answered that the university respects individual differences. The FDWIE role and support team, working together with the departmental champions have also contributed to success in Athena SWAN, improved communications and effected changes such as amended core working hours.

= Link to submission

### Initiatives to combat gender-based violence, discrimination and harassment

The National Union of Students’ campaign to raise awareness of the extent of gender-based violence experienced by students has resulted in a much needed increase in specific initiatives to tackle gender-based violence affecting both staff and students. At the time of writing this report, the Universities UK (UUK) taskforce established to examine violence against women, harassment and hate crime against students published its first report. These particular initiatives met the criteria used to identify sector-leading and innovative practice and they have also been recognised in the work of the UUK taskforce. For further information on the task force see www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/Pages/taskforce-violence-against-women-hate-crime.aspx. Both examples here highlight the benefits of universities working with each other to share best practice and develop resources.

**University of Manchester and University of Manchester Students’ Union: ‘We Get It’ campaign**

Collaboration between the Students’ Union and the University’s Equality and Diversity Team led to a multi-platform campaign initially focussed on a ‘zero-tolerance’ message around sexual harassment. Launched in 2014, the campaign has since been expanded to include all forms of bullying, harassment and discrimination.

Staff and students were invited to take a pledge to stand up to all forms of harassment, and training was provided for staff on handling disclosures of sexual harassment and violence. In addition the university developed a new online reporting tool and support materials, as well as an interactive activity to prompt discussions. The campaign received visible support from senior managers and staff and student groups.

Resources and other information from the campaign have been provided to support the wider sector through the UUK taskforce on Tackling violence against women, harassment and hate crime affecting university students, and is currently collaborating with the University of Oxford, University of Cambridge and University College London to further develop the ‘Where do you draw the line?’ online task further to cover staff interactions.

**Outcomes:** The online reporting tool has facilitated 159 people to report incidents since November 2014 with 96 requesting to speak further with an adviser. Eighty key members of
support staff have been trained in how to respond to disclosures of sexual violence and harassment, and there is evidence of greater institutional awareness and discussion of harassment and discrimination issues.

= Link to submission

In addition to working closely with external agencies and its students’ union, SOAS, University of London has acknowledged the need for guidance which goes beyond the 1994 Zellick report, which gave the police responsibility for investigating allegations of gender-based violence that occurred within an HEI. It has launched new guidance on preventing and responding to gender-based violence and has committed to investigating allegations in clearly defined circumstances – rather than simply saying that they are a matter for the police to deal with.

**SOAS, University of London: guidance on preventing and responding to gender-based violence**

SOAS consulted widely with its students’ union, with the National Union of Students (NUS), and with external specialist agencies such as End Violence Against Women (EVAW), Rape Crisis, and legal experts to develop guidance and procedures relating to gender-based violence.

In terms of prevention, training on ‘sexual consent’ was provided to students and staff, and student societies were provided with training materials from UWE Bristol’s Intervention Initiative programme which aims to prevent sexual coercion and domestic abuse in universities.

In terms of disclosures and responses to disclosures (including investigations) the university provided training to senior staff, and updated ‘step by step’ guidance for staff receiving disclosures. This guidance aimed to respect the victim’s wishes and inclusivity, and acknowledged that LGBTQ and male students can also suffer gender-based violence.

**Outcomes:** In addition to the roll-out of training, resources and new guidance, an anonymous reporting system was launched in January 2016 and will be used as part of the review of the effectiveness of the new guidance and to inform future developments.

= Link to submission

The issue of ‘lad culture’ frequently arises in relation to work to tackle gender-based violence, discrimination and harassment. The following example illustrates another multi-faceted approach but in this case, has a focus on challenging ‘lad culture’ through working with sports teams.

**Nottingham Trent University: Respect and Consent initiative**

In 2014 the university set out to better understand the nature of issues it faced around student cultures, associated behaviours and sexual assault. This was predominantly driven by its own case work, together with emerging concerns in the sector around ‘lad culture’, respect, sexual consent and sexual violence on campus. A three-year initiative commenced with the objective of embedding a culture of respectful behaviours. It also involved the establishment of an institutional framework for dealing with incidents where students or staff experience unacceptable behaviours (particularly sexual harassment or violence).

The university took a collaborative and localised approach, based on consultation with students and staff across all three campuses with high level support from the Vice Chancellor, University
Executive Team and Students’ Union Executive. Activities included: ‘Consent is Everything’
campaign, supported by a video and training of student peer influencers; a Dignity and Respect
Policy; a revised protocol for responding to reports of sexual assault; activities within NTU Sport
including a move away from using alcohol-related sponsorship from bars and clubs for sports
teams. Links have also been developed with external support agencies and multi-agency groups,
such as Nottingham Sexual Assault Referral Centre (Topaz), Nottingham Crime and Drugs
Partnership and Nottinghamshire Police.

The university is currently developing an online resource and video relating to respect,
harassment and assault.

**Outcomes:** There has been an increase in referrals and complaints (including historic
complaints). Survey results also indicate improved behaviours within the sporting context and a
greater sense of safety during Freshers’ Week. There have also been fewer related incidents
reported on student club nights.

Link to submission

**Networks to promote equality**

Many institutions support a number of networks made up of individuals and organisations with a shared
interest or identity. We have highlighted particularly strong examples where networks have provided
outcomes which benefit not only individual members but have contributed to wider improvements
relating to equality and diversity, either within their host institution or the wider community. Many
networks are tangibly supported by their institution through engagement, communications, and
collaborative work with senior leadership, human resources or equality and diversity practitioners.
Strong staff and student links have supported wider cultural change and increased understanding
between students and the staff, of their experiences and challenges.

The **University of Essex** for example is part of a large regional organisation, reflecting its awareness of
the geographical and organisational links affecting its staff, students, and local communities. The extent
of external collaboration here was striking:

**University of Essex: Essex Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Alliance**

The university co-founded the Essex Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Alliance (ELGBTA) in
2014, which now includes up to 25 organisations (including Essex Fire and Rescue, Essex
Community Rehabilitation Service, Essex Police, North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group,
Southend Borough Council, Essex Football Association, Essex County Council, and Colchester
Institute) as well as the Charing Cross Gender Identity Clinic. The aim of the Alliance is to share
best practice and raise awareness of issues relating to sexual orientation and gender identity
amongst staff at all levels, and in acknowledgment that the workplace is part of the wider
community.

The Alliance serves as a consulting body, and has provided insight into the institution’s new

The Alliance has provided opportunities for new relationships and initiatives, including an LGBT
careers event focussed on student employability with the Students’ Union and Employability and
Careers Centre; sporting tournaments in support of International Day Against Homophobia and Transphobia (IDAHOT); and events around LGBT History Month.

**Outcomes:** Staff disclosures of sexual orientation have increased by 17.5% over three years and the network has increased the visibility of the institutions’ commitments to LGBT equality. The network has also contributed to the wider community with a number of initiatives including the development of continuing professional development (CPD) resources for secondary schools to support LGBT students, and a publication entitled *Supporting the LGBT classroom - A University of Essex Reader.*

[Link to submission](#)

The University of Sheffield’s Open@TUOS network of LGBT staff and allies ([http://openattuos.sites.sheffield.ac.uk/](http://openattuos.sites.sheffield.ac.uk/)) and its targeted communications campaign also provide a strong example of how institution-level networks can help to generate cultural change.

[Link to submission](#)

Staff and student links may also be promoted through an HEI’s networks, as demonstrated by the University of Kent’s Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Network (below).

**University of Kent: Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Network**

The university’s EDI Network helps to relay messages relating to equality between departments, the central university staff and student EDI teams, as well as providing a space for discussion of best practice, and consultation on university policies. The network consists of volunteer EDI representatives amongst staff, trades union and Kent’s student union members, who are based across each academic school and professional service department.

As a staff-student collaboration, the Network is co-chaired by the staff EDI Manager and the Student EDI Officer, and reports to three different committees: the Staff Policy Committee, the Joint Staff Negotiating and Consultation Committee (JSNCC) and the Student EDI Operations Group.

**Outcomes:** The Network has been involved in a number of activities, including the embedding of equality and diversity principles into departmental activities (including recruitment, selection and induction programmes and marking guidelines for students with specific learning differences); celebratory events including IDAHOT; religious occasions; and training and awareness campaigns. A dedicated online resource relating to EDI good practice across the university has also been established.

[Link to submission](#)

Institutions do report that momentum in networks can decline over time. Institutional support as well as recognition of the time required of individuals can be key to maintaining a strong network. To address this issue some HEIs are considering how staff are supported and encouraged to volunteer or participate in such activities. We noted for example, that at Liverpool John Moores University, Network chairs provide mentoring and coaching to new staff if requested, organised through the University’s Equality and Diversity Adviser. The Director of Human Resources also personally writes to all line managers of staff network members to ensure that staff are permitted and supported to take time away from their regular duties as necessary to participate in network meetings and activities, and relevant community and network events.
Pay gaps

The higher education sector has been working to address pay inequalities and the gender pay gap through the work of the Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff (JNCHES) www.ucea.ac.uk/en/empres/paynegs/new-jnches/index.cfm. JNCHES first issued guidance on equal pay reviews in March 2002. In England the median gender pay gap in higher education is 13.7% and the mean is 17.9%. See ECU’s 2016 Equality in Higher Educational Statistical Report.

Alongside equal pay reviews many institutions have also been working to review recruitment and promotions processes and have taken action to raise awareness of unconscious bias through the provision of training. In addition to this, there are many mentoring and career development schemes designed to support and encourage women in applying for promotion. The University of Essex was the first institution in England to directly address differential pay through salary increases and we have sought to highlight the basis of this decision:

**University of Essex: Closing the gender pay gap**

“We realised that these initiatives [focussing on recruitment and promotion and staff development] would take time to produce results and, driven by impatience when they failed to close the pay gap quickly enough, we decided to take action to close the gap with immediate effect.

We knew this would be a difficult issue to address and that we would be challenged on our actions. The data was complex and took time to analyse and interpret and was contested but, once we were clear that it proved that we had unfairness within our institution and that it was a structural issue and not related to performance, we were determined to address it.

Whilst many in our community shared our view of the need to take positive action, there were those who took some persuading. I was asked why we were taking action now when no other university had taken this step. And the answer was easy as the decision was about living up to our values – diversity and inclusivity, treating our members with equal respect and dignity, and rewarding people in a fair and transparent way.”

Prof Anthony Forster, Vice-Chancellor, speaking at ECU Conference 2016

The university’s Equal Pay Review in 2012/13 revealed that its gender pay gap had increased since its first review in 2008/09, from 6% to 7%. Despite taking steps to address the gap through mentoring and development for women academics, the use of positive action statements in the recruitment process, and unconscious bias training, by July 2015 it was clear that pay gaps persisted, with professors’ pay demonstrating a 5.49% gap between men and women (average of £4,800 p.a.), even after controlling for RAE/REF performance, and research income.

