



Equality and Diversity Committee Meeting
Wednesday 4 July 2018, 14:00-15:00, SW00, William Gates Building

Agenda

Members:

Richard Mortier (Chair) (RMM)
Andres Arcia Moret (AAM)
Claire Chapman (Secretary) (CLC)
Ann Copestake (AAC)
Hatice Gunes (HG)
Miriam Lynn (ML)
Anil Madhavapeddy (AVSM)
Dinah Pounds (DP)
Joy Rook (JLR)
Caroline Stewart (CS)
Diana Vasile (DV)

1. Apologies for absence

Miriam Lynn
Diana Vasile

2. Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes from the meeting held on 25 May 2018 are attached (**2018-07-02**)

3. Report on actions from previous meeting

- i. women@CL Subgroup (AVSM)
- ii. PhD student focus groups (JLR)
- iii. Issue of patronising behaviour in some supervisions to be taken to next DoS meeting (DP)
- iv. Feeding issue of Paternity Leave scheme into local industry's HR process and to include this in our Action Plan (RMM)
- v. Issue of academic job titles to be taken to the School of Technology Meeting (CS)
- vi. To include explanation of UK job titles and their US equivalent in the Graduate Student Induction Pack (JLR)
- vii. Explanation of an appraisal in the notification of an appraisal message (CLC)
- viii. Research Staff Survey (AAM)
- ix. Staff Benchmarking Data from E & D (CLC)
- x. Amendment of Career Pipeline Graphs (CLC)
- xi. Amendment of colours to represent Female and Male (CLC)
- xii. Circulation of successful action plans (ML)

4. Action Plan Draft

Report from RMM.

5. Date of next meeting

To be held at the end of August.



Equality and Diversity Committee Meeting

Minutes of the meeting of the Equality and Diversity Committee Meeting held at 10:00am on Friday 25 May 2018, SW00, William Gates Building

Present: Andres Arcia-Moret (AAM)
 Claire Chapman (Secretary) (CLC)
 Ann Copestake (AAC)
 Hatice Gunes (HG)
 Miriam Lynn (ML)
 Anil Madhavapeddy (AVSM)
 Richard Mortier (RMM)
 Joy Rook (JLR)
 Caroline Stewart (CS)
 Diana Vasile (DV)

1. Apologies for absence

Dinah Pounds

2. Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes from the meeting held on 10 April 2018 were approved.

3. Report on actions from previous meeting

i. women@CL Subgroup (AVSM)

AVSM and DV will meet after this meeting to discuss the setting up of a subgroup.

AVSM reported that he has secured funding for a UROP student to work on an App to calculate the time women spend on invisible activities (see description attached). This research is in collaboration with the Faculty of Education.

Action: AVSM and DV

ii. Student Focus Groups (DP and JLR)

JLR said the Postgraduate Student Focus Group will take place on 14 June.

DP submitted the following report:-

Undergraduate Focus Group held on 7 May 2018

The Focus group was well attended. Although several female participants did not attend, there was a female representative from each year of the Tripos. The meeting was very positive and the students engaged in giving positive feedback that would be helpful to our future planning. Individual suggestions for teaching have been taken to the Teaching Committee for consideration.

We were particularly concerned to gauge the views on the current revisions to the Tripos and received positive feedback, particularly on the introduction of more creative courses such as Further HCI. More theoretically-minded students were not negative but found these courses difficult and requested more support.

The female IA and IB students particularly enjoyed the new creative courses and were also confident they would have applied to study computer science here even if the 50% option was not available.

The female students had no concerns about feeling uncomfortable studying here even though we have on average 18% female students and they felt well supported, but they had experienced patronising behaviour in some college supervisions by male supervisors.

Members agreed the reported issue of patronising behaviour which some female students are experiencing in College supervisions should be taken for discussion at the next DoS meeting (RMM reported he is the Chair). It would also be appropriate to make it compulsory that all college supervisors attend a Supervisor Training course, which covers some form of dignity at study training.

