A REPORT ON

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion at Queen Margaret University

Prepared by

Professor Paul Miller
Professor of Educational Leadership & Social Justice,
and Director, Institute for Educational & Social Equity

&

Dr Leroi Henry
Visiting Fellow, Queen Margaret University,
and Academic Portfolio Lead (HRM), University of Greenwich

&

Dr Kenisha Linton
Visiting Fellow, Queen Margaret University,
and Associate Professor, University of Greenwich

On behalf of Institute for Educational & Social Equity

August 2023

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction to the Report

This Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (EDI) Culture Review[1] is a specific piece of work commissioned by Queen Margaret University. It was commissioned to understand, inter alia:

- Staff and students' overall experience of inclusivity at the University
- Perceptions, observations and/or experiences of discrimination among staff and students
- Recruitment, selection, reward, progression, development, disciplinary and performance management practices related to staff
- Curriculum, support and other experiences among to students

It drew on a wide range of datasets, namely:
- **Voices**: review, analysis, and evaluation of interview data from 16 'Facilitated Conversations' with 172 staff and students
- **Numbers**: review, analysis, and evaluation of quantitative datasets related to staff and students
- **Policies**: review of five policies (three staff related and two students related).

The recommendations of the EDI Culture Review, and associated Action Plan are based on the above datasets.

The research team included: Professor Paul Miller (Principal Investigator), and co-investigators: Dr Kenisha Linton, Visiting Fellow at QMU and Associate Professor, University of Greenwich, and Dr Leroi Henry, Visiting Fellow at QMU and Senior Lecturer, University of Greenwich. Support and 'sense-checking' was provided by the Race Equality Steering Group/ Project Steering Group (RESG/PSG).

A Note on Terminology

In this report, we use the term '**ethnic minority'** and the acronym **'BAME'** (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic)' interchangeably. We recognise that both terms have problematic limitations, as they mask important differences between different ethnic groups. However, in a small number of cases, we

---

[1] A Cultural Review is a solutions-focused exercise which identifies issues and potential solutions through stakeholder engagement and sets out options or recommendations for improving organisational culture.

have presented disaggregated data into categories such as '**Black'**, and '**Asian'**, but due to small numbers, it has not always been possible to do this throughout the report. In addition, we use "**some**" to denote fewer than half the group or population in question (e.g.: "some staff", "some students") and "students" and/or "**staff**" to refer to the "majority" of persons in the identified group or population.

Policy Review data

Five policies were reviewed as part of this EDI Culture Review. Five staff participated in the policy analysis training and review process. The five policies reviewed were:

- Fitness to Practise Policy -ITE
- Academic Promotions Policy
- Academic Promotions Applications Guide
- Regulations Governing Discipline
- Appropriate Contract Use Policy (Including procedure for end of a Fixed Term Contract)

Qualitative data

A total of 172 persons: **48/547 or 8.7% of staff and 124/6100 or 2% of students** participated in 'Facilitated Conversations'[2], each lasting between 45 – 60 minutes. There was broad gender make-up of participants. However, it is acknowledged that only 5 students who participated were from ethnic minority backgrounds. Some ethnic groups are missing from the 'Facilitated conversations' dataset, including no Black students in the student conversations.

Quantitative data

There were three discrete quantitative datasets as follows:

- ***Employee census***
  - Ethnicity (census categories or other), nationality, gender, department, job role, grade.
- ***Pay data***
  - Data on salaries for all staff including fractional positions and bonuses; ethnicity (census categories or other), nationality, gender, department, job role, grade.

A bespoke survey was developed in collaboration with students which was administered as part of this EDI Culture Review. **Twenty-six or 0.4% of** students completed the survey.

---

[2] A 'Facilitated Conversation' is a form of semi-structured interview in which a facilitator uses a set of questions as prompts. A 'Facilitated Conversation' could include 1- 20 individuals.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Key findings from the policy review:

The **context** of the policies provides insights of an institution on a journey to protecting staff and students, and to deliver quality education to students.

- The **text** of the policies reviewed is overwhelmingly positive. However, deeper analysis highlights tensions and gaps that can be addressed through updating (regularly), in consultation with multiple stakeholders and through engaging with contextual data. The 'Fitness for Practise Policy -ITE' appears somewhat disjointed in some places and convoluted in others.

- The potential **consequences** of the policies are addressed by a series of questions. Potential power imbalances between staff/ students, and minority ethnic/ white staff, line managers and staff, for example, are noted. Whilst the 'Regulations Governing Disciple', in its current form, appears to present risks to the University, the 'Appropriate Contract Use Policy (Including procedure for end of a Fixed Term Contract)' appears to be the least contentious of policies reviewed.

Key findings from the quantitative dataset (STAFF):

Pay gaps
- Several pay gaps have been identified. These include for (i) minority ethnic staff, (ii) female staff, and by (iii) job function, and by (iv) level, and (v) job role.
- In terms of ethnicity, there are significant variations in pay between different groups of BAME staff. In terms of gender, there is a 3.8% gender pay gap in favour of men.
- In terms of job function, all pathways, with the exception of 'not teaching and/ or research', White UK staff receive more pay than BAME. Further, Operations and Finance and the School of Health Sciences have 22% and 13% gaps between White UK and White Other staff.
- In terms of job level, with the exception of the professorial grades and the Senior Leadership Team, White UK staff earn more than the mean salary at that level.
- In terms of job role, at lecturer grade, there is a pay gap in favour of White UK and Other compared with all other groups, and at senior lecturer grade, there is a pay gap in favour of White UK compared with other groups.

Ethnic profile of staff
- The workforce is overwhelmingly White. White British, Scottish, White Other
- (2/3 of whom are UK nationals) and Irish account for 92.3% of all staff, with all other minorities making up 5.9%. SLT is 83% White British, whilst 17% have "withheld" information on ethnic identity.
- 80% of staff are UK nationals and 20% have other nationalities.
- BAME staff are absent above grade 9.

- BAME staff tend to be clustered at certain levels particularly grade 8. For example, 63% of Other ethnic background, 43% of other Mixed, 60% of Black and 50% of White and Asian are clustered at grade 8.
- There are fewer UK born South Asian and Black staff compared with migrant South Asian and Black staff, and compared with White British staff, White Other and Black staff are more likely to work part-time.
- BAME staff are underrepresented in discretionary grades.
- White UK staff are much more likely to be on permanent contracts. 'White Other' make up almost half of fixed term contracts but make up less than one third of staff. BAME staff are much more likely to have fixed term contracts.

Key findings from the quantitative dataset (STUDENTS):

Twenty-six or **0.4%** of students across six divisions completed the survey. Half were postgraduates and half undergraduate. 8/26 identified as White British, 7/26 identified as White Other, 9/26 came from BAME heritages and two did not disclose their ethnicity.

Support

- 21/26 had sought help from the University. White UK were most likely, and White Other the least likely to seek help. A small number (3/26) of students sought help from the Students Union.
- Overall, students felt that they had been given good support from the University. White British respondents were the most satisfied and Asian respondents the least satisfied with the support received. Black students found access to University support easy whilst Asian students found access more difficult compared with the other identified groups.
- Asian students believed that there was a strong relationship between their ethnicity and ease of access to support from the University. Black and White UK students saw no relationship.

Ethnicity/ racism

- All five Asian students had experienced racism themselves or knew someone who had experienced racism. This included in clubs and societies, teaching spaces, at Students' Union events, on placements, accommodation, from other students, from academic staff, and from the curriculum.
- Three of the seven White Other and two of the four Black students had experienced racism themselves or knew someone who has experienced racism.
- For White British, only a small minority (one of eight) knew someone who has experienced racism.
- No student had experienced racially motivated physical violence on campus, however Asian and Black students had experienced micro-aggressions, unfair treatment and exclusion, although among Asian students this was more widespread.

Reporting

- No student had used the University systems for reporting racism and only five of 26 (including no Asian students) were aware of them.
- The majority of BAME students (seven of nine) were not comfortable using the available reporting systems whilst seven of eight White students were comfortable using them.

Curriculum
- All groups of students believed that the curriculum was inclusive. White Other and Black students gave curriculum inclusivity a higher rating compared with Asian and White British.

Representation
- Black, Asian and White Other students felt least represented by University, School and other staff in leadership roles compared with White British.

Understanding of racism
- Students generally agreed that understood the concept of racism, although Black and White Other were less in agreement compared with Asian and White UK
- All groups were more likely to think that staff understood the impact of racism compared to their understanding of the concept.

Perception of the University
- Overall, students believe the University is inclusive.
- With the exception of Asian students, other students tended to believe the University is anti-racist.
- Black students tended to have positive views that the University fosters a sense of belonging. The perceptions of both Asian and White British students varied with equal numbers within each of the groups believing that the University did and did not foster a sense of belonging.

Key findings from the Facilitated Conversations (STAFF):

1. *Inclusive Culture:*
- Staff who participated in the Facilitated Conversations feel that the University is generally inclusive for disabled individuals but identified various systemic barriers like lack of sign language support, accessible marketing, and support for disabled part-time and international students. Changing names in the system was criticized for possible impact on transgender wellbeing. Ethnic and gender representation in senior leadership needs addressing. Some staff felt that issues around racial inequity or discrimination were 'evaded' and usually 'swept under the carpet'. Religion impacted inclusion negatively. LGBTQ+ inclusivity signs were visible, but tensions arose over trans exclusionary views.

2. *Systems / policies / processes:*
- International staff recruitment faced bureaucracy and visa-related challenges. Compassionate leave arrangements were inconsistent and inadequate. The grievance policy impacted Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) due to perceived HR bias towards management. Streamlined promotion processes and preparatory sessions were needed. HR sessions lacked family-friendliness for working parents. Precarious contracts disproportionately affected underprivileged individuals, reinforcing inequity. 'Resourcing' issues and staff shortages led to increased workloads in all conversations.

3. *Reporting & supporting mechanism:*
- Only a small number of staff were clear about how and where to report incidents of discrimination. Some staff suggested they would not report concerns because the processes for doing so are 'too complex and time-consuming'.

Key findings from the Facilitated Conversations (STUDENTS):

- International students seek more integration and cultural awareness activities. LGBTQ+ participants want an upgraded Pride Progress flag and consistent use of 'preferred names' on University systems. Students with disabilities ask for improved seminar room desks and staff training in Disability Services. Primary Education students recommend more male representation in program adverts to address the underrepresentation of male teachers. Some minority ethnic students feel excluded and alienated. Students suggest clarifying the University's stance on antisemitism based on IHRA's definition. The curriculum should be more inclusive and genuinely embedded in courses. Reporting incidents of discrimination is unclear, and better signposting for EDI support is needed. Students view the Students' Union as more responsive to discrimination concerns. They also request EDI training for Personal Academic Tutors (PATs).

