

MEETING OF THE EQUALITY & DIVERSITY DELIVERY GROUP

Thursday 17th February 2011

Blue Room (Ab01)

2:00pm – 4:00pm

Present: Tina Hagger; Martin Hyde; Sarah Johns; Tony Lavender (Chair); Derek Maslin; Robert Melville; Moira Mitchell; Phil Poole; Lynda Saunders; David Stroud

In attendance: Lucy Dearden

1. Apologies

Hilary Bungay; Paul Carney; Kathy Chaney; Melissa Cleary; Kathryn Goldfinch; Jan Hope; Silvia Rasca; Sue Rodford; Margaret Scott;

2. Chair's Remarks

Strategic Plan - The Consultation process has finished and the Senior Management Team (SMT) have produced twelve chapters of the strategic plan (available in draft form) in time for the SMT Away Day on Tuesday 22nd February. They will be presented to the Governing Body on Thursday 24th February.

Financial Climate – There are unknowns about future financial implications for Higher Education (HE) Institutions and the Government has criticised Universities who want to charge higher rates of tuition fees (above £6,000 towards a £9,000 maximum). Currently, there is a cap per institution but in order to create a market, the Government, it would appear, has considered a national cap which would promote competition between Higher Education Institutions, but also with Further Education Institutions. There were, however, considerable difficulties to doing this and no proposals have so far been put forward.

Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) is as well equipped as many others to cope in the next few years and is not as vulnerable as the UCU list has suggested.

ACTION: The UCU list of vulnerable Universities is inaccurate and the Chair urged the Group to correct the misunderstanding

3. Notes of the previous meeting held on 11th November 2010 [paper 05]

The Group agreed that there were two small amendments to be made to the minutes. It was requested that UCU be removed from the list of badge holders on the Dignity at Work Policy and that a question of timescale refer to 'the Policies' rather than 'for disciplinary policies.'

ACTION: LD to make these amendments and post revised minutes onto the web pages.

4. Matters Arising

4.1 Dignity at Work Working Group

Human Resources and the Equality and Diversity Manager are to lead the agreed review of policies related to Dignity at Work in collaboration with the unions and staff representatives, after a year of its operation.

5. Update from the Equality & Diversity Committee meeting held on 2nd February 2011 [verbal report]

5.1 Staff Data Monitoring

The Committee discussed the data from short-listing to interview for Gender, Ethnicity and Disability.

Gender

For professional service staff there has been a consistent pattern over the years that women have been more likely to be short-listed than men. However this was not statistically significant in the years 2007/08 and 2008/09 (it was in all the other years). The percentages indicate a similar picture for short-listing to appointment. However this has never been statistically significant.

For academic staff there has been a consistent pattern over the years that women have been more likely to be short-listed than men and this was statistically significant in all years except 2008/09. There is a similar pattern of women being more likely to be appointed after interview than men but this was only statistically significant in 2007/08.

Ethnicity

Although it appears from the percentages to be less likely that Professional Service BME staff will progress from application to short-listing and from short-listing to appointment, this has never been statistically significant.

For academic staff there is statistically significant evidence over the last five years that applicants from a BME background were less likely to be short-listed. The reason for this drop between application and short-listing may be because significant numbers of overseas applicants appear to be submitting non specific CVs for numerous posts in the UK and/or do not have work permits. The Human Resources department has agreed to provide further data to substantiate or negate this theory.

Although it appears from the percentages that there is a similar pattern of a decrease in the likelihood of BME candidates being appointed after interview, this has not been statistically significant in the last five years.

Disability

The low numbers of people declaring a disability at each stage make these data difficult to interpret. No obvious trends can be seen.

Equal Pay Audit

CCCU has been conducting equal pay audits for several years. As with all previous years, the data for 2009/10 indicate that all grades are within the 5% band and therefore that the University is offering equal pay for equal work to men and women.

MM explained to the Group that these data would be presented at a future meeting in the form of the Annual Report.

5.2 Student Procedures

This year is the second year that data has been presented relating to student procedures. The Chair thanked Robert Melville for his ongoing work on producing these data.

5.3 Single Equality Scheme

The Equality & Diversity Unit have not launched a major staff consultation for the Scheme so as not to clash with the Strategic Plan consultation and the Delivery Group were consulted on it in the previous meeting. An online survey for students was launched in January and the Unit is expecting around 100 responses.

5.4 Strategic Plan – University Values

The new Values (a list of five, down from the original ten) had been signed off by the Governing Body, although some members were not clear about the signing off. The Committee discussed the new values, which are available on the web for staff.

5.5 Policies

The Equality and Diversity Policy is in draft on the Equality & Diversity web pages, waiting to be approved by the Governing Body.

6. Role of the Equality & Diversity Delivery Group Member [paper 06]

The Document was approved by the group. There was a suggestion that it be sent to all new members and added to the New Staff Orientation pack.

ACTION: SJ to add to Staff Orientation pack.

7. Discussion about the future of Student and Staff Data Monitoring [paper 07]

MM explained to the group that the three protected characteristics currently monitored for staff are disability, gender and ethnicity. Student data is more complex. The University does monitor Religion and Belief, but the data is not used because there is a lack of data due to the fact that the question is not asked consistently. MM is meeting with Registry to discuss how this can be done more thoroughly.