Action: DP

iii. Meeting between HG and CS

A meeting has been held. CS has some actions to pick up. HG reported on a focus group she had held with members of staff who had been appointed since the last staff survey.

HG agreed that she would send a full report to the HoD and DS. A summary of some of the comments and the Committee's suggestions are noted below:

- i) The shared Paternity Leave Scheme does not seem to be widely supported in the local community. As Cambridge is an intensive research city which the Lab has many connections with, members felt that it may be possible to feed into industry's HR process in order to highlight this scheme. ML said that this is an action we could include in our Action Plan.

Action: RMM

- ii) The Focus Group members felt that a change needs to be made to the ethos of the Department – terminology can be very confusing for newcomers. New staff also found it difficult to know who to ask questions and the Departmental Secretary was often targeted. Newcomers said they would appreciate more opportunity to meet with staff from different research groups.
- iii) The title of University Lecturer/University Senior Lecturer is not a well-known term. In the US, Assistant/Associate Professor is the equivalent term. It was reported that this cannot be changed without central approval, and so it was suggested that staff may choose to use both titles on their home page and in their email signature. CS will raise this issue at the next School of Technology Meeting. The titles of officers should also be made clear to Masters and PhD Students as those who come from Europe and Overseas and are not familiar with them. JLR suggested this could be explained in the student induction packs.

Action: CS and JLR

- iv) The issue of new lecturers being asked to co-lecture a course in their first term was commented on. A new member of staff did not know if it was acceptable to decline. Members felt that this issue should be discussed at the Induction Meeting.

Action: CS

- v) There is confusion about the difference between mentoring and appraisals. When appraisees are notified, members felt it would be beneficial to include the following sentence *'please note, this is not in any way an assessment, but an appraisal gives you the opportunity to discuss your career with an academic member of staff.'* CLC will include this sentence in all new RA appraisal messages which are organised.

Action: CLC

vi) **Research Staff Survey (AAM)**

AAC reported he has constructed 5 survey questions which target the issues of how to promote a safe, welcoming, inclusive and diverse community in the Department. It was agreed that it would be appropriate to circulate a separate survey to all research staff rather than to incorporate these questions in the Research Staff Forum's Career Progression Survey. Once final approval has been given by RMM, AAM will circulate the survey to all research staff.

Action: AAM

vii) **Wednesday Seminar Timings (CS)**

CS reported it has been agreed we will retain the seminar time of 16:15. Seminars have been discussed more widely and the feeling is that the seminars in Michaelmas Term have greater attendance because students attend them as part of their research skills and so we will keep to regular weekly slots where possible. However, it was agreed that the seminars in Lent and Easter may be less frequent. It was agreed that all seminars should appeal to a wide audience and there should be no pressure to fill gaps in the schedule with inappropriate seminars.

viii) **Staff benchmarking data (CLC)**

See 5.1 below.

4. Draft Application

Members noted the Draft Application attached. ML reported that she thought it was making very good progress.

5. Questions about the Process (Miriam Lynn)

- i) **We have obtained comparative staff data ourselves for 2016-17 from Oxford and Manchester Computer Science Departments. Should we obtain more?**

(E & D can only provide data for Engineering and Technology)

ML reported that E&D have been able to obtain staff benchmarking data solely for Computer Science and they will submit the information to us shortly.

Action: ML

- ii) **Do we need to include the text for each question under each heading or just the actual title in the final submission?**

ML said that the text for each question should appear under each heading to ensure that the questions are answered fully. It was noted that the question text does not get included in the word count.

- iii) **Initiatives: How many do we need on average per section?**

ML said that this is very dependent on our SMART actions and these recommendations will form our Action Plan. The data we include should be both qualitative and quantitative

- iv) **Career Pipeline – how do we comment on any gender issues in the pipeline? Is there any additional data?**

ML said that the male career pipeline graph is not needed and the graph should be amended to show percentages rather than the number of each member of staff.