Anomalous findings

- Students in the survey reported their curriculum was inclusive, although students in the 'Facilitated Conversations' felt otherwise.
- Most students in the survey felt the University was inclusive, although the feeling among many students in the 'Facilitated Conversations' was that this is not the case.

Main findings - OVERALL

- Staff and students generally consider the University to be an inclusive environment
- The University has a number of staff pay gaps
- Staff and students are concerned about ethnic and gender representation in the University's leadership structure
- The ethnic profile of staff is below the census data for Edinburgh (e.g.: there are few BAME staff at Queen Margaret University compared with the population of Edinburgh)
- A number of students have either witnessed and/or experienced racism in clubs and societies, teaching spaces, at student Union events, on placements, accommodation, from other students, from academic staff, and from the curriculum.
- Some students didn't always feel their curriculum is inclusive
- There appears to be a faultline in the experience of international students and students of South Asian heritage
- Students felt the Students' Union is more responsive to concerns about discrimination compared with the University
- Systems for reporting discrimination are not well known by staff and students
- Whilst some policies reviewed appear non contentious, other appear convoluted and unclear and some appear to carry a degree of risk if not changed (or if tested)

Summary of Key Recommendations

- **Systems and data:** Collect data on staff at least twice annually, in order to get a more comprehensive and more accurate picture of the characteristics and profile of staff. [P1, P2] Commits to encouraging staff to declare identity characteristics, whilst also implementing systems to streamline and 'tidy' the data [P1].

- **Pay Gaps:** Studies and eliminate multiple pay gaps across identified for (i) minority ethnic staff, (ii) female staff, and by (iii) job function, and by (iv) level, and (v) job role. [P1]

- **Staff contracts and grades:** Examines and monitors staff contract type (e.g.: part time, fixed term, v permanent contracts) by gender and ethnicity. One way to do this could be through encouraging and offering targeted support to BAME staff to apply for Pay Awards [P1, P2, P3]. Examines and eliminates the disparity of the dominance of White UK staff receiving discretionary pay awards [P1, P2].

- **Staff and diversity:** Increases the overall percentage of staff of BAME heritage, including in senior leadership roles – academic and professional services to reflect and/or exceed the percentage of ethnic diversity within the student population; considers an ambitious aspirational 3 years rolling target. [P1, P2, P3]. Set 3–5-year aspirational targets for increasing the numbers of BAME and female staff in senior leadership, in both academic and professional service roles. [P1, P2]

- **BAME staff recruitment (advertising and attracting):** Adopts and implements a range of recruitment methods and options to boost recruitment of BAME staff, including at senior level. For example: Uses direct recruitment. Within the UK Higher Education sector, this practice is quite common for senior white staff but less so for BAME senior. This might be more difficult for some professional services jobs [P1, P2, P3]. Requires that recruiters, where used, return a racially diverse shortlist, and make them aware of the University's priorities for increasing ethnic diversity in staffing. [P1, P2]

- **Training & development:** Requires senior leaders and line managers (academic and professional services) to undertake a suite of anti-racism/ EDI training. [P1, P2, P3].

- **Resource & support:** Commits to continued close working with line managers to engage in workforce planning, and to also work closely with trade unions to understand and alleviate concerns about staffing levels [P1, P2, P3]. Recruits an ethnically and culturally diverse staff team in the International Office, and provide existing and new team members with ongoing training in Cultural Competence in order enable them to better support the needs of international students, and to act as cultural brokers for them where necessary. Training however should not be a proxy for recruiting an ethnically and culturally diverse International Office team [P1].

- **Curriculum:** Continues to develop and promote new programmes that will attract and retain a more diverse range of students (e.g.: skills-based programmes) [P1, P2, P,3]. Ensures students are introduced to a range of real-life EDI scenarios and content on their courses (e.g., the Gender Recognition Act and other legislations crucial to practice-based professions) [P1, P2, P3].

- **Communication, Culture & Community:** Raise profile of EDI/ Anti-racism across the University through a co-ordinated and resourced 'Communications and Engagement Plan' [P1]. Upgrades the Pride Progress flag used by the Students' Union [P1]. Convenes a Working Group (e.g.: a sub-Committee of the RESG) to better study and understand what appears to be faultlines in

the experience of Asian students and international students; works with the International Office and the PALS team to address concerns identified [P1, P2].

- **Leadership of EDI:** Establishes clear EDI/ Anti-racism priorities and commitments for the senior leadership team, and members of University Court, including in areas of visibility, commitment and accountability [P1]. Invites the members of the PSG/ RESG to serve as a reconstituted Project Oversight Group or Project Delivery Group. A Project Oversight Group would oversee the implementation of the EDI Plan and ensure funding and other accountability mechanisms are in place. A Project Delivery Group would have an active role in supporting the delivery of the EDI Action Plan, and would report to the Project Oversight Group. It is important to ensure work undertaken in these roles is properly accounted for in staff workload [P1]. Ensures the newly appointed EDI Adviser has autonomy to make decisions and receives adequate resources to successfully undertake the demands and opportunities of the role [P1]. Implements changes to the policies and procedures reviewed as part of this review; ensures other policies and procedures are reviewed and updated [P1]. Integrates EDI into annual PER objectives for all staff regardless of role or level [P1].
- **Progression and careers:** Continue to support part-time staff with targeted Continuous Professional Development (CPD) opportunities, likely to improve their chances of promotion/ progression [P2, P3].
- **Accessibility:** Provides more user-friendly desks for wheelchair users in seminar rooms [P1, P2, P3]. Makes the University's website more accessible [P1, P2].

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

Chapter 1: Background & Contextualisation

This Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (EDI) Culture Review is a specific piece of work commissioned by Queen Margaret University as it seeks to be more proactive in advancing and intensifying the University's EDI and social justice agendas. It was not commissioned as a response to any specific event or a negative event.

1.1 Objectives and Purpose of the Research Consultancy

This EDI Culture Review was commissioned to understand:

- Staff and students' overall experience of inclusivity at the University
- Perceptions, observations and/or experiences of discrimination among staff and students
- Recruitment, selection, reward, progression, development, disciplinary and performance management practices related to staff
- Curriculum, support, and other experiences among students

The findings from this EDI Culture Review are intended to contribute to broader understanding of (i) inclusivity among QMU staff and students (ii) inclusivity in QMU processes, and (iii) to identify potential areas for improvement.

1.2 The Scope of the Consultancy

The four deliverables associated with this EDI Culture Review were:

- Capacity-development (training) for staff via the policy review process
- Evidence informed three-year EDI Strategy
- Evidence informed three-year EDI Action Plan
- A final Review Report which includes a list of prioritised recommendations.

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Chapter 2: Methodology

2.1 Design and Approach

This Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (EDI) Culture Review was collaborative in nature and involved several participants and three discrete phases as set out below:

Phase 1: Policy Analysis & Training – Five staff participated in an online policy training; review & analysis exercise held in August 2022.

Phase 2: Analysis of QMU's internal/ quantitative data – review and analysis of Employee census, Pay data and Application, Recruitment and Selection, and the results of a students' survey, during the period October 2022 – April 2023.

Phase 3: Facilitated Conversations and students' survey - 172 staff and students participated in 16 'Facilitated Conversations', held January – April 2023. 26 students completed the survey between March – May 2023.

2.2 Data Analysis

Data from the 'Facilitated Conversations' were analysed by combining Question Level Analysis and Thematic Analysis. That is, data for each question was analysed separately, and within the response for each question, themes were identified. University data on staff, and student survey data were analysed using descriptive statistics.

As a whole, data analysis involved:

- Identifying key themes and findings
- Exploring the themes – common views, divergent views, and participants' views by role
- 'Reality- checking' findings with the RESG/PSG to ensure emergent themes and findings were in line with the scope of the project, and to share any additional insight that may be useful for the completeness of the report
- Triangulation - Data was gathered from different stakeholders and from different sources (e.g.: policies, 'Facilitated Conversations' and Internal quantitative data) which resulted in a more complete picture of experiences and perceptions of EDI practice.

Given only five policies were reviewed and given only **48 or 8.7% of staff** and **124 or 2% students** participated in the 'Facilitated Conversations' and given only **26 or 0.4% of students** completed the survey questionnaire, the findings themselves may not be generalisable. Some groups are missing from some datasets (e.g., no Black students participated in the Students' Facilitated Conversations). We cannot be certain therefore that the issues identified by participants in this EDI Culture Review are the only concerns among staff and students at Queen Margaret University. Notwithstanding these limitations, given that triangulation was achieved through methods used (quantitative, qualitative and documentary analysis), and by participants (students and staff from a range of

backgrounds and identity characteristics (e.g.: dis/ability, gender, age, ethnicity, gender identity, religion, sexual orientation), the findings do provide an "index of generalisability" (Miller)[3] or "fuzzy generalisations" (Bassey, 1999)[4].

Furthermore, a strength of this review is self-reporting with regard to the experience, observation and/or perception of discrimination. Many researchers argue that the use of self-report in psychological studies is valid when the research aims to examine cognitive content (the sum or range of what has been perceived), the relationship between self-reported attitudes and behavioural outcomes, and "constructs that are perceptual in nature" (Haeffel & Howard, 2010, p. 185)[5]. Furthermore, a recent study of racial attitudes found that directly asking about participants' perceived experiences prejudice and discrimination is effective regardless of participant numbers (Axt, 2018)[6]. Given this EDI Culture Review sought to investigate staff and students' perceptions, experiences and observations of inclusivity and/or discrimination at QMU, self-reporting was arguably the most valid way to arrive at a meaningful answer. Consequently, the results, despite the small size sample, should be treated as valid.

---

[3] Miller, P. (2012). Professional Lives in Transition: Shock, Turbulence and adaptation in Teacher identity Reconstruction (2012). Lambert Academic Publishers

[4] Bassey, M. (1999). *Case Study Research in Educational Settings*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

[5] Haeffel, G.J. & Howard, G.S. (2010). Self-report: psychology's four letter word, *The American Journal of Psychology*, 123(2): 181–188.

[6] Axt, J.R. (2018). The best way to measure explicit racial attitudes is to ask about them, *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 9(8): 896–906.