Following consultation and communications, the university chose to close the gap with immediate effect through an increase in the base salary of all female professors as of 1st October 2016.

**Outcomes:** The pay gap for female professors was reduced from 5.49% to 0.07%. The university will conduct a further Equal Pay Review in 2016 across all grades and all staff groups, and the Vice-Chancellor, Prof Anthony Forster, has committed to evaluating the impact of the professorial pay gap closure, and to remain “vigilant” against its reoccurrence.
Cultural change

This example from Brunel University highlights how a range of approaches to celebrating and supporting diversity can work for both staff and students:

**Brunel University London: Instilling ‘disability know-how’**

The university has focussed on collective responsibility and a willingness to engage in challenging issues and developing support around disability. All new staff attend a mandatory equality and diversity course which has a focus on disability issues; training is also provided to staff by the disability and dyslexia service. Further advice and guidance is available to staff on the intranet on supporting disabled staff and students as well as information leaflets aimed at raising awareness of impairments and disability-related issues.

The course, training and information is further supported by Well@Brunel sessions that cover all aspects of health and wellbeing while working or studying at Brunel, annual celebrations of Disability History Month and an active disabled staff network.

The disabled staff network reports to the Equal Opportunities and HR Committee (chaired by the Vice-Chancellor). Role models are also highlighted and ‘story-telling’ of how Brunel has helped support individual staff and students is encouraged.

The university sends periodic surveys which prompt staff to update their diversity information (in addition to data collection at the point of recruitment).

**Outcomes:** In the last two years student disability declarations have increased by 5% and staff by 1.5%. Access arrangements at the university have also improved, and managers are now provided with specialist recruitment and selection training related to disability.

The university will survey all staff (targeting disabled staff) later in 2016 to understand how the university can better support them, and also aims to develop a ‘reasonable adjustments’ policy supported by a central fund and training for line managers.
Departmental data

Many submissions referred to qualitative and quantitative equality data either as providing catalysts for action or as a useful means of measuring the impact of initiatives. Requirements of equality legislation, Office For Fair Access (OFFA) access agreements and the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) as well as ECU’s equality charter marks have resulted in an increased need for institutions to be able to effectively gather and analyse data on the equality characteristics of their staff and students. Some institutions have developed their own software for data analysis, and the initiative below is an example of one tool that has been developed.

**Royal Holloway (University of London): Annual review using data dashboard**

A ‘data dashboard’ has been provided to departments to enable them to view and query student data when conducting their undergraduate and postgraduate annual reviews. The dashboard can provide reports and visualisations of student progression against equality data (protected characteristics), which can be viewed at departmental, faculty or college level. Trends can be identified by examining year-on-year changes.

**Outcomes:** This dashboard tool has replaced previous data provided through static pdfs, and permits departments to use timelier and higher quality data to inform decision making for action plans to address equality concerns. Continuing developments have been informed by user feedback.

= Link to submission
Events

ECU recognises the value in events for sharing ideas, receiving feedback, providing an opportunity to reflect, networking, providing a catalyst for new initiatives and learning. Many of the submissions to the call for evidence were examples of one-off events. It was difficult to gauge whether a one-off event is sector-leading or innovative as it is often the outcomes of an event for individuals, organisations and the wider community that are of significance as opposed to the event itself. At the validation workshop ECU posed the question to practitioners: What makes a sector-leading and innovative event? All present agreed that it was dependent on:

- Context and geography. For example, is the equality group widely represented in the region or is it a region with very low representation of a particular equality group? Is it an issue likely to be discussed within the region? For instance, due to the high concentration of organisations influencing and promoting the work of government, there are often events around political and legislatures developments in London but these tend not to occur as frequently in other towns and cities across England.

- Is the theme developmental or new?
- Are stakeholders fully involved in the planning and delivery of the event?
- Is the event accessible and inclusive?
- What are the benefits for the audience of participation?
- Is the event culturally sensitive?
- What happens after the event? Does it inspire future partnerships or initiatives?

The example received from Liverpool John Moores University was striking and the only event-based example included in the report. The university has a history of providing conferences in partnership with external community organisations.

Events have included Diversity Today & Tomorrow - Forging Partnerships for Real Change (2009), Human Rights in the Age of Austerity: Making Rights Real at Community Level (2011), and Is Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Yesterday’s Debate? (2015). The events have brought together some of the most prominent people in the field of human rights and have been topical and timely. They have also enabled the university to raise its profile in the local community with external organisations in relation to equality and diversity issues.

The events are designed to provide an opportunity to debate equality issues, share ideas and best practice and devise solutions to equality and diversity priorities. The first event was held in 2009 and attracted over 300 delegates. Due to positive feedback from delegates further events were organised.

Link to submission
Governance and policy

Committed and collective action to increase women’s representation on governing bodies and other committees has been taken by the higher education funding bodies, sector umbrella bodies and individual HEIs. In 2014 the sector adopted a new code of governance which includes, the need for governing bodies to consider equality and diversity throughout the institution, including in relation to its own operation. HEFCE has also outlined measures in its 2015-2020 Business Plan to ensure greater diversity in governing bodies and senior leadership. These measures include a target of 40% women on governing bodies by 2020. The Athena SWAN charter mark has also been adopted by the majority of institutions in England and requires institutions to consider the representation on influential committees.

According to the 2016 report of “WomenCount: Leaders in Higher Education” a third of governing bodies are now gender balanced compared to a fifth in 2013 the earlier report. Men chair 81% of all governing bodies but the percentage of female chairs has increased from 12% in 2013 to 19% in 2016. Women have 26% of the chair roles on key committees which oversee nominations, remunerations and audit.

In this context, ECU highlighted initiatives which focus on both short-term and long-term improvements in the diversity of governing bodies. Some strategies actively examined the recruitment processes of governing bodies or school committees as below:

**London School of Economics and Political Science: Gender targets for school committees**

The school set a target that women would represent a minimum of 30% of the Academic Board’s five strategic committees (with a voluntary target for sub-committees) from 2016/17. The target applies only to Academic Board-nominated members, and not to ex-officio members or student representatives and was chosen to reflect the fact that women currently make up 29% of the school’s associate and full professors. A more ambitious target would have the unintended effect of overburdening this staff group, to the potential detriment of other areas of their work. The target is being kept under review to ensure it is reflective of the composition of staff. A similar target has been established for the school’s Promotions Committee.

In terms of gender balance, the School set minimum targets for male representation in acknowledgement that historically women had been overrepresented on a small number of committees.

**Outcomes:** Initial data points to positive change: for example, the Academic Planning and Resources Committee composition has changed from 87% male and 13% female (2014-15) to 62% male, 38% female (2016-17). The targets have also stimulated procedural changes to encourage greater gender balance, such as changes to the nomination procedure for Promotions Committee.

[Link to submission]
University of Kent: Women count

For recruitment for ‘lay membership’, positive action was taken where the university targeted successful women from specific groups (including Kent alumnae, honorary graduates and those in leadership positions in the region) and invited them to express an interest or to apply for a Council position. Advertisements were also placed locally, nationally, and on ‘Women on Boards’ with a statement regarding the inclusivity of the university.

For staff positions, an online nomination system was introduced in June 2016, with an available position for a representative at every level (grades 1 to 6) in the university. The call for nominations received a response rate of 32% and was seen to be promoting inclusivity.

Outcomes: Representation of women on Council increased from 29% in 2013 to 48% in 2016, and on influential committees has increased from 35% in 2013 to 50% in 2016.

However it was important to see that in examining diversity issues in governance bodies, some institutions such as Canterbury Christ Church University have also considered the accessibility and inclusivity of boards’ working practices:

Canterbury Christ Church University: Increasing diversity in the governing body

As part of an analysis of the diversity of its governing body – including recruitment and selection challenges – the university also considered practical issues around the accessibility and inclusivity of its meeting arrangements including a review of its venues, timings and expenses.

Governor meetings are now held in accessible venues, at times which allow participation from those with other commitments, and expenses are provided for related travel and childcare costs.

= Link to submission

Staff networks can also make significant contributions to policy development within HEIs. Their chairs may comprise members of equality and diversity committees but they may also assist policy development through participating in or supporting working groups as is the case at the University of Nottingham:

University of Nottingham: Trans working party

The university established a ‘task and finish’ working party to review its support for trans staff and students, following indications from a staff survey that current processes and relationships needed improvement. The working group was led by the university’s Lesbian Gay Bisexual Trans and Questioning (LGBTQ) Staff Network and supported by Human Resources. It incorporated a range of both individual trans staff and students, and operational leaders from across the college to ensure changes could be communicated and implemented swiftly.

The working party aims to review a particular area of concern at each monthly meeting, which has included items as varied as institutional guidance, support for staff and students on work placements and overseas study, internal IT systems, and communication and cultural change.

Outcomes: The focussed actions of the working party have resulted in institutional changes such as changes to records systems relating to non-gender specific titles (‘Mx’) and removing the collection of legal sex data from staff until the point of recruitment. In addition, the university’s renewed focus on this area has led to change in the way trans people feel within the institution,
with positive feedback received in relation to the work of various departments with trans students.

=   Link to submission
Staff

Recruitment

There is increasing awareness amongst HEIs that recruitment procedures that actively promote and ensure equality and diversity must look beyond basic compliance with equality guidance, or provision of equality statements in advertisements. Holistic approaches tended to look at minimising procedural, structural and cultural barriers to diversity, and emphasised the importance of raising awareness and commitment amongst selectors and interviewers to ensure they attract talent from a wide range of backgrounds. The Universities of the Arts, London example below in particularly highlighted the advantages to the institution in engaging with this work:

**University of the Arts London: ‘Selecting the Best’**

“Diverse interview panels enable different perspectives to influence the selection process and help ensure we present applicants with a dynamic view of UAL’s culture, priorities and objectives.”

Andrea Farrell, Organisational Development & Learning Manager

This initiative aimed to raise awareness amongst line managers of how bias, discrimination and stereotyping can affect recruitment and selection decisions through a Selecting the Best workshop. Supported by a positive-action training scheme to establish a volunteer ‘pool’ of Black, Asian, or minority ethnic (BAME) interview panellists who are trained in recruitment and selection, these BAME panellists in turn also contribute to the Select the Best workshop.

BAME panellists will be surveyed for further understanding of their experience, and the effect of increased representation of BAME staff on interview panels on BAME staff recruitment will be monitored.

**Outcomes:** All interviews now have a BAME staff member as a panellist, with over 50 BAME staff trained as interview panellists. All line managers must take part in a Selecting the Best workshop before they are permitted to recruit.