The Group was asked to discuss which of the Protected Characteristics from the Equality Act 2010 should be monitored for staff and students by CCCU. The Group's recommendations will then go to the SMT and then to the Equality & Diversity Committee.

7.1 International Perspective

The Chair asked MH to give an overview of the International Student's perspective on monitoring and data collection. MH suggested that it is a culturally British exercise but other countries which do monitor were highlighted. It was suggested that the University should not collect the data prior to students' arrivals for a number of cultural reasons, for example:

- Sexual orientation in countries where homosexuality is illegal and can carry legal sanction
- Marriage in countries where polygamy is legal
- There is internal discrimination within countries where CCCU recruits, over which the University has no control

Data can be collected once the student has arrived, at enrolment for example, however there would need to be an explanation about how the data will be used.

ACTION: MM to seek advice from the British Council and investigate this further

7.2 Discussion of protected characteristics

Protected Characteristic	Discussion	Recommendations and Actions
Sexual Orientation	<p>The Purpose of monitoring and analysis was discussed. It was raised that collecting data could be a useful tool to monitor potential discrimination.</p> <p>There was concern that by adding it to equal opportunity forms, individuals may be forced into an involuntary disclosure by choosing to leave it blank.</p> <p>CCCU staff should reflect the community and have a comparative representation to that of Kent/ Canterbury.</p> <p>The potential response rate discussed – in order for data to be meaningful, good disclosure rate needed. However, Sexual orientation is traditionally a contentious area.</p> <p>Time and resources discussed – monitoring and analysing data is time consuming.</p> <p>Question as to what is the purpose of monitoring and analysing this for staff? It was discussed that it should be monitored for current to staff in order to check for possible discrimination.</p> <p>Not compulsory area to monitor but there are Government initiatives to tackle homophobia in schools and discussions on gay marriage.</p> <p>Local HEI experienced negative reactions to the introduction of the question on its online recruitment,</p>	<p>Further consideration is needed – including an explanation of why the question is asked.</p> <p>Self Service HR record is going to be introduced at the end of the year – it could be introduced at this stage.</p> <p>Further consultation needed – marketing should be involved as some issues with CCCU reputation (on Wikipedia, Stonewall)</p>

	which was subsequently removed.	
Age	<p>HR has just removed age from application form.</p> <p>Important for workforce planning.</p> <p>More subtle age categories needed – for staff currently has a broad ‘over 30’ category.</p> <p>For students, there needs to be more finely tuned age bands with narrower banding for younger students.</p>	<p>Introduce Age monitoring on Equal Opportunities monitoring forms.</p> <p>ACTION – SJ to look at banding and send through to MM and TL</p>
Gender and Gender Reassignment	<p>Little benefit in numerically recording gender reassignment.</p> <p>Definition depends on what stage of the reassignment an individual is. How the question is phrased is particularly important as there is a complex picture of different potential categories – it could have an adverse affect on an applicant if they cannot find a box to identify with.</p> <p>An additional category should be added to gender in order to capture more fully.</p>	<p>Investigate other ways to illustrate CCCU’s commitment e.g. educating staff and students, introduction of unisex facilities</p> <p>ACTION – MM to work with a member of the Committee to work out the complex categories which could be used for gender and gender reassignment</p>
Marriage and Civil Partnerships	<p>Purpose and benefit of gathering data questioned by the Group.</p> <p>Discrimination against single people is more common.</p> <p>Declaring Civil Partnership, also declares Sexual Orientation.</p>	<p>Group agreed that there is no significant purpose to monitoring this.</p>
Pregnancy and Maternity	<p>Cannot monitor on application as potential discrimination could occur.</p> <p>It would be useful to monitor the number of students at any given time who are pregnant, given that 75% of students are female and it could have an effect on the provision of services.</p> <p>For staff, it would be useful to monitor progression for women and flexibility at work, however it is more useful to analyse combined protected characteristics e.g. age and gender</p>	<p>Start monitoring student pregnancy (through Risk Assessments to Registry) to support improved facilities e.g. milk expressing areas</p>
Religion and Belief	<p>Not currently collected for staff and not efficiently for students – this is because it is not collected consistently across the board.</p> <p>Application forms for staff include a paragraph about the Anglican Foundations, so monitoring may be misinterpreted and applicants may not want to answer.</p>	<p>MM is meeting with Registry to streamline the student data process.</p> <p>Reconsideration needed on the paragraph on the application forms,</p>

	<p>Useful to monitor so that can validate requests for extra multi-faith facilities.</p> <p>Issue of whether it can be recorded on QL - if it is not possible on QL as it stands, it would need to be raised at a User Group and agreed before the company will be willing to change the software to enable.</p>	<p>followed by a consultation with staff.</p> <p>ACTION – MM to take advice from Equality Challenge Unit and other universities.</p>
--	--	---

8. Single Equality Scheme second consultation [paper 08] – not discussed, to be added to Agenda of next meeting.

9. Any Other Business

Freedoms Bill – Published last week and has subtle Equality and Diversity implications.

ACTION: RM to produce a paper on it for the next meeting

Next meeting: Tuesday 10th May, 2pm-4pm in the SCR Blue Room