Chapter 3: Findings from the review and analysis of five policies

Five policies were analysed using Taylor et al's (1997)[7] framework of "policy as context", "policy as text" and policy as "consequences". The five policies reviewed and analysed were:

- Fitness to Practise Policy -ITE
- Academic Promotions Policy
- Academic Promotions Applications Guide
- Regulations Governing Discipline
- Appropriate Contract Use Policy (Including procedure for end of a Fixed Term Contract)

Below is a summary of the issues identified.

3.1 Policies as contexts

Context – Policies are not developed and implemented in a vacuum but are instead developed and implemented in a 'context', and this context is always specific and particular to the issue to be addressed. For example, **Fitness to Practise Policy – ITE** establishes the context by setting out that, "Most professional bodies make fitness to practise a requirement for registration to practise" (p1), and that "The Fitness to Practise Policy for Initial Teacher Education is modelled closely on the published University Fitness to Practise Policy…" (p.1). Although the contexts (regulatory and internal) are clear, it would appear the policy attempts to reach beyond ITE by suggesting "Additionally, **some programmes may require students to self-certify annually their continuing fitness to practise**; this will be made clear in Admissions procedures" (p.4). This raises the question, is the **Fitness to Practise Policy – ITE** solely focused on ITE or does it also focus on other areas?

The policy also sets out that "A panel may also, as a result of its operation, identify and remit particular issues for discussion and/or review by the Student Experience Committee, the School Academic Board, or other formal group concerned with practice-based learning, as appropriate" (p.4). *What are the implications for sharing information and for protecting individuals and their dignity?* It is also set out that, "Allegations of unprofessional or unethical conduct, including conduct outwith the University" (p.4). *How are these terms defined and understood by staff and students? And how are they 'measured'?*

A number of potentially serious consequences could arise if some areas of the policy are not reframed or removed. For example: "The standard of proof operated by Fitness to Practise Panels is the **civil standard of proof**, which is 'the balance of probabilities" (p.2). *What does this mean? Perhaps a footnote clarifying 'the civil standard of proof' would be helpful?* "Fitness to practise concerns may arise from disciplinary or misconduct issues, from health related or disability issues, or from reported

---

[7] Taylor, S., Rizvi, F., Lingard, B., & Henry, M. (1997). Education policy and the politics of change, London, England: Routledge

professional capability issues. Different procedures may apply in each case" (p.3). *This statement is made on both p2 and p3. It is not clear why the statement is repeated. It would also help if the policy set out the procedure or likely procedure to be followed in each of the instances highlighted. A flow chart could be effective in each case.*

Additionally, the policy set out, "The University will seek information about **character**, **health and disability prior to admitting students.** Clear information about this will be published in the prospectus" (p.3). *This is potentially problematic? What is meant by 'character' and as far as 'health and disability' are concerned, is the information to be sought related to 'mental health?' What if someone has a mental health condition, will this mean they won't be given entry? Are there considerations regarding neurodiversity?* "Wherever possible, issues relating to fitness to practise will be dealt with as part of the University's standard procedures, or at the programme level. **However, where a judgement is made that such consideration is not appropriate**, there is provision for referral to a Fitness to Practise Panel, and the provisions of this policy will apply. A panel will be convened on the advice of the University Secretary" (p.4). *This paragraph raises a number of potential concerns. For example: what factors might inform such a judgement? Is this judgement pre or post entry? Do the University's standard procedures carry less 'weight' in Fitness to Practise matters? Does the policy potentially open up the University Secretary to potential claims of abuse of power and/or potential undue scrutiny?* It is also set out that Fitness to Practise panels *"…*will include at least **one external**, professional representative" (p.12). *Is this external to the department or School or to the University? Are there provisions for situations which could fall outside the 'normal'? Are EDI characteristics considered in panel composition? Is yes, should the policy make these explicit? Furthermore, "*In cases where the Panel is split evenly, the Convener shall have the casting vote" (p.11). *How might this open up the convener and the University to claims of bias and/or potential misconduct?*

3.2 Policy as text

Text – The policy texts largely supported the context the policies were trying to create. The **Academic Promotions Policy** sets out, "The remit of the Academic Promotions Panels is to consider all applications for promotion (supported or unsupported by the Head of Division) and make recommendations to the Reward and Recognition Committee on the award of academic promotion" (p4). This is fairly straightforward. However, there are some areas of concerns, including: "Heads of Division will attend Panel meetings to provide information. They will not be required to contribute to the final decision" (p.4). *It is a good thing that 'unsupported' staff can apply. Might an application for promotion that is unsupported by a HoD raise more question at the panel than answers? Might the HoD, who will be present at the panel 'exert' any 'undue' influence given the 'imbalance of power' and/or any problems in a staff-HoD relationship?'*

The policy also sets out, "Panels will be **gender balanced** and all panel members will be required to undertake unconscious bias training" (p.4). *Is there any training in the immediate lead up to panel meetings? What about wider EDI characteristics, e.g.: ethnicity? What does 'gender balanced' mean*

in the context of non-binary and trans people? Additionally, "This policy applies to **all members of staff** with a minimum of **twelve months continuous service**" (p.4). *Should it be academic staff? What policy applies for academic staff without 12 months of continuous service?* Furthermore, "The Deputy Principal chairs the Academic Promotions Panels and its members include: Deans of School, HR representative (panel secretary), one member from the other school and **one external member**" (p.4). *Is this external to the University or to a School? Who chooses the external and what's the process and criteria for doing so?* The precise nature of involvement with the Higher Education Academy is also unclear since the Policy appendix provides, "Evidence of engagement with and/or membership of the Higher Education Academy". *How is engagement measured and is a there a baseline level of "membership" (Fellowship) required?* In addition, the Policy appendix also states "Examples of where you demonstrate excellence in the supervision of undergraduate and post graduate student projects, field trips or placements".* This however could be more specific, e.g.: in the context of completed doctoral supervisions.

Several items in the APP are similarly presented in the **APAG**. *For example,* "Panels will be gender balanced, panel members come from a range of academic disciplines and backgrounds and are required to complete unconscious bias training" (p.3). *Is there any training in the immediate lead up to panel meetings? What about wider EDI characteristics, e.g.: ethnicity?* And "You **should consider** cross-referencing your application to the Student Experience Strategy and the process for application to the Higher Education Academy" (p.4). W*hat happens in cases where staff choose not to?* Beyond these overlaps, there are some items of concern that are specific to the **APAG**. For example, "Applicants are required to demonstrate achievement in at least two out of the following areas, teaching and scholarship, academic leadership and administration and Research, KE, Enterprise and Innovation" (p.3). Additionally, "You will be required to attend the promotions panel meeting to deliver a presentation no longer than 5 minutes in length outlining your future contribution to QMU if successful. Thereafter you will be asked questions that the panel have drafted upon reviewing your application" (p.6). *What value, if any, might this add to the process? The purpose of this activity is unclear. Isn't the purpose of the panel to adjudicate and determine if someone is 'successful'? This practice appears unique to QMU.* Furthermore, "As a general guide circumstance impacting a period of less than six months should not be reported under this process" (p.5). *What is being measured here: impact of 'event' or duration of 'event'?* It was also set out that "The Head of HR will arrange for **a member of the Senior Management Team** to consider the appeal in conjunction with all relevant documentation. The member of the Senior Management Team hearing the appeal will have had no previous involvement in the promotions process" (p.7). *How will this person be chosen? How much background, if any, will the Head of HR provide? Might the 'background' provided prejudice the outcome of an appeal – since information provided is likely mediated by the Head of HR?*

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

3.3 Policy as consequences

Consequences – Although specific effects or "consequences" of the policies reviewed could not be established without speaking directly to persons who 'experienced' them, several areas of potential tension and/or gaps were noted. These tensions and gaps have potential to undermine, if not bring into conflict, the aspirations and outcomes of the "context" (the University).   For example, **Regulations Governing Discipline** sets out that "Harassment of any student or member of staff of the University, or any visitor to the University, on the grounds of sex, sexual orientation, race or disability" (p.2). *Should all EDI protected characteristics be considered along with other ascriptions (e.g.: first language and hair colour, etc) which are sometimes the subject of discrimination?* It is not immediately clear what is meant by the statement "Failure to respect the rights of others **to freedom of belief** and freedom of speech" (p.2). *What might this mean in practice? The policy also set out,* "Breach of the provisions of **any** University code, rule or regulation" (p.2). *It is not clear whether this is more concerned with what statute is breached and less with the nature of the breach. It might be helpful to clarify.* It is also set out that, "Unless the matter is deemed to be urgent by the Principal, no student shall be suspended or excluded unless he or she has been given an opportunity to make representation to the Principal" (p.3). *Might this expose the Principal to potential claims of bias? Should disciplinary issues be decided by a Committee operating in the Principal's name or should disciplinary decisions be proposed by a Committee to the Principal for action/ final decision?*

Furthermore, it is also set out that, **"If the allegation is not so dismissed, and the offence does not lead the Principal to suspend or exclude the student under the provisions outlined in section 4 above, the matter will be referred to the relevant Dean of School**. The Dean of School will consult with the University Secretary to determine whether or not the matter should be dealt with summarily or referred to a Disciplinary Panel, subject to paragraph 5.6 below" (p.4). *Is there a probability of 'double-jeopardy' here? Under what circumstances might the Principal show no interest in a case but send it to Deans to action? This is potentially contentious, unless the circumstances are clarified.* Additionally, "If the matter is dealt with summarily, **the Dean will consider written or oral evidence as he or she thinks fit"** (p.4). *Could this leave the Dean open to potential claims of bias and/or abuse?* It was also set out that "**Absolutely discharged**, which means that although the student **may be technically guilty** of the misconduct alleged, no blame should be attached to his or her actions" (p.7). *Is this contradictory? Or is this another way of saying 'although the jury has found you "not guilty" it doesn't mean you are?'. It might be worth reconsidering or rephrasing this statement.*

The **Appropriate Contract Use Policy (Including procedure for end of a Fixed Term Contract)** sets out that, "Payment for accrued leave is paid" (p.7). *Is this correct? If the casual worker is not an employee, under what condition would they be entitled to "leave" and payment for leave?* "A key consideration in determining the status of a casual worker will be whether or not **mutuality of obligation** exists in the working relationship. Where there is no mutuality of obligation, a casual worker will not be an employee" (p.6). *Might it be helpful to add a footnote defining 'mutuality of obligation'?* Where a worker is engaged on a casual contract but the nature or hours of the work

changes during the engagement, **it is the responsibility of the manager to undertake the necessary process to change the contract type"** (p.9). *What are the implications for the manager where this requirement is not adhered to? How are newly appointed managers supported in these cases?*

The policy also establishes that, "In law, when a fixed term contract **expires** and is not renewed (or converted to open ended), **it is considered to be a dismissal**" (p.11). *If this is correct then it has significant reputational and future employment risks for anyone on Fixed Term contracts.* "The reason for the expiry of the fixed term contract will depend on the circumstances of the case and will not always be redundancy" (p.11). *This point appears contrary to the previous point. Might it be worth clarifying the circumstances under which a Fixed Term contract could come to an end, different from its expiration by date?* It is also noted in the policy that, "The appeal will be heard by a senior manager who has not previously been involved in the case. **The senior manager will be a manager identified by the Head of Human Resources in consultation with the relevant line manager/Dean/Director"** (p.13). *How might the University safeguard itself and those involved against potential bias, and claims thereof? Will EDI characteristics be considered in the choice of manager hearing an appeal? Whilst this may not make a difference to the outcome, it could amount to a psychological difference to an employee.*

Chapter 4: Findings from the Quantitative Datasets (STAFF)

This chapter presents quantitative data on staff across the University using two datasets: Employee Census Data (June 2022) and the Equal Pay Audit (March 2021). There are likely to be some inconsistencies between what's found (and reported) between these datasets. This is because the data snapshots of the two sets are 15 months apart, and we can therefore expect slight changes in the staff composition between the two dates. The two data sets also use slightly different categories, due to changes in the reporting categories set by the Higher Education Statistics Agency between the two snapshot dates.