= [Link to submission](#)

Initiatives aiming to diversify senior positions may face the additional complexities of the use of recruitment agencies and search firms. The example below highlights a multi-layered approach to ensuring external process and agents are engaged in diversification of the recruitment process:

**University College London: Executive search firms and diversifying senior leadership positions**

Conditions regarding gender and race diversity were agreed with search firms used to recruit to senior roles: at least 30% of the candidates must be women, and Black and minority ethnic groups must be represented
Where conditions were not met the firms had to provide evidence to demonstrate that there were no qualified candidates and how they had conducted their search. A race equality steering group would review data annually.

The university’s race, gender and LGBT equality networks also met with search firms as part of the tendering process to discuss more proactive behaviours in putting forward diverse candidates.

**Outcomes:** Of the eight senior roles available since the new conditions, three were offered to women. The scrutiny of annual data revealed that most search firms were meeting the gender condition, but not the ethnicity condition. As a result of this review, the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion team are now included in the initial meeting with search firms for each vacancy.

---

**Staff progression and development**

Examples of staff development to promote equality and diversity within an organisation have tended to focus on developing the career paths of staff from groups underrepresented particularly at higher levels within the HEI. Such activities aim to offer additional opportunities for professional development, or to actively encourage preparation for application and success in promotion rounds. These activities may be aimed at benefitting a particular group through content or structure which addresses issues perceived as barriers for that group.

**Royal Holloway (University of London): Enabling women academics through the promotion process**

“Irrespective of what factors are operating to create barriers for women ... this project gets to the crux of encouraging women to ‘invest’ in their CV for promotion.”

This project provided support and coaching for female academics who were considered more than two or three years away from professorial promotion, in support of the institution’s target to increase the percentage of female professors from 24.1% to 35% over five years.

Consisting of three half-day seminars over two terms, including real-life scenarios, trial promotion evaluations, and CV preparation support, participants of this cross-institution programme also benefited from increased networking opportunities.

The flexible delivery of the project aimed to meet the needs of participants: for example, women were welcome to attend the seminars with babies whilst on maternity leave or learn via Skype.

**Outcomes:** Of the 26 women in the first and second cohorts, 50% have achieved professorships or readerships (including two of the five BME participants). Three women also successfully applied to become heads of department. Six of the seven women promoted in the 2016 round of academic promotions had been participants in this programme.

---

The strategic approach to providing development opportunities for any disadvantaged group should be carefully considered and communicated, so as not to risk falling into a ‘deficit’ approach, whereby the burden of effort for change is seen to fall to the underrepresented individuals themselves. This may involve providing additional opportunities connected to the formal development offerings. For example,
the University of the Arts London ‘en-route’ programme provided development and training opportunities for BAME staff working in higher grades in professional services, in academic roles at the university, and in Arts higher education as a whole. However participants were further supported by an ongoing communication network.

Considering the wider beneficiaries and stakeholders beyond the original programme participants is also key. Kingston University’s leadership programme for BME staff was supported by an internal managers’ programme which was developed in parallel to existing external and internal initiatives, with the aim of preparing managers to support BME staff in general, and participants of the BME leadership programmes in particular. Topics included ‘Leading inclusively to develop a more diverse talent pipeline’, ‘Sharing lessons learned and good practice’, and ‘Principles of action learning and appreciative inquiry’.

Ultimately institutions may consider how development opportunities for staff are supported or hindered by institutional processes. We received a number of strong submissions where internal progression and promotion procedures where themselves reviewed. The example below not only goes beyond acknowledgment of equality in academic research, but draws a direct link between staff promotion and student attainment gaps:

**Kingston University: Academic progression and promotion framework**

This example draws attention to the value of targeted embedding of institutional EDI objectives within a specific process – here, academic progression and promotion – which had raised equality concerns at Kingston in previous consultations with staff and students.

The new procedure aimed to ‘promote innovation’ in EDI, for example by ensuring EDI objectives were embedded at all stages of the process, including recognition of alternative career routes to professorship and amending role criteria for academic promotion which ensured applicants addressed student equality challenges (such as the BME student attainment gap).

Workshops or training on EDI criteria were held with all academic staff at Grade 10, heads of school and panel members.

**Outcomes:** The first stage of the new framework saw tangible results in equal representation of men and women at academic progression application and success stage. A greater portion of BME staff both applied for promotion and were successful.

Half of all new applications referenced EDI in their applications or panel recommendation.

= [Link to submission](#)

The University of Liverpool has also focused on increasing the ‘transparency’ of its process, as well as looking at procedural barriers:

**University of Liverpool: ‘Cradle to Chair’ academic promotion system**

“... increased staff satisfaction and an institutional pride in delivering a fair process for all staff through an intersectional approach to enhance equality and diversity.”

Increased ‘transparency’ of the promotion system was provided following feedback from female staff commenting on the ‘leaky pipeline’ of academic promotion. Communications have been re-written for clarity, and application forms and interviews have been redesigned. Online resources were
provided which included case studies and filmed interviews from a diverse set of successful applicants. Detailed feedback is provided to all unsuccessful applicants.

Small group sessions are held with recently promoted staff, panel members, and pro-vice chancellors to discuss the promotion scheme. Academic promotion panels have become more representative of the academic staff as a whole, and all receive unconscious bias training.

Outcomes: There was an increase in the number of staff applying for promotion at all levels, as well as increased success rates. Promotions account for a major reduction in the gender gap in representation at chair level – with 85 female professors compared to 45 in 2012 (in the same period applications from women increased by 18 percentage points, and success rates by 22 percentage points).

An enthusiastic response to the new system has meant fully booked group sessions, and a variety of staff volunteering to offer mentorship or to be filmed for their tips and advice.

Institutions may closely monitor and evaluate their progress over time, particularly if considering setting targets. For example, the University of Oxford [setting targets to advance gender equality] announced publicly institutional targets in 2015 for the proportion of women in all academic roles (including professorial roles specifically) and governance positions; local targets were also set for different academic divisions, recognising the particular gender balances of those disciplines. Work towards supporting these targets has included a review of recruitment processes for academic roles, including the requirements that the process is paused and the vice chancellor’s approval sought if all-male shortlists are produced.

Mentoring

Mentoring schemes are increasingly being used as a method of engaging, supporting and developing underrepresented individuals’ career progression to higher levels of responsibility within HEIs. For example, Sheffield Hallam University has seen qualitative and quantitative success from its mentoring scheme for female academics considering applying for professorships.

Schemes which involved mentoring from internal staff also reported real benefits to the mentors, in terms of increased awareness of diversity issues and awareness of existing diverse talent within their institutions. Internal mentoring also has general benefits of networking, relationship-building, as well as making the best use of ‘human’ resources – particularly advantageous for the long-term commitment of a mentoring scheme.

The Open University: Aspire mentoring programme

“Completing the Aspire programme was a real turning point for me in my academic career. Being dyslexic, I have always struggled with writing tasks and felt that dyslexic academic was an oxymoron!”

The Open University’s implementation of the programme involves a nine-month mentoring relationship for internal staff at any grade who self-identify as ethnic minority or disabled (or both), with the possibility of an additional nine months (‘Aspire Plus’) introduced for those who have
completed the first programme. A pool of senior managers act as mentors and received training on coaching skills as well as a ‘mentoring masterclass’ hosted by the vice-chancellor.

In addition to the mentoring relationship, mentors were also invited to monthly ‘surgery’ sessions with the programme coordinator, and completion of the programme was celebrated at an event hosted by the vice-chancellor.

**Outcomes:** Of the approximately 50 staff having completed the programme, a fifth felt that it was key to their success in moving to more senior/desired roles, and many reported increased recognition and responsibilities in their current role. Staff survey results showed improvements in satisfaction levels of ethnic minority staff and disabled staff.

However, mentoring schemes raise similar challenges to other staff development schemes aimed at specific groups: continued evaluation is key in reviewing long-term progress and the basis on which the schemes operate. In terms of transferability, an HEI should consider carefully whether a scheme that worked for one group of individuals might or might not need adjusting for a different group: not only in terms of issues relating to the ‘disadvantage’ or characteristics, but also the relevant working environment (for example, academic or professional services), and the level of seniority and responsibility within the organisation. It was striking that the University of Sheffield operated two different mentoring schemes for female academic staff with the duration and nature of the mentoring tailored to the level of seniority.

The schemes themselves worked best when offered in conjunction with other types of support for both mentors and mentees (such as training sessions) as well as wider HEI developments of promotion and staff development processes.

**Maternity leave and career breaks**

The support provided by HEIs to staff who are considering, taking, or have taken career breaks particularly due to caring or parental responsibilities continues to evolve. Much of this focus arises from an increased awareness of the gendered implications for career progression and retention of female staff (the ‘leaky pipeline’ of female career and academic progression).

Examples received in the call for evidence also recognised the implications of breaks for male parents and carers, and the need to foster a ‘family friendly’ environment which demonstrated an HEI’s championing and normalising of the diverse needs of its workforce. Cultural change and open discussions around working hours and care arrangements work to reduce any ‘stigma’ around taking leave, which may exist either within specific environments, departments, or across an institution. Following the introduction of Shared Parental Leave in April 2015, and recent case-law (Snell v Network Rail ETS/4100178/2016) indicating that differential pay arrangements for male and female staff taking such leave could constitute ‘sex discrimination’, this will be an area which HEIs must continue to review.

**Brunel University London: Shared parental leave pay**

“We wanted to give parents the maximum flexibility in how to share the care of their child in the first year following birth or adoption.”
The university decided to ‘mirror’ its existing Enhanced Maternity Pay scheme when developing its policies and practices in relation to Shared Parental Pay, following the introduction of Shared Parental Leave rights in relation to children born on or after 5th April 2015. The objective was to provide staff with the most flexible options for parental leave arrangements by extending the same enhanced pay opportunities to leave taken by all parents including fathers and/or partners.

The university also actively promoted the Shared Parental Leave option, discussing the scheme whenever a staff member enquired about maternity leave.

**Outcomes:** Although uptake of the scheme is still low (in line with national trends) the scheme itself has won external accolades in relation to equality and inclusion.

ECU noted that pregnancy, maternity and care-related leave should not be viewed entirely from a workforce perspective: engaging with students on these issues (as below, by including postgraduate students) will be of increasing importance, particularly if HEIs are seeking to increase mature student numbers. There should also be recognition that the distinction between students and staff is not always clear.

**University of Manchester: Researcher parent information session and peer support group**

“Should I start a family during my early research career?”

The university held an even entitled ‘The Researcher Parent Trap’ in conjunction with Human Resources to provide information to early-career researchers as to how the university’s parental leave pay and related polices specifically apply to fixed-term contracts or studentships.

A collection of ‘real researcher stories’ was also produced with advice and reflections from both current and ex-researchers and discussing the challenges relating to academic career progression.

To continue the sharing of best practice, the Researcher Parent Peer Support Group (RPPSG) was created for postgraduate research students, post-doctoral research assistants and research fellows to discuss issues and inform further training and support.