Action: CLC

- v) **Staff Survey 2015 – should we use these statistics to highlight our success or improvements needed? The opinion of the HoD team is that these statistics are not very useful**

We don't necessarily need to use the statistics but ML reported that we could state what we learned from the staff survey. We could reflect on the process and identify key questions that we would like to learn more about for focus groups to consider.

- vi) **Do our Charts have sufficient impact? Are there any occasions where you would suggest a different format?**

ML reported there was the view that the darker colours should be chosen to represent females. CLC will amend these. She also stated that any graphs which are not referring to Male/Female, should have different colours to the others.

Action: CLC

- vii) **Do you have any suggestions to the actual visuals in the document?**

ML said that as each application is only assessed for around one hour by the Equality Challenge Unit, the more visuals, photographs and quotes that we provide in the application to highlight our achievements, the more well received our application was likely to be.

ML emphasised that we should show where we have travelled since our last application and what have we put in place that has created change and shown a shift in our culture. Our Action Plan should show actions that make a real impact. At the Silver level we are not just reviewing what we do. ML concluded that the draft application should be in place by end of September so that E&D can review it and make any suggested revisions.

The action plan should be in place by our next meeting in June/July. RMM confirmed that he would work on this. CS and AAC could support this. ML said she will circulate successful action plans to the committee.

Action: ML and RMM

6. Date of next meeting

A meeting date of 4 July 2018, 2:00pm was proposed. CLC will doodle poll all members to see if they can attend on this date.

Action: CLC

The Invisible Labour Project

Arathi Sriprakash, Paulina Sliwa, Tyler Denmead

Labour comes in many forms. This project seeks to examine the forms of labour that are often invisible, hidden, or not formally acknowledged in workplaces, specifically in higher education institutions. Feminist sociological research has long argued that invisible labour often falls to women and minorities. Sara Ahmed and Elaine Swan (2006), for example, trace the ‘diversity work’ of institutions to show how minorities are ‘continually interpellated not only as signs of diversity, but also as responsible for it’. Arlie Russell Horchschild’s now classic book *The Managed Heart* (1983) drew attention to the forms and effects of ‘emotional labour’ that are explicitly gendered – for example, the efforts involved in ‘being approachable’, and taking unofficial pastoral and solidarity roles, particularly for groups marginalised within/by institutions.

Institutions rely on this labour. But there has been little empirical research to understand its various forms, how widespread it is, and how it is experienced differently across various social and institutional positions in higher education. This project has two aims. Firstly, it seeks to generate data on the forms and extent (labour-hours) involved in academic work in the UK. Data will be collected via a user-friendly mobile app through which academics can log their forms of ‘invisible labour’ over a set period of time. Data will be analysed by gender, type of employment, discipline subject, and ethnicity in order to understand more fully the differential distribution of labour in the sector.¹

Secondly, the project aims to build public and professional awareness of the equality issues that arise from the empirical work. We seek to understand how differential practices and distributions of ‘invisible labour’ relate to the mechanisms which give rise to the gender-pay gap and the underrepresentation of women and minority groups in senior positions and in particular disciplines in UK Higher Education. As such the project intends to make a significant national-level contribution to equality and diversity policy and implementation in Higher Education. We also recognise the potential of extending the project and its development of an app to other employment sectors and social campaigns.

The team, resources and timeline:

The project brings together scholars at the University of Cambridge who are experts in philosophy (Dr Paulina Sliwa), Arts and Creativity (Dr Tyler Denmead), and the Sociology of Education (Dr Arathi Sriprakash). We are seeking to work with scholars who have expertise in app design and development, and an interest in the role of technology and social change. We are very keen to work closely with such scholars from the beginning of the project, in order to collaboratively refine our ideas and approach. As such we are seeking resources to employ two Undergraduates in Computer Science who have skills and passion in this area, for a period of 10 weeks each. The intention is to focus on design-work and piloting in July, and to continue to seek partnerships for the project in order to extend its reach, so that the project can be launched in late 2018.

¹ No identifying information will be collected from participants and this project will adhere to the Cambridge Risk Assessment and Ethics processes, and relevant regulations relating to data security.