4.1 Ethnic profile of staff

This section draws on the Employee Census Data (June 2022)". The University workforce is overwhelmingly white. White British, Scottish, White Other and Irish make up 92.3% with all other minorities making up 5.9%.

Ethnicity	
White British / Scottish	63.6%
White other	28.3%
Information Refused / blank	1.8%
Other Ethnic Background	1.6%
Asian or Asian British Indian or Indian	1.1%
Black or Black British-African	0.9%
Any other Mixed background	0.7%
White and Asian	0.5%
Chinese	0.5%
Irish	0.4%
Asian or Asian British-Bangladeshi & Pakistani	0.2%
Any other Asian background	0.2%

Analysis of these figures suggests that the University has recruited limited numbers of UK BAME staff and has recruited fewer UK born South Asian (3) and Black staff (2) compared to migrant South Asian (6) and Black staff (3)

The situation for staff of Arab heritage is complicated with some identifying as White Other and some as Other.

Figures for White Other looks unusually high, and it should be noted that 2/3 of those who self-identify as White Other are UK nationals.

4.1.1 Nationality of staff

Nationality		80% of staff are UK nationals and 20% have other nationalities.
UK (not Channel Islands or IOM)	451	
Overseas	111	
Not known	5	
Grand Total	567	

4.1.2 Ethnic profile of staff, by faculty as a share of ethnic group.

BAME staff are under-represented and/ or absent from all divisions. This was particularly apparent in Operations and Finance and the University Secretary's group. However, there were small clusters of some BAME groups in the School of Health Sciences.

4.1.3 Ethnic profile of staff by contract type

This section indicates the ethnic profiles of staff by contract type.

Ethnicity	Full time	Job share	Part time
White - UK	65%	0%	35%
White other	50%	1%	49%
Not Stated	64%	0%	36%
Asian or Asian British-Indian	78%	0%	22%
Other Ethnic Background	75%	0%	25%
Any other Mixed background	71%	0%	29%
Black or Black British-African	40%	0%	60%
Chinese	100%	0%	0%
White and Asian	50%	0%	50%
Any other Asian background	0%	0%	100%
Asian or Asian British-Bangladeshi & Pakistani	100%	0%	0%
Irish	100%	0%	0%
Average	61%	1%	39%

High proportions of White Other and Black staff are working part time whereas all Irish, Bangladeshi & Pakistani and Chinese staff work full time.

4.1.4 Ethnicity of staff on permanent and fixed term contracts

This section indicates the ethnic profiles of staff working on fixed term and permanent contracts.

Ethnicity	Fixed Term	Fixed Term - Acting Up	Permanent	QMU Staff - Secondment	Grand Total
White - UK	8.8%	1.5%	89.4%	0.3%	100.0%
White other	22.3%	0.0%	77.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Not Stated	28.6%	0.0%	71.4%	0.0%	100.0%
Asian or Asian British-Indian	33.3%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Other Ethnic Background	37.5%	0.0%	62.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Any other Mixed background	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Black or Black British-African	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Chinese	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
White and Asian	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Any other Asian background	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

Asian or Asian British-Bangladeshi & Pakistani	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Irish	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Grand Total	14.6%	0.9%	84.3%	0.2%	100.0%

White UK staff are much more likely to be on permanent contracts compared to the average of all other staff. White Other make up almost half the staff on fixed term contracts although they make up less than one third of staff. Most BAME staff, and particularly Black staff, are much more likely to be fixed term although numbers are very small so liable to distortion.

4.1.5 Nationality of staff on permanent and fixed term contracts

Of the larger groups, UK nationals are less likely to be employed on fixed term contracts whereas EU, White Commonwealth and Indian nationals are more likely to employed on fixed term contracts.

4.1.6 Ethnic profile of staff by grade

This section indicates the ethnic profile of each of the staff grades.

The SLT is 83% White British with 17% opting to withhold information regarding ethnic identity. There are no BAME staff members above grade 9. Due to the relatively low numbers of BAME staff, it is difficult to make definitive conclusions. The data suggests that 36.5% of academic staff are at Grade 8, although, in particular, 45% of White Other, 63% of Other Ethnic Background, 43% of Other Mixed, 60% of Black and 50% of White and Asian staff are at Grade 8. Except for one member of staff, staff of BAME heritage are absent from the two lowest grades.[8] With the exception of G4 (Disc) [9], White British staff are overrepresented at all the discretionary grades.

4.2   The Gender and Ethnicity Pay Gaps

The pay gaps were calculated from the Equal Pay Audit (March 2021). Due to the relatively low numbers of staff from BAME groups it has been necessary for reasons of GDPR compliance to combine all racialised groups including those of mixed heritage into one category – 'BAME' and all non-British White groups including Irish have been combined into 'White Other'. The authors of this report are aware that this is likely to mask differences in salary between different ethnic groups. For the same reason detailed analysis of ethnicity pay gaps at the level of grade, employment function, level 3 structure and job role have been removed.

---

[8] This figure is contradicted by data in the pay audit carried out 15 months earlier.

[9] The dataset does not provide clear information about the ethnicity of one of the two staff at grade G4 (Disc).

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

The table shows the mean scale-point value and mean payment by hourly rate.

Ethnicity	Mean Salary	Mean Hourly Rate
BAME	£36,131	£19.75
Information Refused	£41,783	£22.76
White Other inc. Irish	£40,076	£21.88
White - British	£41,620	£22.68
Mean	£40,860	£22.28

Across the University there exists a significant pay gap between White British staff and BAME staff. On average White British staff earn £5,489 per annum more than BAME staff which equates to £2.93 more per hour.

The hourly rate is arguably more accurate than the mean scale-point value as it considers the longer hours worked by some staff at the same pay point for the same pay. This relates to academic vs professional services contracts. The hourly rate has been used for the remaining calculations which indicate pay gaps across the institution.

4.2.1 Ethnicity pay gaps including divergence from White UK and mean

The figures below explore in detail how the mean salaries for the different categories diverge from both White UK staff and the mean salary across the University.

		Divergence from White Br £	Divergence from White Br %	Divergence from mean £	Divergence from mean %
BAME	£19.75	-£2.93	87%	-£2.53	89%
Information Refused	£22.76	£0.08	100%	£0.47	102%
White other incl Irish	£21.88	-£0.80	96%	-£0.40	98%
White - British	£22.68	£0.00	100%	£0.40	102%
Average	£22.28				

The figures above highlight a significant pay gap between BAME and White British staff of 13% and a gap of 4% between White Other and White British staff.

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

4.2.2   Gender Pay gap

Sex	Average Hourly Rate
Female	£22.00
Male	£22.85
Average	**£22.28**

Sex	Average Hourly Rate
Female	98.71%
Male	102.55%

Women earn on average 85 pence per hour less than men which equates to a 3.8% gender pay gap.

4.2.3 Ethnicity pay gaps: women

In order to investigate intersections of ethnic and gender pay disparities the figures below calculate the pay gaps for women in different ethnic categories.

		Divergence from White Br £	Divergence from White Br %	Divergence from mean £	Divergence from mean %
BAME	£20.16	-£2.49	89%	-£1.84	92%
Information Refused	£21.16	-£1.49	93%	-£0.84	96%
White Other incl Irish	£21.10	-£1.55	93%	-£0.89	96%
White - British	£22.65	£0.00	100%	£0.65	103%

For women there is a 11% pay gap between BAME and White British staff and a 7% pay gap between White Other and White British staff.

4.2.4   Ethnicity pay gaps: men

		Divergence from White Br £	Divergence from White UK %	Divergence from mean £	Divergence from mean %
BAME	£19.23	-£3.51	85%	-£3.62	84%
Information Refused	£27.02	£4.28	119%	£4.17	118%
White other incl Irish	£24.16	£1.41	106%	£1.30	106%
White - British	£22.74	£0.00	100%	-£0.11	100%

For men there is a 15% pay gap between BAME and White British staff whilst there is a 6% reverse pay gap between White Other and White British staff, that is, White Other men earn £1.41 more than White British men.

4.2.5 Ethnicity pay gaps gender comparison

These figures compare the mean pay for men and women in each category, and the percentage gender pay gap within these categories.

	Female	Male	GPG £	GPG %
BAME	£20.16	£19.23	-£0.92	4.6%
Information Refused	£21.16	£27.02	£5.86	27.7%
White Other	£21.10	£24.16	£3.05	14.5%
White - British	£22.65	£22.74	£0.09	0.4%
Grand Total	£22.00	£22.85	£0.86	3.8%

The figures indicate that despite there being a small overall gender pay gap of 3.8%, intersections of ethnicity and gender have led to differences between the categories. For BAME staff there is a 4.6% pay gap in favour of women whilst for White Other there is a 14.5% pay gap in favour of men. There was a 27.7% pay gap for those who did not disclose their ethnicity.