**Outcomes:** A diverse range of early-career researchers who are parents – or who are thinking about becoming parents – have a monthly, confidential forum for support and information. The RPPSG recommendations have also led to a project focusing on reviewing and updating information for both new and prospective postgraduate students.

It is noticeable that in this area some institutions are offering significant tangible support through central funding reserves. The focus on mitigating the effect of breaks on the trajectory of research careers – and research outcomes – has seen the University of Lincoln establish an ‘R2F’ (Return to Research Fund), offering significant financial awards to support women researchers. Similarly the University of Sheffield has established an award scheme which can be used for a variety of support for women academics returning from long-term leave:
University of Sheffield: Women Academic Returners’ Programme (WARP)

“It is very easy to see the impact of the rollout of WARP across the university based on my experiences across two periods of pregnancy in different departments. The first time, when I was not eligible for WARP support [pre-university-wide rollout], I saw a huge dip in my research outputs and a much slower return to pre-pregnancy levels. The second time, when I had WARP funding, the dip was smaller and the time to return to previous levels was shorter.”

Female academic, MDH Faculty

This programme provides additional support – if needed – for female academics upon return to work following a period of long-term leave, to minimise the impact of extended leave on their research activities. Women can currently request up to £10,000 funding to support an additional post, or up to £5,000 to support other research related activity such as conference costs, coaching, and training courses. A central budget is also available to meet costs for those on external contracts (if not covered by department or funding body). The scheme, initially focused on STEM subjects, was opened to female academics and researchers across all faculties as of 2010.

Outcomes: Over 136 women have received awards since 2006 totalling over £1.7million. Award recipients have since brought in over £12.5million in apportioned research grant income to the university, representing a return on investment of over 620%. The university also saw improved retention rates for women after maternity leave.

Link to submission

Disability

The examples provided were striking in that they demonstrated the value of reflecting on the suitability of existing support provision and collaborating directly with affected staff (disabled staff, their line managers, and support services) to promote further inclusivity. Awareness and support of the ‘social’ model of disability was also prevalent in which universities celebrated the talents and contributions of its disabled workforce, and worked for inclusivity and accessibility as everyday practice.

Kingston University: Central fund for reasonable adjustments

“Staff felt uncomfortable asking for reasonable adjustments particularly when they knew budgets were very tightly allocated.”

Staff feedback indicated dissatisfaction with the local administration of requests for reasonable adjustments due to a disability (including the purchasing of equipment). Staff were sometimes reluctant to ask for necessary adjustments in departments with tight budgets or a high number of disabled staff. There was also evidence that managers often lacked the required expertise to deal with requests.

All reasonable adjustment requests are now referred to the EDI Unit who provide the individual staff member with full guidance, whilst purchasing equipment and providing training out of a centralised fund. EDI work closely with Occupational Health and Human Resources teams.
Outcomes: The university has increased central oversight and understanding of staff disability prevalence and resource-demands, which in turn ensured sufficient budget was made available. Positive feedback indicated staff appreciated increased confidentiality and expertise in supporting their needs.

Whilst it is too early to evaluate the outcomes of the work undertaken at Manchester Metropolitan University below, the process of working together with disabled staff and equality networks to review and develop practical guidance has great potential:

Manchester Metropolitan University: Guides for disabled staff and managers

“We hope the guides will encourage more disabled people to apply for jobs at Manchester Met, as well as instil confidence in our disabled staff and demystify processes for their managers.”

The university undertook a review of its support for disabled staff and their line managers in preparation for a strategy launch for the International Day of Disabled People in November 2016. Guides were updated in collaboration with the university’s Disabled Staff Forum and Equality and Diversity champions, and aimed to provide not only information to disabled staff, but also a checklist for managers on how best to support the staff they manage (including funding applications, reasonable adjustments, and tips on inclusive communication and language).

The guidance was also issued in a new medium, as an online resource targeted at three different audiences – managers, current disabled staff, and disabled job applicants seeking to work at the university.

Similarly UWE Bristol took a structured approach to developing its support for disabled staff, through the creation of a dedicated working group with defined priorities:

UWE Bristol: Collaborative approaches to progressing support for disabled staff

The Disability Working Group (DWG) is a collaboration established in 2013 between the three recognised trades union at the university and university management, which aims to set and inform institutional priorities relating to staff disability following feedback regarding low satisfaction ratings from disabled staff in a previous staff survey. Following detailed consultations – including with various staff networks, and HR – the group established three key priorities for change: policies, processes and communications.

Outcomes: The university’s Reasonable Adjustments policy (with increased examples) and policies relating to planned disability-related leave and disability-related sickness have been refreshed and updated. Following a successful pilot, the university launched in September 2015 a dedicated support service for disabled staff through an external provider, rather than utilising student disability support services. Internal communications have also been developed and the institution has seen an increase in satisfaction from disabled staff.

Training

Submissions in this area have illustrated that institutions need to reflect carefully on their training aims and provision, particularly with an increasing supply of external providers and online training options.
ECU noted the benefits of training aims which considered the needs of the trainees (including consideration of what type of content and medium might be most engaging) as well as how any specific scheme might work together with wider institutional objectives and messaging.

Some institutions also showed innovative use of the training course design or procurement as an exercise in diversity and inclusion itself, working with affected groups collaboratively and valuing their contributions. ECU noted examples which sought to maximise impact of available resources, while also ensuring the institution can ‘futureproof’ their provision, keeping it relevant and reactive to changing internal and external influences (see also the University of Oxford example in ‘Initiatives to Watch’ p. 50).

ECU also noted varying approaches to training ‘monitoring’ and areas of good practice in relation to recording – and increasing – participation in opportunities when provided, as with the two examples below:

**Buckinghamshire New University: Embedding ‘unconscious bias’ training in induction**

‘Unconscious Bias’ online training is required of all new staff as part of their induction process, in order to embed the intuition’s EDI values from the start of employment. Unions were consulted regarding the introduction of the scheme which was designed to support the institution’s revised policies around Dignity at Work, and Student Bullying and Harassment.

As the probation procedure for new staff requires the completion of the training, automated reminders have been set up for managers as part of the probation monitoring system.

**Outcomes:** The training has a 95% completion rate for new staff over two years (exceeding the original target of 80%) with positive feedback. The course offering is now extended to students as part of an ‘employability’ package, following requests from academic staff to be able to embed training into some of their courses. Students have commented that the training has already assisted them with job interviews.

= [Link to submission](#)

**University of Exeter: Ensuring compliance for mandatory equality and diversity training**

The university agreed to set an ambitious equality target to ‘ensure all staff complete mandatory equality and diversity training’. To ensure compliance with this requirement for all staff, the Learning and Development team reviewed the quality of its staff training records, and undertook a data-cleansing in order to ensure high quality data from the start of the monitoring process.

Monitoring the staff training data allowed the team to identify areas of the university which had lower completion rates and provided targeted support with college management teams to increase compliance. Compliance reports were also placed as standing items on the agenda of university-level groups relating to equality and diversity, and the relevant deputy vice-chancellor would contact any college or professional services area with a compliance rate of less than 90% each month to investigate and discuss further actions.
Outcomes: The compliance rate for equality and diversity training has increased from 32% in 2013 to 94.4% as of July 2016. Refresher training has also been designed to ensure staff’s knowledge and awareness is kept updated (every three years).

Submissions revealed that institutions are reflecting on the benefits and limitations of different types of training for their staff. We highlight below two approaches which consciously chose to approach EDI training in innovative ways:

University of Sheffield: Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity (SEED)

“So often we are in our own ‘bubble’ and day-to-day interactions are very territory based. It was reassuring to find out that a lot of the issues we have are widespread but also to learn about each other’s work and interact.”

The university chose to use a ‘peer-led’ CPD programme originally developed in the US, and adapted for the UK higher education sector, which aimed to provide an opportunity for participants to reflect practically and critically on equality and diversity issues within their own professional and teaching practices, job roles and working environments.

The programme used a variety of interactions including seven workshops (each two and a half hours) around key themes (Diversity, Educational Systems, and Inclusive Practice and Inclusive Curriculum), advanced reading and reflection, as well as a supporting website (with private and public sections) and blog.

York St John: ‘Equality Elephant in the Room’

This series of ‘equality conversations’ sessions was introduced in response to Equality Champions network feedback that there was a need for a more accessible and informal introduction to equality issues.

Any member of staff can suggest an equality-related topic and facilitate a session, which is considered a ‘safe space’ and open to all staff. Events are promoted through the Equality Champions network, all-staff weekly emails, as well as a specific mailing list, and materials (presentations and handouts) are circulated. A supporting blog is under development.

Ten sessions have taken place so far, with sessions including “Trans and non-binary identities, ‘LGBT and BAME (intersectionality)’, “Fostering inclusive language and behaviour in the classroom” and ‘Diverse faiths’.

Outcomes: Attendance has been monitored and has varied from 19 to four, although six sessions had 12 or more attendees, who tended to come from across the university. More widely, the resources and information shared from the talks have been used in learning and teaching practice, and in other networks and groups.
The simplicity of the ‘Elephant in the Room’ example is a reminder that training in regard to EDI need not always be formal, or delivered ‘top down’. Providing new spaces for challenging conversations, and subsequently raising awareness of equality issues, is an important part of any institution’s development of its staff, culture and environment.

**Flexible working options**

A range of flexible working options are available to staff working in the higher education sector. In response to the Government’s Work-Life Balance Campaign a project hosted by [Staffordshire University](https://www.staffs.ac.uk/support_depts/equality/toolkit/flexible-employment-options/#flexible) and funded by HEFCE’s Good Management Practice initiative from 2000–2008 aimed to improve awareness and availability of flexible working options in higher education. Yet, similarly to other sectors, options for staff to work flexibly within senior management remain limited. The following example highlights how flexible working options can successfully be utilised and championed by senior management.

**University of Reading: Normalising flexible working**

“I think the fewer people there are visibly doing part-time, the harder it is to do because you perceive that you will be viewed as less of a contributor.”

Athena SWAN Focus Group participant 2011

Focus groups which had taken place in the School of Mathematical, Physical and Computational Sciences (SMPCS) as part of its 2011 Athena SWAN work had indicated concern amongst staff at perceived negative attitudes towards various types of flexible working including part-time work, alternative hours, and working from home. It was felt that career progression was hindered by part-time work.

The school undertook a range of actions to seek to normalise flexible working, as it acknowledged that this could potentially hinder the diversity of staff at all levels as its staff body contained an increasing number of staff, particularly those with caring responsibilities, who wished to explore flexible working options.

A website was developed with case studies of flexible working and guidance for managers to consider, and the school expanded the number of jobs advertised as potential job-shares. Flexible working options were also publicised to men and women through blogs, talks from senior staff at other universities, and articles on the staff online portal.

**Outcomes:** The school saw improved feedback in focus groups, and has seen an uptake in part-time arrangements (including male staff). Two senior female staff undertook a job-share in a leadership role.