Overall, the main pay gaps identified were:

- In terms of job function, all pathways, with the exception of 'not teaching and/ or research', White UK staff receive more pay than BAME. Further, Operations and Finance and the School of Health Sciences have 22% and 13% gaps between White UK and White Other staff.
- In terms of job level, with the exception of the professorial grades and the Senior Leadership Team, White UK staff earn more than the mean salary at that level.
- In terms of job role, at lecturer grade, there is a pay gap in favour of White UK and Other compared with all other groups, and at senior lecturer grade, there is a pay gap in favour of White UK compared with other groups.

4.3 Ethnic profile of staff involved in grievance and disciplinary procedures as complainants and respondents

No staff labelled as BAME were involved in grievances or disciplinary procedures between 19/20 and 21/22.

4.4 Ethnic profile of staff and outcomes of grievance and disciplinary procedures by gender, complainant and respondent

No staff labelled as BAME were involved in grievances or disciplinary procedures between 19/20 and 21/22.

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

Chapter 5: Findings from the Quantitative Dataset (STUDENTS)

This chapter presents findings from the students' survey. The survey was co-designed by the research team and students to collect data from student (UG, PGT, PGR) regarding their experience and/or or perception of inclusivity and unfairness at Queen Margaret University. As mentioned in Chapter 1, a total of 26 students completed the survey.

Due to the low response rate, ethnic categories have been merged into four categories Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British), White British, and White Other). Responses have been analysed in relation to these categories. Due to the low numbers, more granular analysis and/or intersectional analysis (e.g.: gender or nationality) were ruled out.

5.1 Respondents

Of the 26 students who completed the survey, half were postgraduates and half undergraduates. These were from across the University as follows: 4 - from Dietetics, Nutrition and Biological Sciences; 5 - Media, Communication and Performing Arts; 2 - from Nursing; 7- Psychology, Sociology and Education; 6 - the Business School; and 2 - Speech and Hearing Sciences. There were no participants from Physiotherapy, Podiatry and Radiography, Occupational Therapy and Arts Therapies or The Institute for Global Health and Development. Nine identified as BAME (Asian or Asian British, or Black or Black British), eight as White British, seven as White Other and two did not provide their ethnic identities. 17 are female, 6 are male and two participants felt that the categories did not match their gender identities.

5.2 Support from the University

This section explores students' experiences of seeking support from the University to meet any of the following needs: General counselling / Wellbeing, Mental health, Disability, Academic, Careers / Employability, Financial, Race-related issues.

Ethnicity	No	Yes
Asian or Asian British	1	4
Black or Black British	1	3
Prefer not to say		2
White British / Scottish	1	7
White Other	2	5
Grand Total	**5**	**21**

In all groups students had sought help from the University with Prefer not to say and White British students the most likely to have sought support, with White other the least likely

Students were asked if they agreed that they were provided with good support by the University in relation to General counselling / Wellbeing, Mental health, Disability, Academic, Careers / Employability, Financial, Race-related issues.

Ethnicity	Average rating of support from the University
Asian or Asian British	2.99
Black or Black British	2.24
Prefer not to say	4.00
White British / Scottish	2.15
White Other	2.64
Average	**2.62**

Results across all these domains were averaged with 1 being strongly agree and 5 being strongly disagree.
BAME and White Other were less satisfied than White British whilst the prefer not to say group was the least satisfied with the quality of the support they received from the University.

Students were asked if they agreed that they found it easy to access support from the University in relation to General counselling / wellbeing, Mental health, Disability, Academic, Careers / Employability, Financial, Race-related issues.

Ethnicity	Average of ease of support
Asian or Asian British	3.09
Black or Black British	1.62
Prefer not to say	4.43
White British / Scottish	2.07
White Other	2.30
Average	**2.48**

Results across all these domains were averaged with 1 being very easy and 5 being very difficult.
It should be noted that more students responded to this question than the previous question on the quality of support suggesting that they had not been able to access the support.
Black students found access most easy (although less than half of them responded to this question). Asian students found access more difficult than all the other identified ethnic groups. However, 'Prefer not to say' found it most difficult to access support from the University.

Students were asked the extent to which they believe that their ethnicity was related to their ease of access to support from the University.

Ethnicity	Strongly related	Quite related	Neutral	Quite Unrelated	Strongly Unrelated
Asian or Asian British	2	1	1		
Black or Black British		1			2
Prefer not to say	1				1
White British / Scottish			3	1	3
White Other		1	2		2

Grand Total	3	3	6	1	8

Two of the four Asian students believed that there was a strong relationship between their ease of access to support and their ethnicity. Most Black (2/3) and White British students (4/7) saw no relationship as did a small proportion of White Other students. The two 'Prefer not to say' responses were highly divergent.

Students were also asked what the University can do to make its support services more accessible. The responses included improving signposting and communications, being more consistent across localities and departments, anonymising forms and creating links with other local universities in order to help integrate overseas and students of minority ethnic heritage.

5.3 Support from the Student Union

This section explores students' experiences of seeking support from the Student Union to meet any of the following needs: General counselling / wellbeing, Mental health, Disability, Academic, Careers / Employability, Financial, Race-related issues.

Only three students had sought support from the Students' Union. No Black, or White British students had sought support. Three students, one Asian, one White Other and one Prefer not to say had sought support from the Students' Union. The results of in this section are based on a very small number of students (three). Therefore, no breakdown of the ratings for each of the above areas has been undertaken.

These three students were asked if they agreed that they were provided with good support by the Student Union in relation to General counselling / Wellbeing, Mental Health, Disability, Academic, Careers / Employability, Financial, Race-related issues. Results across all these areas suggested White Other was very satisfied, whilst the Asian student and 'Prefer not to say' student were very dissatisfied.

These three students were asked if they agreed that they found it easy to access support from the Students' Union in relation to General counselling / Wellbeing, Mental Health, Disability, Academic, Careers / Employability, Financial, Race-related issues. The Asian student was neutral whilst the White other and 'Prefer not to say' students found access easy.

Students were then asked what the Students' Union can do to make its support services more accessible. Connecting with other Students' Unions in Edinburgh/ Scotland as a means of widening provision and providing BAME students with a greater sense of belonging were suggested.

5.4 Impact of racial or ethnic identity on students' University experience

This section summarises students' perceptions of the extent to which their racial or ethnic identities have impacted on their experience in relation to access to counselling or wellbeing services, disability services, academic support, off-campus accommodation, catering, financial support, transportation, employability and careers.

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

Ethnicity	Average of impact of race on University experience
Asian or Asian British	3.57
Black or Black British	3.70
Prefer not to say	2.25
White British / Scottish	3.71
White Other	2.86
Grand Total	**3.45**

Results across all these areas were averaged with 1 strongly agree and 5 being strongly disagree.

Asian, White British and Black students tended to disagree with this statement with Black and White British students disagreeing slightly more than the other groups. White other and 'Prefer not to say' groups to tended towards agreeing with the statements.

5.5 Students' experiences of racism

Students were asked if they or anyone they know had experienced racism at QMU or in the wider community

Ethnicity	No	Yes
Asian or Asian British		5
Black or Black British	2	2
Prefer not to say		2
White British / Scottish	7	1
White Other	4	3
Grand Total	**13**	**13**

All five Asian and both 'Prefer not to say' students reported that they had experienced racism themselves or knew someone who had experienced racism. Three of the seven White Other and two of the four Black students had experienced racism themselves or knew someone who has experienced racism. Only a small minority (1/7) of White British students had either experienced racism themselves or knew someone who has experienced racism. This requires more nuanced analysis since it would appear that this white student has experienced 'cultural racism'.

Students were asked where they experienced racism on campus. Two of the five Asian students and both prefer not to say indicated that they or someone they know had experienced racism in clubs and societies. Three of the five Asian, one of two of 'Prefer not to say', one of the seven White British and two of the five of White Other students indicated that they or someone they know had experienced racism in teaching spaces. One of the five Asian, one of the four Black, both 'Prefer not to say' and one of the seven White British students indicated that they or someone they know had experienced racism in non-teaching spaces. One of the five Asian and one of the six White Other students indicated that they or someone they know had experienced racism in Student Union events. Two of the five White Other students indicated that they or someone they know had experienced racism in the library. One of the five of Asian students indicated that they or someone they know had experienced racism in accommodation. Four of five Asian students, one of two 'Prefer not to say' students and one of the seven White Other students indicated that they or someone they know had experienced racism from other students.

Students were asked to describe the types of racism they or someone they know had experienced on campus. No student had experienced racially motivated physical violence on campus.

	micro aggressions		verbal abuse		threats of physical violence		unfair treatment		exclusion	
Ethnicity	no	yes	no	yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Asian or Asian British	3	2	5		4	1	1	4	2	3
Black or Black British	3	1	4		4		4		3	1
Prefer not to say	1	1	1	1	2			2		2
White British / Scottish	7	1	8		8		8		8	
White Other	6	1	6	1	7		5	2	7	
Grand Total	**20**	**6**	**24**	**2**	**25**	**1**	**18**	**8**	**20**	**6**

Micro-aggressions, unfair treatment and exclusion were the most common manifestations of racism. Asian British students reported that they had experienced these forms more often than other groups. The most significant difference is that four of the five Asian students had experienced unfairness on campus whilst none of the four Black students reported experiencing unfairness on campus.

Students were asked to describe where they had experienced racism off campus.

	Racism in community		Racism in placements		Racism at place of work	
Ethnicity	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Asian or Asian British	2	3	4	1	4	1
Black or Black British	3	1	3	1	4	
Prefer not to say		2	2		1	1
White British / Scottish	7	1	8		8	
White Other	5	2	6	1	5	2
Grand Total	17	9	23	3	22	4

Most Asian and prefer not to say and White Other students had experienced racism in the community or knew someone who had experienced racism in the community. One of the four Black and one of the five Asian respondents had experienced or knew someone who had experienced racism in

placement whilst one of the five Asian and two of the seven White Other respondents had experienced racism at work.

Students were then asked to describe the types of racism they or someone they know had experienced off campus. No student had experienced racially motivated physical violence off campus.

	micro aggressions		verbal abuse		Physical violence		Threats of violence		unfair treatment		exclusion	
Ethnicity	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Asian or Asian British	2	3	5		5		4	1	2	3	2	3
Black or Black British	3	1	3	1	4		4		3	1	3	1
Prefer not to say	1	1	1	1	2		2			2		2
White British / Scottish	8		7	1	8		8		7	1	7	1
White Other	6	1	5	2	6	1	6	1	5	2	5	2
Grand Total	20	6	21	5	25	1	24	2	17	9	17	9

Three of the five Asian students and one of the four Black students had experienced or knew someone who had experienced micro aggressions, unfair treatment or exclusion off campus. One of the four Black students had also experienced verbal abuse off campus.

Ethnicity	No	Yes	NR[10]	Students were asked whether they had experienced racism from University staff.
Asian or Asian British	4	1		
Black or Black British	2		2	
Prefer not to say	1	1		
White British / Scottish	1		7	
White Other	2	1	4	
Grand Total	10	3	13	

One of the seven White Other students had experienced racism from catering staff, one of the five Asians and one of two 'Prefer not to say' respondents had experienced racism from academic staff and one of the five Asian students had experienced racism within the curriculum.

[10] NR = 'no response' to question

5.6 Students' perceptions and experiences of University reporting systems

No student had used the University systems for reporting racism. Students were then asked about the extent to which they were aware of these systems.

Ethnicity	No	Yes
Asian or Asian British	5	
Black or Black British	3	1
Prefer not to say	1	1
White British / Scottish	7	1
White Other	5	2
Grand Total	**21**	**5**

Five of 26 students were aware of the University's systems for reporting racism with one of seven White Other and one of two 'Prefer not to say' students being very aware.

Students were asked whether they trusted the reporting systems. One of the two 'Prefer not to say' students strongly trusted the systems. One of the five Asian students and the other 'Prefer not to say' student slightly trusted the systems. Other respondents were either neutral (17/26), which is not surprising as only 5/26 were aware of the systems, or distrusted the reporting systems (6/26).

Ethnicity	No	Yes
Asian or Asian British	4	1
Black or Black British	3	1
Prefer not to say		2
White British / Scottish	1	7
White Other	2	5
Grand Total	**10**	**16**

Clear differences were noted regarding the extent to which students would feel comfortable reporting racism or micro-aggressions from students. BAME students (Asian and Black) were not comfortable using these systems whilst White students were overwhelmingly comfortable using them.

Ethnicity	No	Yes
Asian or Asian British	4	1
Black or Black British	2	2
Prefer not to say		2
White British / Scottish	1	7
White Other	4	3
Grand Total	**11**	**15**

Students were asked if they would feel comfortable reporting racism or micro-aggressions from staff. 4/5 Asian students were not comfortable reporting racism from staff; 2/4 Black students felt comfortable; 4/7 White Other students felt comfortable. White British students had a very different view with 7/8 reporting that they would feel comfortable reporting staff who had engaged in micro-aggression or racism.

5.7 Students' perceptions of the curriculum

This section summarises the extent to which students believe that their course reflects racial and cultural diversity.

Ethnicity	Average of Inclusive curriculum
Asian or Asian British	2.85
Black or Black British	2.38
Prefer not to say	2.88
White British / Scottish	2.75
White Other	2.04
Grand Total	**2.53**

Students were asked to rate their curriculum with 1 being the most inclusive and 5 being the least inclusive.
White Other and Black respondents gave the inclusivity of the curriculum the highest rating whilst Prefer not to say, Asian and White British respondents perceived the curriculum to be somewhat less inclusive.

5.8 Students' perceptions of representation

This section summarises students' perceptions of the extent to which their race/ethnicity is represented within University leadership, School leadership, Programme leadership and elected officers of the Students' Union.

Ethnicity	Average of representation
Asian or Asian British	3.45
Black or Black British	4.19
Prefer not to say	2.38
White British / Scottish	1.66
White Other	3.43
Grand Total	**2.92**

Students were asked to rate the extent to which the holders of the above roles represented their ethnicity / race with 1 being the most and 5 being the least representative.
Black students followed by Asian and White Other students felt the least represented whilst White British students were felt the most represented by these leaders.

5.9 Students' perceptions of staff understanding of racism and its impacts

This section summarises student views on the extent to which the perceive staff understand the concept of racism and its impacts. Students rated the following groups of staff: academics, PATs, Student support staff, Estates and Security, Accommodation staff, Student Union staff, Catering staff, Computing and Library staff and Cleaners. It should be noted that several participants rated all staff members the same. This pattern was particularly clear for the questions on impact.

Ethnicity	Concept of racism	Impact of racism
Asian or Asian British	2.42	2.18
Black or Black British	2.19	2.00

All groups of students tended to agree with the statement that staff understood the concept of racism. Black students and White Other students were less in agreement than Asian students and White British students,

Prefer not to say	2.78	1.94	
White British / Scottish	2.39	2.33	
White Other	2.22	2.13	
Grand Total	**2.35**	**2.17**	

with prefer not to say the least likely to agree. All groups were more likely to think that staff understood the impact of racism compared to their understanding of the concept.

5.10 Students' overall views on inclusivity of the University and Students Union

This section summarises students' views on the extent to which the University is believed to be inclusive and anti-racist and the extent to which they feel that the University and Students' Union affirm their identity and promote a sense of belonging. Students were asked whether the University was inclusive and anti-racist.

	QMU inclusive		QMU anti racist	
Ethnicity	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**
Asian or Asian British	2	3	4	1
Black or Black British	1	3		4
Prefer not to say	2		2	
White British / Scottish	2	6	3	5
White Other	1	6	1	6
Grand Total	**8**	**18**	**10**	**16**

With the exception of Asian students and 'Prefer not to say' students, nearly all students in each group believed that the University was anti-racist. There were significant differences between Asian and Black students regarding their perception of whether or not the University is anti-racist. Four of five Asian students do not believe the University is not anti-racist whilst all four black students believe the University is anti-racist.

With the exception of 'Prefer not to say', most students in each group believed that the University is inclusive. Three of five Asian students and three of four Black students believed that the University is inclusive. Six of eight and six of seven White British and White Other students believed that the University is inclusive.

Students were then asked to rate the extent to which the culture of the University affirms their racial identity and fosters a sense of 'belonging' for them.

Ethnicity	Strongly agree	Mostly agree	Neutral	Mostly disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total
Asian or Asian British	1		2	1	1	5
Black or Black British		3	1			4

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

Prefer not to say	1		1		2
White British / Scottish	1	3	3	1	8
White Other		2	4		1	7
Grand Total	**3**	**8**	**11**	**2**	**2**	**26**

Differences were observed within and between ethnic groups. Asian students had divergent views, as did to a lesser extent, White British students. Black students tended to view the University as fostering a sense of belonging.

Finally, students were asked to rate the extent to which the culture of the Students' Union affirms their racial identity and fosters a sense of 'belonging' for them.

Ethnicity	Strongly agree	Mostly agree	Neutral	Mostly disagree	Strongly disagree
Asian or Asian British	2		2	1	
Black or Black British	1	1	2		
Prefer not to say	1		1		
White British / Scottish	1	2	5		
White Other		2	3	1	1
Grand Total	**5**	**5**	**13**	**2**	**1**

The scores for the Students' Union were broadly similar to those for the University, although Asian students were more positive and White British students were a little less positive.

Overall, it should be noted that seven of the 26 students who completed the survey identified their home domicile as international or EU as follows: Black: one; Asian: three; White Other.

Chapter 6: Findings from Facilitated Conversations (STAFF)

Ten facilitated conversations were held with **48 or 8.7%** of staff across the University to understand their impression and experience of equity, diversity and inclusion at the University. What follows is a summary of findings and themes related to the four questions asked:

1. Inclusive Culture: Would you describe Queen Margaret University to be an inclusive institution / place to work?
2. Systems / policies / processes: Are there any policies that you would describe as not inclusive (e.g.: grievance, disciplinary, pay, progression, maternity, paternity, etc)?
3. Reporting & supporting mechanism: If you experienced or witnessed discrimination, would you know how, where or to whom to report this?
4. Change / improvement: What key recommendation/s can you make to the university for improvement in its EDI culture?

6.1 Inclusive Culture

Overall, participating staff suggested that the University is an inclusive institution and a positive environment in which to work. Some expressed the University has a ''remarkable consistent commitment to EDI'' and are ''persistently learning and continually improving as the world shifts''. The challenge highlighted by many respondents was in relation to how staff can create a climate of inclusion at QMU, with ''spaces, places that everyone feel is theirs'' where they truly belong. The conversations about the inclusive culture at QMU underscored themes related to age, disability, gender reassignment, race and ethnicity, religion/belief, sex, sexual orientation, contract type, and social class.

6.1.1 Age

Staff feel that the University is an intergenerational space and want more opportunities to explore what that means for both staff and students. One example focused on age diversity in the classroom and the work that staff need to put in to ensure that all age groups feel like they belong:

> "The nurses and midwives that we have coming in, some of them might be mid-20s. But there's a whole bundle who are much older than that. It's almost like I'm too old to be here. That can be the negative side of it, which adds to their disorientation." (FC9)

6.1.2 Disability

Staff feel the University is generally inclusive for people with disabilities. However, they highlighted various systemic barriers faced by students and staff. For example, it was suggested that the Marketing team could make its material more accessible. Another staff highlighted barriers for persons "wearing hearing aids or relying on remote microphones" and questioned whether there were ways of "checking if they do have a loop system or whether the loop system is working" in the classrooms (FC10).

One staff noted emergency signage (evacuation guidance) needed updating to include refuge points where it's safe to stay for 60 minutes so that disabled members of staff and students do not wait for help in the wrong locations. It was also noted that staff and students with hearing impairments may struggle to hear in some buildings and in hybrid sessions since, 'you can either hear who's in the room or who's online, but you can't hear both'.

Some messages, intended to motivate students, were seen as 'not inclusive'. For example:

> "There are some things that really jar, for example, the posters on the lifts… 'take the stairs, the stairs to success'. This is not inclusive." (FC5)

On the topic of disability awareness, staff expressed that they did not enjoy seeing students playing bumper carts with the wheelchairs and generally showing little understanding of what it means to be a wheelchair user.

One staff member felt that there was a lack of priority with sign language support and timetabling for deaf students because they get booked up months in advance and so "students can get left without any communication support" (FC1). Staff also expressed concern regarding the lack of support available to international students with disabilities, who are barred from accessing the government's Disabled Students Allowance, compared with UK students.

There was a view that individual learning plans (ILP) were not revised or adjusted as the student moves through university. Staff suggested more resources and training are needed to enable them to be better placed to respond to the changing needs and profiles of students.

Some staff expressed that they did not have a formal diagnosis of their disability and that they had to revert to the student process in order to obtain a diagnosis. Some staff suggested the establishment of a disability staff network would be an important step for further promoting disability inclusion and awareness throughout the University.

6.1.3 Gender reassignment

Some staff highlighted challenges encountered when trying to change their names on university systems, with some waiting 'over a year'. Staff found the system to be inflexible and one person expressed that they exist with two names on the system. Persons change their names for various reasons, and wellbeing issues were flagged by transgender staff.