Following the school pilot, the university decided to advertise first all senior academic roles with a job-share option, before expanding the initiative to advertise all roles in the university by default as available through job sharing or flexible working. The university has had ongoing discussions and awards relating to support for these arrangements and cultural shift.

= [Link to submission](https://www.staffs.ac.uk/support_depts/equality/toolkit/flexible-employment-options/#flexible)
Students

Outreach work

Promotion of Higher Education

Most HEIs are engaged with multiple activities around widening participation and schools outreach (as outlined in many OFFA access agreements or equivalents), and are increasingly looking at raising attainment as well as aspirations for higher education study (including in younger age groups). ECU has highlighted examples that demonstrate the variety of approaches to increasing diversity from the earliest stages of the ‘student journey’. ECU is particularly interested in how HEIs are strengthening their organisational and strategic links between widening participation departments, recruitment, admissions and equality and diversity teams, together with the wider community in which the HEI operates.

Bournemouth University: Outreach work relating to learning differences and autism

The university delivered a programme of events in partnership with a local school and Dorset County Council to raise aspiration for progression to higher education in students with autism, dyslexia or dyscalculia. Events were based at a local school and were free and open to the general public. Most talks were filmed and the films are available online.

Outcomes: The events received strongly positive feedback, and worked to demystify certain conditions whilst bringing the university’s outreach work into the wider community.

= Link to submission

In addition to targeted provision of information, advice and guidance for particular groups (looking at ‘the funnel’ of prospective future applicants or students), a number of HEIs went further: making changes to their own structures and course offerings to meet the needs of future students, as with this example from the University of Sheffield:

University of Sheffield: Full- and part-time degrees with foundation year for mature students

“I don’t think I have ever heard of or been to an institution where their main goal wasn’t just to get me through exams so I look good on their stats, kind of thing. With the foundation year I think that the main focus was making sure I was stable and happy and that I was able to work to my full potential.”

The university has established approximately 20 degree programmes with a ‘degree with foundation’ pathway as an alternative entry route specifically targeted at mature students (defined as ‘21+’) with a range of entry qualifications. This provision followed a review in 2013/14 of the university’s offering for mature and part-time students in light of a decline in applications from mature students across the institution.

The foundation year contains core module relating to academic literacy and numeracy, as well as interdisciplinary modules to develop critical thinking and self-directed learning, together with subject-specific modules to prepare for transition to degree level studies.
As students on the foundation years are already part of their destination department, there is also a focus on supporting transition and integration to degree study with often younger students.

**Outcomes:** The full-time version of the programme has attracted an increasingly large number of students (over 89 in 2016/17 up from 25 in 2014), of which over 85% were ‘mature’. Perhaps reflecting some of the barriers mature students may have previously experienced in accessing education, it is notable that 27% of the students have a declared disability and/or specific learning difference. Eighty-four per cent of the 2014 cohort passed their foundation level studies, and 72% continued on to their degree students at the university.

The part-time version of the programme has seen a decline in applications which mirrors national trends, but the university wishes to continue developing this offer as part of its commitment to supporting mature students, particularly those of its local area who make up almost the entirety (94%) of its students.

Where institutions are planning on increasing student numbers or diversifying their subject or award offerings, ECU highlights the need to consider how such approaches can be used proactively to promote diversity and inclusivity of groups with a history of low application and success rates for any particular geographical area, type of institution or subject of study. Continual evaluation was also a key feature of ‘positive actions’ aiming to address historical disadvantage:

**Kingston University: Compact scheme**

The Compact Scheme is a package of support and advocacy for approximately 1,000 new undergraduate students each year with disadvantages due to socio-economic background, disability or learning differences, caring responsibilities, care-leavers, those estranged from their families, and those who are first in their family to go to university.

Support includes various bursaries and scholarships, one-to-one support, and dedicated transitional support including a pre-enrolment summer school. Care-leavers are also supported with priority for accommodation in university halls (available or a full year). Networking and peer support systems are also in place.

**Outcomes:** Compact students were 1.3 times more likely to progress to the next level of study than their undergraduate peers. Other general attainment and progression gaps were also smaller for students who had undertaken the Compact scheme.

**University of Wolverhampton: Raising aspirations amongst Deaf and hearing-impaired learners**

Although the university has a long history of engagement with the deaf and hearing-impaired (HI) community through its Deaf Studies degrees, deaf and HI students were not as well represented in the wider range of university degree subjects.

The university undertook a programme of ‘raising aspirations’ as well as development of its on-course support specifically for this group of students in order to encourage a higher number of enrolments overall, and in a wider range of courses. The approach aimed to be ‘deaf-led’, and to
normalise awareness and communication support across the university (for example, the university usually provides British Sign Language interpreting at all public events and graduation ceremonies).

Key interventions targeted at deaf and HI prospective applicants and students included Deaf Learner Open Days, work experience placements for secondary school pupils, and an Access Bursary specifically for deaf and HI learners worth £2,000 for their first year of study.

The university also makes use of ‘Visible Role Models’, student ambassadors from a volunteer network of deaf students, student interpreters, and is a key sponsor of the UK’s leading Deaf Film Festival.

**Outcomes:** The number of enrolled students who were declared deaf or HI has increased year-on-year, from 72 in 2012/13 to 95 in 2015/16. This includes increased representation in certain disciplines, and the university continues to try and increase representation in a wider range of courses.

= Link to submission

**Specific courses**

Some institutions have demonstrated that they are taking a targeted approach on particularly areas where inequality or a lack of diversity has been identified. This can ensure efforts and resources can be tightly focused on bespoke approaches and outcomes, and demonstrates the benefits of deep insight and analysis of issues affecting particular subject areas or levels of study.

**Sheffield University: Inspiring the next generation of engineers – Suzie and Ricky**

The university sought to challenge primary school students’ perceptions of women in engineering by creating and distributing a fiction book *Suzie and Ricky – The Crash Landing* which features two female engineers (mechanical and aerospace).

This was a collaborative project between the Faculty of Engineering, Women in Engineering Student Society and the university Communication and External Relations teams, and was informed by experiences in providing outreach activities in local schools.

The Women in Engineering Student Society have developed the narrative further into a virtual reality game for young children to engage in problem solving. A continuing communication plan also aims to develop a computer game, video, and more resources for teachers and parents.

**Outcomes:** With the first print run of 2,000 copies now sold out, a second edition is being printed. Positive feedback has indicated enjoyment of the exploration of different kinds of engineering.

= Link to submission

**Sheffield Hallam University: increasing diversity in paramedic profession**

The university has worked in conjunction with Northampton University, Health Education England, East Midlands Ambulance Service and ECU to raise awareness and participation amongst BAME communities in paramedicine careers. Research had already identified that
BAME students are underrepresented within the paramedic student body. This was particularly acute in the East Midlands, where participation was low despite a highly diverse local population. The project utilised ongoing and existing research to develop an action plan with a range of stakeholders including Marketing, Admissions, and the relevant faculties. The action plan included:

- More targeted awareness raising amongst the BAME community through interfaith groups
- Creating more diverse and positive imagery and case studies of role models
- Ensuring equality analysis of the student cycle, reducing barriers (and perceived barriers) throughout the recruitment and admissions process.

Outcomes: The project has received positive feedback from individuals and communities, including increased awareness. Structures are in place for equality monitoring to review the impact of the project in the next admissions cycle.

A similar project to increase the number of BME students on paramedic science degrees at UWE Bristol involved working with a variety of BME community groups and targeted recruitment activities. The institution saw an increase in BME student in the 2016 intake (from 7% to 25% of student cohort). [Link to submission]

Careers and industry

Employability is now recognised as a key ‘outcome’ for students in higher education. ECU observed a number of institutions beginning to explore equality issues relating to careers advice and support. Where interventions were in place to provide additional or alternative support or opportunities to particular disadvantaged groups, they tended to be evidence-based and part of wider institutional equality initiatives. Good practice involved external employers or mentors, as well as consideration of the relationships between employability skills and the main curriculum.

University of the Arts London: ‘en>route’ recruitment and progression

This programme, established in 2011/14, aimed to address the underrepresentation of BAME staff in Arts higher education. In the ‘Recruitment and Career Progression’ strand, BAME students, alumni and creative practitioners are encouraged to consider careers in Arts higher education. Links are maintained with graduates, creative professionals and potential applicants and potential BAME applicants are encouraged to sign up to institution job alerts.

Recruitment practices at the institution are also monitored for any potential barriers to BAME applicants

Outcomes: The en>route network links over 300 staff and postgraduates together with creative practitioners and other higher education professionals and has developed closer links with BAME creative practitioners. The Development and Alumni team is currently exploring if it can develop equalities monitoring and an ‘opt-in’ mechanism for alumni to join the en>route Network.

[Link to submission]
University of Brighton: BAME education mentoring programme

This mentoring scheme matches BAME mentors from the local community with BAME students undertaking teacher-training. The scheme has developed from an awareness of employment gaps for BAME graduates in general, and recruitment and retention gaps for teacher training specifically. Many BAME students also noted a lack of role models of BAME teachers in their local schools, especially at senior levels.

The six-month mentoring relationship also includes sessions focussing on employability skills (including internships, CVs, and interview and negotiation skills). Mentors are supported with training in coaching, mental health awareness and unconscious bias. Completion of the scheme is celebrated at a high level with an awards ceremony hosted by the deputy vice-chancellor.

Outcomes: Strong feedback from participants indicates that the course helped to increase retention (63% mentees agreed), engagement (75% agreed), and employability (75% agreed).

Link to submission

The University of Brighton also operates similar mentoring programmes across the institution, including ‘Momentum’ for participants who are members of groups with an identified gap in academic attainment or graduate recruitment, or other indicators of disadvantage (as indicated by national and local data). An ‘LGBT-Amex’ mentoring programme is offered in collaboration with a mentor from the ‘Pride’ staff network in American Express. [Link to submission]. It was noticeable that with these schemes, such as a similar mentoring scheme at Kingston University, ‘Beyond Barriers’, benefits may be seen not only in the direct recipients of the mentoring but also from mentees who received increased awareness of the complex lives of different students

This positive outcome for mentors can also be seen in the following submission which was highlighted as paying particularly close attention to linking participant data with national statistics relating to student career destinations:

Southampton Solent University: Employability and enterprise professional mentoring

“The absolute gold medal of mentoring is to hear something along these lines: ‘I've got a (graduate level) job! I put your interview techniques into practice and they worked.’ “

Mentor

“The best bit about the programme was a feeling of optimism when leaving meetings, and an ongoing relationship.”