6.1.4 Race and ethnicity

Some staff feel that the University has an inclusive environment for people from varied racial and ethnic backgrounds, meanwhile others opine that the rhetoric of diversity and inclusion did not match the lived experiences of staff and students from minoritized racial and ethnic groups. Both White and staff of BAME heritage expressed mixed perspectives on racial inclusivity:

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

"I would say that is, yes. Inclusive when it comes to the students, but I think with the staff, it depends on what level you're at. I mean, if you're on the sort of academic level, then I'm sure that is great, but I'm working… in a lower-level job, and I've experienced racism, like outright racism, which HR intervened on, the Union were involved as well." (FC2)

Staff felt that issues around racial inequity or discrimination were 'evaded' and usually 'swept under the carpet' by managers and colleagues because of fear and lack of knowledge and understanding of how to address matters of racism or ethnic harassment:

"Managers do not understand how to support people who experience racism. They would rather just smooth everything out and sweep things under the carpet, you know, and they definitely do not seek any sort of punitive measures against, even if the person or people are guilty of doing that…". (FC2)

Staff reported that students face racism and harassment in the local community, with one recounting going to the shops near campus, and being asked by someone at a placement location, 'why are you sending students like that to us?' Staff did not always know how to deal with such forms of 'othering' or cultural discrimination and microaggressions.

One staff recounted an on-campus incident where they witnessed a student being racially harassed, but the student avoided reporting it for fear of getting in trouble:

"One of my students was called the N word by a visiting professor and said they didn't want to get into trouble by reporting it. This is a problem."

"…it's not about if I know how to report instances of whatever exclusionary racism or discrimination that I see on campus, it's also that we get reported." (FC6)

Staff also raised concerns about their own lack of awareness and understanding of the processes for reporting or tackling racism on and off campus:

"Again, a student who experienced racism on placement, and then like, what do we do? It didn't happen here. So, is that the University's responsibility or is that the health service? And kind of back and forth, and we want to be supportive, but we don't know, and why don't we know? And we should know, and who do we go to? And so, that circling thing, it's not just knowledge, but who holds it and who shares it, how we access it, or what gets mobilised?" (FC5)

Staff considered that there was insufficient dialogue on race and ethnic diversity and inclusion at the University, among both staff and students. One staff member stated that, 'even at the level of the Equality and Diversity Committee there is constant referencing to gender, sexuality, but rarely race' (FC8). One manager said they 'would welcome the opportunity to continue these types of conversations' as this was the first time that they'd ever been presented with the opportunity in their 10 years at QMU'. Other staff expressed the need for more openness to dialogue on race and for the University's efforts to be visible, and that race should be integrated in modules and programmes.

"We're sending students who are the next generation of professionals who we need to be out there, changing the profession, and having these conversations in their workplaces…." (FC6)

Several White staff raised concern that the lack of ethnic diversity among staff meant that students might not get the level of support that they need, particularly around issues to do with race or ethnicity.

One staff highlighted structural inequity that impacts international PhD students whose bursaries run out after three years when a PhD is generally four years, on average. This puts international PhD students in a precarious position as they face "financial constraints" (FC4) in the final stage of their programme and risk not finishing their studies.

While some managers and staff try to promote EDI awareness and initiatives, particularly around Black History Month, there are others who are believed to be hesitant to engage with this area for fear of getting it wrong. One staff also noted 'pushbacks', highlighting:

"There is always pushback, always somebody who says, can you please give me quantitative data that explains or that illustrates that there is actual racism at the university. So, all of us now hold back a little bit more or get nervous when we try to be a little bit more activist or try to make our points more strongly." (FC7)

Staff expressed satisfaction that the University did not adopt the IHRA's (International Holocaust Remembrance Association) definition of antisemitism because they felt that the definition was open to abuse. From a cultural standpoint, some staff felt that the exclusion of Gaelic illustrates inequity and an East Coast urban bias towards the English language:

"Research gets put out of Scotland, but it's not the first language of a percentage of the population. I think in terms of equity from a Scottish standpoint, we have been culturally empathic." (FC2)

Staff suggested the University's inclusion agenda should support inclusion of rural groups.

6.1.5 Religion or belief

While there was a mix of positive and negative perspectives on racial inclusivity, differences in religion or belief were believed to have a negative impact on feelings of inclusion and belonging. One staff member suggested the University "…. Feels like a very white institution or a very non-Muslim or unwelcoming of Muslims." (FC8)

Another staff member called for festivals associated with religions other than Christianity to be given the same emphasis and recognition as Christmas. It was noted, "…. we could be more inclusive in celebrating other festivals… We are a multicultural society, international students, you know, so again, being welcoming to that kind of situation… Leadership should promote that kind of inclusive celebration". (FC9) Specifically, it was suggested that the University "…. could use the Christmas tree space to be a space for different kinds of celebrations, a festival of lights, let's get lots of lights for

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

Diwali, or let's get a menorah for the Jewish holiday, let's see some visible signs of other celebrations." (FC9)

Some staff expressed that inclusion and exclusion are tied into various systemic and institutional structures that make some people feel like they belong while inadvertently making others feel like they do not belong:

> ''There are more opportunities that I've seen, for women, for example, and LGBTQ communities. I think..., you know, for every inclusion, there's an exclusion. (FC9)

It was discussed by some staff that more training is needed to understand how best to support students with additional learning needs that are related to ethnic or religious diversity. An example was shared concerning how the lack of understanding and awareness had disadvantaged Muslim students taking exams during Ramadan.

6.1.6 Gender representation and careers

Majority of participating staff said the University is 'quite a safe space for women' with one arguing that, while "we have 70% females at QMU", the university has more work to do in relation to increasing gender diversity in senior management. Although there were some women in senior positions, some participants felt their visibility was reduced due to 'men holding the front-facing roles'. Committee participation and leadership were singled out.

Support for promotions and career progression featured in discussions on representation with calls for the gender breakdown of all staff who progress annually, and for a review of the academic promotions policy and guidance. Some female staff suggested they would benefit from feedback on their application prior to submission so they can obtain 'feedback that's meaningful' about 'what you need to do differently'. Female staff, in particular, felt that post application feedback was too late, and that the quality was sometimes variable.

Female staff suggested women were more likely to be working part time and some participants felt, as a result, that they missed CPD opportunities which led to challenges for career development. This was seen as a key challenge for female academics and for the University to meet its target for female academic staff that are REF eligible and returnable (FC10). Several female staff suggested the University could engage them more in discussions about workplace culture.

6.1.7 Sexual orientation

Staff feel that there are visible and strong signs of LGBTQ+ inclusion at the University. Many described the participation in Pride over the past two years and the ceremonial raising of the rainbow flag as signs of progress. While some staff described the gender-neutral toilets are a 'good sign' of inclusion, others expressed concern that the University had 'reduced the number of safe spaces for women'. The matter of all-gender toilets presented a faultline between staff respecting and implementing the rights of all people and cisgender women feeling safe psychologically and physically. It was reasoned

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

that Estates and Human Resources needed to arrive at a practical solution in what was described as a 'gender safeguarding issue'.

Concerns were raised about growing tensions between people staff presumed to be trans exclusionary who fight against non-binary staff with regard to sex-based rights:

> "Some of the trans inclusive radical feminists and the people who are non-binary are calling for a falling between the gap…because this is a battle to include everybody. We've got sex and gender that is one of the protected characteristics. But it doesn't include non-binary staff members, so there's no protection for that group and there have been various suggestions for amending the policies so that they are inclusive of people of all gender identities and none.'' (FC5)

Staff suggested the University needs to develop more consistent use of pronouns in email signatures and on online platforms, and that overall LGBTQ+ allyship and inclusion could be improved:

> "I'm wearing this lanyard of pride for, you know, as an ally, but I feel that more activism is a good thing…." (FC6)

Staff felt that some aspects of the University's systems and processes presented challenges for members of the LGBTQ+ community. They highlighted lack of texts in teaching from well-known authors from the LGBT+ community, and that the 'adoption leave policy is not for people who identify as LGBT'.

6.2 Systems, policies and processes

While staff accepted that they had a responsibility to read the various policies and understand their implications, there were requests from many staff for more support in using the policies, some of which were flagged by staff as requiring updating.

6.2.1 Recruitment

Some recruitment processes were perceived by some staff as being a barrier for international staff because of visa requirements. Some lamented that ''European candidates are disregarded because they don't qualify for sponsorship''. Some staff also criticised recruitment practices regarding payment to visiting lecturers based overseas, describing the situation as a 'huge loss' to the University. It was also felt that recruiting visiting lecturers from Global South countries had been met with a "useless hierarchy between UK and international academic staff". It was illustrated that:

> "If you want to have an international, non-UK external examiner, for example, then you are kind of actively discouraged from that, because it creates more work, paper, form filling, etc." (FC1)

6.2.2 Leave

Many staff expressed concerns about arrangements for leave, ranging from the ''adoption leave policy not being great'' for people who identify as LGBTQ+, to "compassionate leave being inadequate'', particularly for people who must travel abroad for an emergency. Concerns around compassionate/ bereavement leave came up in all facilitated conversations with some staff receiving three days, and others six days paid leave, depending on the line manager's interpretation of the policy, mood and/or relationship with the staff member. The policy was criticised for constructing family into a binary "immediate" or "extended", with "extended" family seemingly somewhat less deserving.

Some staff with caring responsibilities said that they used annual leave to give them flexibility around their working hours, although managerial attitudes toward the use of leave in the context of regular caring was seen as positive.

> "I frequently used annual leave for my dad who's gone into …. hospital. My team has been very flexible in that regard… However, I know that that's probably not something that's kind of written down anywhere, it's sort of it's a little bit dependent on where you find yourself in the institution." (FC2)

On the other hand, one staff member recalled negative experiences in obtaining carer's leave, citing that there is ''a lack of compassion towards that kind of time'' and that they are asked to explain how they will make up the time.

6.2.3 Grievance & Disciplinary

Some staff feel that the grievance policy has the most impact on EDI. They felt that 'the language in these policies and how they are implemented' need further clarification for managers, staff and trade union representatives. Some staff felt that the grievance process was predisposed to managerial gain:

> ''It's not worth taking out a grievance, particularly against somebody who's senior because they will never be upheld. Fudge or just plain no, it was firm and fair management, and it wasn't bullying or microaggression or whatever.'' FC8

Those who had experienced the grievance process felt that the policy should be revised along with the performance enhancement policy as they believe these policies do not promote equity at the University.