Mentee

This mentoring scheme which matches external mentors with students was originally targeted at BME students, but has been extended to any student (or recent graduate) who feels at a disadvantage in terms of employability – reasons may include ethnicity, but also gender, age, disability, or a lack of connections or confidence). In 2015/16 over 17% of mentees had declared a disability (included a specific learning difference), over 22% were from an ethnic minority and almost a fifth were over the age of 25.
The scheme is focused on developing employability skills and providing relevant and industry-specific guidance. The frequency, duration and place of meetings are decided by the mentees with their mentors to suit their needs, but will typically meet at least six times between November and May (although some relationships continue throughout the summer). Mentees also have the opportunity to visit the mentor’s workplace and interact with their colleagues.

The scheme has been supported since 2015/16 by the university’s online ‘Mentor Hub’ which acts as a repository for profiles and skills (to aid matching) and resources, and can also be used for secure messaging with peers and the mentor. Full training and inductions are provided to all participants and a celebration and awards event is held for all involved in May or June.

**Outcomes:** Data from the national Destination of Leavers of Higher Education (DLHE) survey indicate that a higher proportion of participants of the mentoring scheme in 2012-2015 were in professional/managerial level graduate occupations that other graduates at the university who did not participate in the scheme. These positive outcomes were also upheld for female, ethnic minority, disabled and mature participants. Strong feedback was received from mentees and mentors alike, with mentees reporting improvement in attainment, confidence, networking skills and industry insights.

Participation in the scheme has increased from 28 mentees in 2011/12 to 150 in 2015/16. In 2015/16 approximately 90 mentors from 50 different companies contributed to the programme, and past employers have included the BBC, Ordnance Survey, Hampshire Constabulary, and IBM.

**Supporting transition to higher education**

Initiatives to encourage or support transition to higher education may often be wide in focus, so examples which thoughtfully addressed the needs of particular groups are highlighted here. Institutions may also consider the most appropriate scale of their interventions in terms of time, resources and intensity. Working across the university to make use of existing knowledge of widening participation teams, support teams, the students’ union and student accommodation services also provided the most informative events for new students.

**University of Lincoln: Wellbeing Orientation Welcome (WOW) summer school**

“I feel completely different about joining university now; I am not anxious at all and can’t wait to return in September.”

This scheme aims to improve the retention, progression and attainment of students with mental health conditions and/or autism, by providing a ‘taster’ of university life. The dedicated summer school aims to develop coping strategies and reduce anxiety around transition to university life (socially, academically and environmentally).

A series of events are provided including tours, academic sessions, social events and advice on budgeting and student finance. There is a separate support section for parents.

**Outcomes:** Feedback from participants indicated reduced anxiety and awareness of the approachability of support services. Of the 19 initial participants, the 15 who met their entry
requirements and joined the university have been retained on their course of study (three were re-siting their first year). The programme was expanded to 30 new places for 2016.

The University of Sheffield undertook a similar approach in providing bespoke engagement with a particular group (applicants on the autism spectrum) but focused this on a one day event, including talks from disability ‘champions’ - current students who are on the autism spectrum. [Link to submission]

Teaching and Learning

ECU observed that only a small number of submissions related directly to equality and diversity issues in student teaching and learning. Case studies relating to direct engagement with curriculum content or ‘classroom’ practice should be encouraged for the future, although we did note examples such as the University of Wolverhampton’s Self-Harm and Suicide Prevention initiative (see p.42) which included the outcome of a contribution to the curriculum for nursing students.

Anglia Ruskin University: Disability working group

This working group was convened in 2014 to examine the impact of planned cuts to the Disabled Students’ Allowances (DSA) and to plan for an institutional move towards a more fully inclusive learning, teaching and assessment model. The group included the students’ union, and representatives of all faculties and professional services. Representation was from across the three university campuses.

The working group was mindful of the benefits a more inclusive environment would have not only to disabled students, but to the large number of the student body who have English as an additional language, and supported the institution’s work in closing attainment gaps for BME students.

The working group identified 50 actions required to develop an inclusive environment, and prioritised six for the biggest impact in academic year 2015/16. These related to staff training; virtual-learning-environment accessibility; lecture-capture policy and practice; reasonable adjustment processes; and peer support provision for disabled students.

Outcomes: The university has noted a reduction in the attainment gap for students who have declared a disability from 5% in 2012/13 to 1% in 2014/15 indicating that new initiatives are building on existing cultural change due to increased collaboration and support. As some successes of the 2015/16 year are built on, work on new 2017/18 priorities will also begin.

Other outcomes have included key advances in accessibility of facilities and learning materials including a £27,000 investment to carry out a document-conversion project in all faculties, and two conferences dedicated to increasing understanding of inclusive practices.

An example of a tangible outcome in terms of teaching practice from the first year’s work is the new Inclusive and Accessible Learning Materials Policy, created in consultation with five faculties, students and professional service departments. This contains core principles such as ensuring advance provision of learning materials (class presentations to be provided two days in advance; key readings and core materials two weeks in advance); ensuring the accessibility of
teaching documents and presentations (templates and guidance provided on every university desktop), steps to ensure access for colour-blind learners, and ensuring that learners may audio-record classes, tutorials and other teaching sessions for their own personal learning. A ‘Disabilities and Learning Styles Grid’ is also provided alongside the submission to raise awareness and increase understanding of learners’ needs.

Assessment of learning is an area often approached from a deficit perspective (making ‘adjustments’ to a standard procedure). This example from the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama provided an innovative approach to incorporating student choice into the concept of inclusive assessment:

**Royal Central School of Speech and Drama: Inclusive assessment**

The school’s student body contains a high number of students who have declared neuro-diverse conditions including dyslexia and dyspraxia, and sought to develop assessment arrangements which were inclusive by design, rather than providing certain students with ‘alternatives’ to ‘normal’ practice.

One example of this approach is the Reflective Assessment submission to the BA Theatre Practice undergraduate degree, where, in 2015/16 new students were able to select their own style of assessment and submission. Assessment options included written assessments, visual assessments (for example, portfolio), aural assessments (a sound recording submitted digitally) or a presentation (such as a video recording), all supported with further evidence. Students must make a ‘statement of goals’ describing the aim of their submission, and are provided with guidance and examples for each assessment style.

**Outcomes:** The assessment style aims to encourage students to identify and work to their particularly strengths, and also provides greater inclusivity for students who do not wish to formally declare a disability or to undergo ‘alternative’ assessment procedures.

[Link to submission](#)

Learning and teaching provision for those who themselves teach others offers an opportunity for a ‘ripple effect’ of embedding equality issues into the curriculum, as highlighted in this example:

**The Northern College: ‘TeachDifferent - The Identities Programme’**

As part of several initiatives seeking to explore equality and diversity issues in education in a more ‘disruptive’ way, the Northern College ran a programme for teachers looking at different approaches to identities and intersectionality in the classroom, including discussions around learning differences.

The programme consisted of self-reflective approaches, expression through creative projects (such as art and poetry), as well as a coaching provision. The programme also made use of online environments including an online collection of media, discussion forums and social media.
Outcomes: Participant feedback pointed to an awareness of the complexity of different identities, and new methodological approaches to approaching discussions around protected characteristics and identities within the classroom.

= Link to submission

Student support, retention and attainment

Institutions are using a range of different approaches to support the varying needs of their particular student body, whether that support relates directly to issues around disadvantage or inclusion, or simply acknowledges that different students may need to engage with support services in different ways. ECU noted a real awareness from universities of the links between student support and student retention and attainment. Collaborative approaches with service users are increasingly being demonstrated, and in particular, we saw increased awareness and knowledge-sharing around mental health difficulties and trans issues. Increasingly, as with the case below, we are seeing institutions consider how to ‘mainstream’ responsibility for supporting and retaining students:

University of Wolverhampton: Suicide and self harm awareness – whole system response

The university decided to tackle suicide and self-harm separately from other mental health work, treating it as a safeguarding issue in order to ensure a ‘safe and compassionate’ response to staff and students in distress.

Training was delivered to a range of staff groups (including security, conduct, appeals and IT learning) from a team of eight in-house trainers who were themselves trained in suicide and self-harming awareness (and half of whom had qualifications relating to mental health). The ‘Connecting with People’ approach was adopted, which aims to increase skills provision for those responding to individuals in stress, reduce strain on the NHS from urgent referrals, and to reduce stigma. The approach also provides key risk assessment tools.

The university is also developing a mobile app to support physical, emotional and financial wellbeing.

Outcomes: The approach saw an increase in ‘early’ safeguarding interventions and a decrease in the number of direct referrals to the NHS for suicidal ideation (annual reduction from 25 to five). The training will be rolled-out to a wider group of staff in future.

An additional benefit was the embedding of this work into the curriculum for student nurses and similar plans for the curricula of student teachers, social workers and social scientists.

= Link to submission

The example below was highlighted for its benefits to the local community as well as student population:

Bournemouth University: Eating disorder awareness videos

Two video campaigns were undertaken to encourage open discussion of eating disorders, in particular in relation to the experience of carers and service-users. Filming took place on campus and in the community and included male and female interviewees.
This was a collaborative project with a range of services in Dorset including Dorset HealthCare University Foundation Trust and Healthwatch Dorset.

Outcomes: The videos have been used as developmental tools for students and staff within education, and new students were encouraged to share their own experiences for Eating Disorder Awareness Week 2016.

The two examples below directly addressed issues of increasing retention and a sense of ‘belonging’ through filling ‘gaps’ in other support systems:

**Royal Central School of Speech and Drama: Trans and non-binary student mentoring**

The school provides a mentoring service for students who identify as trans and/or non-binary and forms an element of the overall support programme. Mentoring sessions offer the opportunity to explore feelings and needs with a person who has knowledge and experience of being trans and/or non-binary.

Discussions can include topics such as using gender neutral pronouns, undergoing a medical or social transition, as well as looking at difficult and challenging aspects of living and studying as a trans person. The mentoring scheme aims to offer practical support and takes a problem-solving approach to issues that relate to the student’s gender identity and supports people to stay on their course and to succeed.

Outcomes: There are proven examples of retention and success in studies following a flexible student-centred approach to frequency of mentoring sessions. Mentoring sessions can help to fill ‘gaps’ in support for trans students, who cannot necessarily access NHS counselling/mentoring to support any medical or non-medical transition.

**University of Huddersfield: Trans and gender support group**

“The closest group and social networks ... in neighbouring cities [are] approximately 30 miles away.”

This peer-led support group provides a safe, confidential and locally accessible space for students identifying as trans or questioning their gender identity. Creation of the group aimed to respond directly to feedback regarding the limited availability of specific support or social networks near the university. The group is facilitated by a member of the Wellbeing service. Future plans for the next year will focus on developing relationships with external agencies, with speakers such as the university Police Safety Officer to discuss hate incidents, and the university Health Centre.

Outcomes: Increasingly high attendance and demand has led to more frequent meetings (fortnightly rather than monthly).

Future plans for the next year will focus on developing relationships with external agencies, with speakers such as the university Police Safety Officer to discuss hate incidents, and the university Health Centre.
At the **University of Salford** a collaborative and structured approach to creating a more supportive environment led to tangible change:

**University of Salford: Working towards to being a trans- and non-binary-friendly university**

Following a seven-fold increase over a two-year period in the number of students seeking support from Student Services in relation to gender transition or gender questioning, the university undertook an exploration of the support offering available at the university, with a focus on a collaborative, student-led approach to improving services. Student engagement was led by the Student Diversity Officer, and eventually led to the fixed-term employment of a trans student to develop an action plan and dedicated webpages. Links with local organisations and charities were also strengthened, and all frontline Student Services staff undertook trans awareness training.

The university worked on supporting disclosures for those transitioning and a single point of contact through the Student Diversity Officer, providing a template letter for declarations of intent, and supportive meetings to discuss a wide range of support available to them. Support could be pastoral, health-related, academic or establishing informal peer support. Practical issues related to any name change on student records systems, and accommodation provisions were also addressed.

The establishment of a group of eight trans and non-binary students has informed the university’s future practice, developing a key action plan for the future. Key achievements have already included: a working group to advocate and inform on gender-neutral toilets in existing and new buildings; providing an exhibition relating to faith and gender identity; providing a workshop relating to being ‘Trans at University’, and are currently engaging with the development of a module for nursing students regarding trans people in a healthcare setting.

**Outcomes:** The university has developed its support system informed by its service users, developed new resources, and has a student-led action plan for the future for a range of interventions in relation to services, records, support and wellbeing, including plans to amend its record systems to include a range of gender identities, support the title ‘Mx’, and remove gender from ID cards.

This scheme at the **University of East London** was highlighted as taking an innovative approach to improving student retention and attention, by linking a support scheme in with the offer of a paid internship. The scheme also undertook significant self-evaluation of quantitative and qualitative data, as well as building on feedback from participants:

**University of East London: Young Black and Ethnic Professional (YBEP) programme**

“Success or failure in a large part depends on one’s ability to negotiate and navigate one’s way through the academic setting.”
“The mentor takes on a role of an ‘interpreter’ of the academic culture.”

This programme involved the selection of 200 individuals to join a ‘talent management programme’ involving academic mentoring (including potentially tasks to further engage them with the academic culture of the university), the potential for a paid summer internship relevant to their studies, and networking events with motivational speakers. Employability training workshops were also provided (including mock interviews), and support came from the university Employability service.

Data to measure the impact of the programme on participants’ academic retention and progress was collected from a wide range of sources beyond module results, including attendance records, virtual-learning environment engagement, and library resource access. Qualitative data was also sourced from questionnaires to all key stakeholders.

**Outcomes:** This pilot project evidenced the value of a mentoring relationship as part of a holistic package of support for ‘navigating’ and understanding the terms of academic engagement. Initial evidence suggested that YBEP participants demonstrated a higher retention rate than non-participants, higher average module marks, and a higher overall pass rate.

Recommendations for upscaling included further investigation into the value of ensuring the mentor was from a related discipline, as well as a more in-depth training and support provision for the mentors.

=  Link to submission

At Kingston University careful consideration was given as to how the institution could meaningfully monitor improvements in attainment gaps over time:

**Kingston University: Data-driven key performance indicators (KPIs) for BME attainment**

“It dispels the myth of the student deficit model and enables academics to see a truer picture of the issues contributing to ethnic under-attainment, thus generating impactful engagement and action.”

Half of Kingston University’s students are BME, and the university has made an institutional priority of reducing the recognised attainment gap for BME students (the difference in BME and White students achieving first or 2:1 class degrees).

The institution has taken a data and research-driven approach, using a ‘value-added’ score as a key metric in its attainment gap analysis and institutional KPIs, where a value-added score of 1.0 equated to the average level of attainment expected for all students (relative to their entry qualifications and chosen academic subject).

This approach required setting in place institutional processes to ensure useful and timely data provision, and working to embed the BME attainment KPI into every level of academic quality assurance.

The KPI monitoring took place alongside a programme to develop staff knowledge and skills of inclusive curricula, unconscious bias, and ‘value-added’ student experiences. Students were also
better supported with a variety of programmes included mentoring, diversity and course representation training.

**Outcomes:** Following two years of the new KPI and supporting efforts the university’s attainment gap fell from 25.7% to 18%, and BME ‘value-added’ scores have risen from 0.78 to 0.91.

Experience

Empowerment of students to communicate, explore and improve their experiences was a key theme in some of the examples received. Institutional roles tended to be supportive, either in terms of resources, communications or participation, but in the strongest examples institutions would ensure student engagement and take action in response to student needs. The importance of institutions using their students’ unions and other student bodies for information and consultation has been highlighted by the NUS, particularly in relation to ensuring institutions have a current and informed understanding of the culture, concerns and activities of their particular student body and geographical location.

**University of the Arts, London: Diversity Matters**

“To see staff, students and senior management in one safe space was one of a kind. We want more of this. Open debate. Real life voices. Feelings shared. A space for the university’s bodies to express their actions and hopes to improving important matters.”

‘Diversity Matters’ began as a student-staff collaboration, funded by a grant from the university’s Teaching and Learning Exchange. Focused around a one-week series of events entitled Diversity Matters Awareness Week: Let’s Talk About Race, including a panel event involving senior management engaging in the discussion ‘Why does race matter in the learning environment?’

The success of the event led to Diversity Matters continuing as a student-led platform for staff, students and recent graduates to discuss issues relating to race. A key focus has been on examining an identified BAME attainment gap particularly for international students, and examining diversity in the context of arts, media, education and work environments. Specific events have included work with the LGBTQ+ community, a careers-related workshop called ‘Women of Colour in Graphic Design and Illustration’, and a ‘Divercity Arts’ [sic] mentoring project developing enterprise skills, all focused around arts projects.

The project is supported by a dedicated blog, video interviews with staff and students, and social media.

**Outcomes:** The initiative continues to gather momentum, with the university seeking to organise a ‘Divercity Arts’ project event following a 100% satisfaction rating, as well as a 2017 Diversity Matters Awareness Week. Kai Lutterodt, the student leading the project, continues to develop the platform at [https://diversity-matters.org.uk/](https://diversity-matters.org.uk/)

**Link to submission**
Training

Noticeably fewer examples of training for students were received than training related to staff, although ‘bystander intervention’ training is increasingly being investigated by institutions and students’ unions. Many of the issues around staff training – resource, delivery, monitoring – also apply to training aimed at students. Timing and context, however, may be a crucial difference. Whereas training ‘on induction’ for staff might involve more staggered delivery for an institution and individuals, for students first joining an institution (or going through a particular point of progression) an ‘induction’ period will contain an intense and varied range of training, lessons, and experiences, often over one or two weeks. As such it can be a challenging time to additionally deliver an equalities programme, both practically and in terms of ensuring impact of message. ECU did however noted some innovative examples of training delivery that reflected these challenges and sought to engage more creatively with the student body and those who support them such as these at Canterbury Christ Church University and Kingston University below. There are also indications of equality and diversity training that increasingly works alongside, or within, the main curricula.

Canterbury Christ Church University: Student induction programme

Canterbury Christ Church took an innovative and collaborative approach to raising awareness of equality and diversity issues amongst the student population.

Performing Arts students and alumni, together with university staff, provided a mixed-delivery model of theatre, discussion and debate in first year students’ Induction Week to highlight inclusive behaviours, and the academic and employability benefits of inclusive working.

The holistic approach sought not only to educate students about equality and diversity in practice, but also to raise awareness of the importance of student emotional wellbeing and building an inclusive higher education community.

Outcomes: Positive feedback was received particularly in relation to raising awareness of intercultural communication (verbal and non-verbal). Participants also highlighted increased confidence and knowledge for dealing with situations where equality and diversity are not respected.

The programme will now be an annual offering, with current student-facilitators involved in training a new cohort of their peers to deliver and facilitate sessions.

= Link to submission

Kingston University: Academic multicultural and diversity programme

“Short, snappy, thought provoking videos … explaining basic concepts of EDI, including a critical look at the nine protected characteristics.”

Following the example of a similar programme with the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Kingston University ran a pilot programme aiming to foster an inclusive student community and to enable students to engage critically with equality and diversity issues. The work of the programme aims to support ‘co-creation’ of inclusive academic curricula.

Initially offered as an ‘extra-curricular’ activity, the pilot will be expanded to form part of every faculty curriculum.

**Outcomes:** Strong feedback indicated that participants had a stronger awareness of how identities shape perceptions (94% of participants) and felt that they had an increased understanding of ‘world issues’ (83%). The university will also be investigating medium-term links between this programme and student retention.

Access agreement funding has been allocated for a student consultancy project to replace the external speakers feature, provided paid employment for eight to 10 students to research an equality and diversity challenge within the university, and to design and implement a solution.

= [Link to submission](#)
Initiatives to watch

Inevitably we were made aware of work which is likely to contribute to best practice but where key outcomes were not due until after the submission deadline. Below we have highlighted projects, initiatives or strategies which we expect to deliver useful outcomes or updates in the next twelve months.

University of Manchester: What makes an inclusive learning environment?

“HEIs should consider encouraging students as partners to be involved in finding barriers and enablers for inclusive classrooms and student experiences.”

HEFCE, 2015

This collaborative project between the university’s Equality and Diversity Team, and the Centre for Higher Education Research, Innovation and Learning (CHERIL) aims to examine understanding of an ‘inclusive learning environment’ from students’ perspectives, with the aim of identifying how individual, community and structural assets can help to develop, maintain and sustain inclusive learning environments. The project directly references HEFCE’s 2015 research on differential student outcomes (including attainment gaps for different ethnicities), particularly recommendations to involved students in tackling these issues.

Eight students have been recruited as part of the project team, acting as peer researchers and co-convening a student ‘think tank’ event with other students.

Expected Outcomes: The project has resulted in a report identifying key assets that could support inclusive learning and curricula, better relationships between staff and students, and develop social, cultural and economic capital whilst understanding relevant psychosocial and identity issues. This work contributed to a successful bid to the HEFCE Catalyst fund Call B ‘Barriers to Student Success’, which aims to develop and expand a ‘Diversity and Inclusion Ambassador Scheme’ across three partner institutions, of University of Manchester, Manchester Metropolitan University and the University of Birmingham.

= Link to submission

University College London, the University of Oxford, the University of Cambridge and the University of Manchester: ‘Where do you draw the line?’ Harassment prevention approach

“Harassment in contemporary academia is more commonplace and widespread than we would like to admit, but that it is often nuanced and covert.”

UCL, the University of Oxford, the University of Cambridge, and the University of Manchester are working collaboratively on a department-level approach to harassment prevention, focussing on the cultural prevalence of harassment, however ‘harmless’ the intentions. A 90-minute engagement session has been designed and piloted to work in conjunction with follow-up activities.
The initial session is co-facilitated by the head of department and aims to be specific to that department’s discipline (if applicable) and socio-culturally relevant to all participants. Follow-up activities focus on peer-influence to bring about cultural change.

The initiative was based on wide-ranging consultation from all partner universities, including all 40 Athena SWAN leads at UCL. Pilots of the initial sessions took place at UCL and the University of Oxford in September 2016, and will be rolled out at all partner institutions following full evaluation.

**Expected Outcomes:** The initiative was based on wide-ranging consultation from all partner universities, including all 40 Athena SWAN leads at UCL. Pilots of the initial sessions took place at UCL and the University of Oxford in September 2016, and will be rolled out at all partner institutions following full evaluation.

---

**University of the Arts, London: ID-OGRAPHY bespoke online training**

The university decided to design its own e-learning resource regarding equality and diversity for its 8,000 staff, in recognition of a need for a programme more specific to its own workforce needs (including ways of working), university strategy and culture – specifically looking for training with more ‘creative flare’. The design process was undertaken in conjunction with academics and students in recognition of their creative skill-set.

The university has designed a five-module e-learning programme, which includes ‘Unconscious Bias’, and ‘The Art of Equality’, and is to be used in staff inductions and compliance monitored in staff ‘one-to-ones’ and appraisals, as well as wider training and development initiatives.

**Outcomes:** The university will monitor use of the new module through assessment of staff before and after the modules, as well as looking at compliance rates at a local and individual level, and collected online and in-person feedback to inform future in-house developments.

---

**University of Oxford: Building local capacity to deliver implicit bias and race awareness training**

The university sought to find a cost-effective way to meet the significant demands for staff training relating to race awareness and bias as part of its Athena SWAN and Race Equality Charter action plans.

Staff with experience of training, facilitation, or simply group work or teaching were asked if they wished to volunteer to be trained as internal facilitators. Volunteers represented a wide range of seniority levels, departments, and included White and BME minority staff. Once trained, they will conduct training in pairs, with support, supervision, peer mentoring, as well as customised materials for the target audience (for example, admissions tutors or exam invigilators). Training requests were prioritised, with initial focus on student-facing roles, leaders and managers.

In addition to internal facilitator training, a tendering exercise was conducted for external consultants to train the facilitators and to assist with customising training materials.
Outcomes: The initial recruitment and training of facilitators was completed in summer 2015, resulting in 30 staff trained to deliver race awareness training. A full review will be undertaken in 2017.

= Link to submission
Qualitative and quantitative evaluation

Being able to demonstrate impact as a result of evaluation often helped support the case for securing ongoing or increased resource. This was primarily evident in submissions which started at the departmental level and were then rolled out to other areas of the institution. The most striking example of impact received was in relation to the benefits for research funding of the women academic returners programme (see p.29) at the University of Sheffield, where 136 women have received awards since 2006 totalling over £1.7million. These women have since brought in over £12.5million in apportioned research grant income to the university, representing a return on investment of over 620%.

ECU recognises that it is not always possible to come up with monetary sums when it comes to demonstrating progress in equality and diversity, nor is it always appropriate to do so. For this reason, ECU encourages institutions to consider qualitative as well as quantitative evidence. However, while many of the schemes submitted were able to present evidence of impact and evaluation others were not or had inadvertently overlooked this element of HEFCE’s call for evidence. Where evaluation was implied and submissions met the other criteria in full, ECU sought further information. Some of the examples submitted were also of new initiatives where it was too early to assess impact.

At the validation workshop organised by HEFCE, ECU asked equality and diversity practitioners present for their tips on ensuring project evaluation and impact were considered at the outset. Their tips were as follows:

1. Use the annual access agreement and monitoring guidance issued by OFFA
   https://www.offa.org.uk/universities-and-colleges/guidance/annual-guidance/

2. Consider how the initiative and its aims relate to and help fulfil institution-level objectives.

3. Use logic mapping. Although written for the transport sector, the following guide is sufficiently general to be of interest to HEIs: www.gov.uk/government/publications/logic-mapping-hints-and-tips-guide

4. Develop links with staff responsible for strategy and planning within your institution.

5. Take a longitudinal approach.
Recommendations for future exercises to identify sector-leading and innovative practice

This exercise was the first of its kind to collate, identify and share sector-leading and innovative practice. The findings will not only be of use to policy makers but should assist HEIs in establishing new and evaluating existing initiatives. Based on our experience of this exercise ECU would like to make recommendations for any future exercises:

**Recommendation 1**

ECU recommends that HEFCE consider repeating the call for evidence on an annual basis with the aim of developing a repository of case studies for the sector on sector-leading and innovative practice on equality, diversity and inclusion.

This idea was also raised at the HEFCE’s Strategic Advisory Committees Conference and relates to Recommendation 6 of Universities UK Social Mobility Advisory Group in their final report (2016) ([www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/working-in-partnership-enabling-social-mobility-in-higher-education.aspx](www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/working-in-partnership-enabling-social-mobility-in-higher-education.aspx)). Recommendation 6 specifically highlights the need to improve the sharing of qualitative data through the establishment of an independent central function that would systematically evaluate and promote the evidence relating to higher education’s role in supporting social mobility of which equality and diversity initiatives play a key role.

**Recommendation 2**

In many cases information on qualitative and quantitative evaluation was not provided. When further information was requested it was usually provided. However, it was evident that further consideration needs to be given to the evaluation and impact of initiatives. ECU has sought to provide further information on this (see p.52) on the basis of information gathered at the validation workshop. ECU recommends that HEFCE consider how it can better support the sector in considering and demonstrating the impact of equality and diversity initiatives.

**Recommendation 3**

ECU recommends that consideration be given to the need to focus any future calls for evidence on equality areas for which few submissions were received, specifically age, gender identity, religion and belief, and sexual orientation.

**Recommendation 4**

It was not possible to evaluate some of the submissions as they did not follow the guidance provided in Annex A of HEFCE’s call for evidence ([www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE,2014/Content/Pubs/2016/CL,162016/CL2016_16a.doc](www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE,2014/Content/Pubs/2016/CL,162016/CL2016_16a.doc)). ECU recommends that consideration be given to how such information is provided to HEIs in any future exercises.

**Recommendation 5**

ECU recommends that in any future exercises to collate information, HEIs be encouraged to give equal consideration to ongoing initiatives as well as those that have recently been launched. ECU is aware that there are many long-running initiatives in the sector that have been highly effective at improving
equality for particular groups but the majority of submissions focused on initiatives that were relatively recent or new.

**Recommendation 6**

Many of the submissions received had been recognised in other fora as good practice. In any future exercise ECU recommends that HEIs be encouraged to submit a broader range of initiatives in order to demonstrate the breadth of their work. This is not to say that those already recognised in other fora should not be submitted as many have been included in this report.
Conclusion

The submissions in this report demonstrate the concerted effort in the sector to actively improve equality and diversity for staff and students. This has in part been legislatively driven but many HEIs recognise equality, diversity and inclusion as a key driver for attracting and retaining staff and students and for ensuring that they can fulfil their potential. The submission by the University of Wolverhampton on its work with the deaf community clearly illustrates this (See page 35).

HEI leaders and their vision can also not be overlooked in evolving the sector’s equality and diversity initiatives. This is evident from the work taking place at the University of Essex to address pay inequality. For further information see ECU’s publication The rationale for equality and diversity: How vice-chancellors and principals are leading change www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/rationale-equality-diversity-vice-chancellors-principals-leading-change/.

There is unquestionably still significant work to be done. The introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework; the reform of Disabled Students’ Allowances; the continued underrepresentation of women in senior positions; the persistent BME attainment gap; the report of the UUK taskforce to examine violence against women, harassment and hate crime affecting university students; and the report of the Social Mobility Advisory Group highlight some of the equality challenges faced by the sector that require continued concerted action.

Sharing the submissions received as a result of the call for evidence will undoubtedly help the sector progress its work. However, the lack of examples received in relation to age, gender identity, religion and belief, and sexual orientation also indicate that some institutions may require further support in advancing these areas of their work.
### Annex A: Criteria used to evaluate practice

Submitted practice was shortlisted as potentially ‘sector-leading’ and ‘innovative,’ if it demonstrated that it met each indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>To be shortlisted, assessor must consider...</th>
<th>This will be demonstrated through...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Positive impact** | = Has the practice had a positive impact on the employment/educational/social experience of staff and/or students? | = Qualitative assessment of application, in particular section on ‘aims and objectives’, ‘description of the practice’, and ‘results of any formal evaluation’ AND follow-up interview/email if not provided  
Positive impact will include:  
= Qualitative evidence (e.g. real-life stories which demonstrate impact at an individual level, evidence that profile of equality and diversity has increased)  
= Quantitative evidence (e.g. aggregate level statistics demonstrating progression from a clearly identified baseline/need, evidence that profile of equality and diversity has increased) |
| **Sustainable** | = Is the positive impact of the practice likely to be sustained after initial investment/resource? | = Qualitative assessment of application, in particular section on ‘aims and objectives’ and ‘description of the practice’. |
| **Transferrable** | = Is it practical for the practice to be transferred to another institution in the sector? | = Qualitative assessment of application, in particular section on ‘explanation of why it would be of benefit to other institutions’ and ‘description of the practice’. |
| **Transformative** | = Has the practice transformed existing ways of working?  
= Is the practice different from practice routinely adopted by other institutions? | = Qualitative assessment of application, in particular section on ‘explanation of why it would be of benefit to other institutions’ and ‘description of the practice’. |

This shortlisted practice was then further interrogated to determine whether it will be recommended for publication:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>To be considered for publication assessor may look to determine...</th>
<th>Evaluator’s comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Positive impact** | = Does the practice have impact in a number of different ways?  
= Does the practice have a relatively high impact? |                      |
| **Sustainable** | = Does the practice aim to achieve long-term impact?  
= Is there evidence of a commitment to on-going investment (if required)?  
= Has the practice been embedded into mainstream activities? |                      |
| **Transferrable** | = Does the practice require a low level of initial investment?  
= Could the practice be transferred to a high number of other institutions without major modification?  
= Could the practice be transferred to other departments/areas within the institution without major modification? |                      |
| **Transformative** | = Is the practice unique, in terms of for the institution, and the sector?  
= Is there evidence that the practice is more effective than other practices?  
= Is the practice more efficient than other practices in terms of costs?  
= Has the practice facilitated a shift in understanding of how to address equality issues? |                      |
# List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHERIL</td>
<td>Centre for Higher Education Research, Innovation and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLHE</td>
<td>Destinations of Leavers of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU</td>
<td>Equality Challenge Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAW</td>
<td>End Violence Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Hearing-impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHOT</td>
<td>International Day Against Homophobia and Transphobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNCHES</td>
<td>Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key performance indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>National Union of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFA</td>
<td>Office for Fair Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEF</td>
<td>Teaching Excellence Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUK</td>
<td>Universities UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>