6.2.4 Reward and Recognition

Some staff criticised the scheduling of HR reward & recognition sessions as not being family friendly for working parents. Mainly female staff complained that these sessions were often scheduled during school holidays when they were faced with greater caring obligations. This approach to HR scheduling was flagged as a potential barrier to women's career progression at the University.

A small number of staff felt that some aspects of the reward and recognition scheme could be simplified for acknowledging staff that have gone above and beyond their regular duties:

> "…job descriptions are so broad that, to prove that you've gone above and beyond what you're supposed to be doing is actually quite difficult.'' (FC10)

They were of the view that the forms are ''too lengthy'' and ''too difficult'' and line managers should play a bigger role in nominating or selecting staff for this category of recognition. Academic staff called for more pathways for progression, arguing that there needs to be "more recognition that there are some roles that colleagues do throughout the University that might not necessarily be around research''. They want clear recognition for excellence in teaching and management, and for professional services staff.

6.2.5 Promotion and Progression

A small number of staff felt that the university's preparatory sessions for promotions ''need to be streamlined'' to offer real support for candidates. An academic staff explained how the process was unhelpful for them:

> "Although HR do run some kind of preparatory sessions, when I've been through the process, I didn't actually find that they were very well aligned with what was then happening in the presentation and the kinds of questions.'' (FC10)

Professional services staff expressed a lack of confidence in the prospects for career progression, citing that even though a supervisor and other members of their team started off on the help desk, they ''think those days are gone''. One respondent stated that they were overqualified for the roles that they undertook but lamented that there are limited opportunities for progression in their department.

6.2.6 Contract type

Several academic staff raised concerns about the use of temporary contracts that are cancelled strategically at times that benefit the University's "short term HR processes", but that are "detrimental to individual staff members and project teams.

> "Once you've worked for a certain amount of time, you automatically should be put on a permanent contract. But you know, the contract's reviewed, and then not being renewed for two months, or something like that, which is exactly the amount of time that is counted as a break in service and therefore, can't be renewed." (FC6)

Staff argued that these precarious contracts "particularly affect people who don't come from a position of privilege". They regard forms of contracting as a "premeditated approach to forcing a break in service" which indicates the University "doesn't care about people" and we "don't respect diversity".

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

Some part-time staff suggest that they miss out on important activities that can support their career development because "most of the committee meetings happen in the afternoon" and this regular scheduling excludes persons with caring responsibilities. Other part-time staff explained that ''if you're full time, you get a desk and if you're part time, you hot desk''. They view this hierarchical system as a disadvantage for part-time staff and the University more broadly.

6.2.7 Other

Concerns around 'resourcing' and shortage of staff was reported in all ten facilitated conversations. Many felt the University's generous staff leave was 'used up' by working 'overtime' to complete extra allocated jobs. Staff argued that resource limitations would negatively impact work around equity, diversity and inclusion, which it is often presented as "extra work".

Several staff also explain that there is a "lack of time to talk across our systems in the University", and they want the systems and processes to provide "protected time" for teams to talk about EDI matters.

Staff raised issues around parking cost and the implication for commuter students and staff. They argue that students who need to commute long distances for one class can be put off by this additional cost. Staff suggest that the University considers a cost-of-living support measure by waiving parking charges for students who commute long distances.

6.3 Reporting & supporting mechanisms

Only three of 10 groups of staff were clear about how and where to report incidents of discrimination, if witnessed or experienced. The remaining groups provided mixed responses, with the majority of staff stating that they were either 'not sure' or did not know where to report such incidents.

	FC1	FC2	FC3	FC4	FC5	FC6	FC7	FC8	FC9	FC10
Majority aware of support?	No	**YES**	Not sure	Not sure	**Yes**	No	Not sure	No	**Yes**	Not sure

Table 6.3.1 Groups of staff and awareness of reporting and support mechanisms for discrimination.

In the main, staff suggested they would report incidents of discrimination to either their line managers and/or Human Resources and/or the trade unions. Majority of staff taking part in the Facilitated Conversations however stated that the University could not be relied upon to follow-through on reports or to dispense justice.

"I have a real fear to use any of those policies and be seen as a troublemaker. Because whilst they [policies and procedures] exist, I don't have faith that those who are tasked with

implementing them appropriately would deal with it if I had an issue. It's about trust in management." (FC3)

Many staff said that they would not feel confident to raise an issue because they would be putting themselves through "a stressful situation for a prolonged period of time". Other staff said that they would not report incidents because of the "baggage that comes with it". Majority complained about the length of time that it seems to take to deal with concerns raised, stating "it's a lot for an individual and for anybody who's supporting that individual". One staff explained that it would be easier to leave the institution than to go through the process of reporting discrimination:

"It's very, very hard to complain about anything. If you're not a complainer at heart, it gets to such a pitch that by that point, you're probably alienated. I think, actually, the next stage is usually to leave. Because it's such a painful process." (FC6)

Many staff suggested it was difficult to raise concerns whether as a victim or as a supporter of a victim of discrimination. Some suggested the University needs to work harder to provide "a safe place for staff" to report discrimination.

Some staff reported that they found the process to be "distressing" when they needed to support students who report incidents of discrimination. One staff said that they felt unprepared to handle the situation and it was "triggering" for them because it also resonated with their own experience (FC7). The staff subsequently referred the student to the Students Union for additional support.

Chapter 7: Findings from Facilitated Conversations (STUDENTS)

Six facilitated conversations were held with 124 students across the University to elicit their range of perspectives and insights on equity, diversity and inclusion at Queen Margaret University. It is important to note that the sample cohort included four Asian students, one Chinese student, and no Black students. What follows is a summary of findings and themes related to the four questions asked.

7.1 Inclusive Culture

Students generally felt that the University was "definitely striving for inclusivity", but many expressed that they were "not sure" if the University is an inclusive place to study. Some students said that the reason they chose to study at QMU was because of the "social justice and inclusive elements". Others suggested the diversity among students makes everyone feel 'a little bit included'.

> "A lot of other people on this course didn't come straight out of high school, we went and done other things. And a lot of other universities just weren't interested in that, but Queen Margaret was really interested in what experiences we had. And yeah, it's made us feel a bit more welcome. I'm not the youngest, like, we have such a mix on the course. And it's quite nice, because I think everybody feels a little bit included in that way, nobody's kind of singled out." (FC03)

Some felt that the rhetoric of inclusivity was strong, such as the 'front facing' aspects of the University, their 'website stock photos of groups of diverse students' and 'statements' and 'posters' displayed on campus, but inclusivity in practice was limited. The student accounts provoked questions about how inclusivity is felt by diverse groups. One of the facilitated conversations included a group of 35 students, who all identified as female, able-bodied, heterosexual, and White Scottish. These students said that the University is an inclusive place to study but acknowledged that, due to their shared Scottish identity, they were 'in their comfort zones'.

> "I know of people on our course who maybe haven't had the same experience as I, but then they also don't appear from the same background as us." (FC04)

One international student who also identifies as queer and a disabled person said, 'I think on the international student front, they try their best to welcome us.' However, they suggested the University is more 'regulation focused' in how it communicates with international students:

> "If you're feeling homesick or if you want to get some cultural activities or find the cultural society or whatever, you have to do your own digging. You don't feel like it's celebrated, and, in your face, you know." (FC01)

Other international students suggested that the University could proactively encourage integrative activities where students can share and learn about each other, such as, 'bring your own food from your culture night', or 'share a movie from your culture'. Some felt that there is an effort to keep things 'neutral':

"I don't know if they're trying to cater or like not cater to too many things to keep it more neutral, but I don't know what it is. But remember, neutrality is on the side of the oppressor." (FC01)

Another international student who had studied at a different University said that the support that they receive at QMU was owing to individual factors rather than institutional factors:

"I've felt more at home at QMU than I have at other institutions. And I felt more supported. But that's also because the bar is really low, I feel, across the rest of other similar institutions. I feel supported because of individuals within departments rather than the structure itself, I suppose." (FC06)

Another international student pointed out that systems and resources were not always signposted:

"I think that some things like the resources to make it inclusive, aren't always told to us, you know, like, we're not always aware of things that we could use to make us feel more included." (FC03)

7.1.1 Sexual Orientation

Participants who identify as LGBTQ+ said that the culture at QMU is generally inclusive, but 'visibly, there is not enough diversity, in terms of representation for different groups'. Some felt that this lack of representation impacts the level of understanding and inclusion they experience.

"I've got a quite unique and different identity from a lot of people. So having, like a trans member of staff, is nothing I've ever really experienced. And it's not necessarily just having someone like you around that you can relate to, but the person might not identify as trans. It's that you feel like they don't have an understanding. They don't properly, fully get a lot of my emotions and what I'm dealing with, but they try to be as open and as inclusive as they can be." (FC03)

One student raised concern about the pride flag used by the Students' Union and the lack of understanding around upgrading it to the 'progress' variation that includes marginalised people of colour, transgender people, those living with HIV/AIDS and intersex equality rights.

"Like if we're talking about progress, and if we're talking about inclusivity, it doesn't even have like the black stripe and the brown stripe, when we know that like, people of colour, who are also LGBT have more struggle, that's the whole point that the community is progressing." (FC01)

Another student said that being asked for their preferred name is a good practice by the University because it helps with issues around gender identity. However, students experienced challenges with changing their name in different communication systems at the University.

"I think it's not integrated in all systems. So, for example, if I'm communicating with the library, I will see my preferred name there in the automated emails that they send me. But for some

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

reason, when another department say like, or the international student office, suddenly I'm dear [government name]. No, no, no, where did this come from? It must be an IT thing, but it just takes you aback." (FC01)

One student expressed that the issue of representation is a significant challenge in the teaching profession because 'teachers are scared to come out because of the cisgender heteronormative culture in teaching' (FC03). This concern was reiterated in another group where a student explained the challenges with being 'out' in schools. The student wanted help from the University in 'how to have those kinds of conversations in a professional setting'.

7.1.2 Disability

Some students presented examples of systemic barriers for people with disabilities. They pointed out the lack of desks in 'accessible spaces' and in seminar rooms. One student said they had to self-advocate for reasonable adjustments:

> "From my own experience, it comes in more of through, like personally through Disability Services, as coming to commute as an autistic person, and going in for resources and being told, well, what do you actually need? What can you offer? And they're like, no, you have to tell us." (FC06)

Some students felt support services for disabled students were limited, and that staff did not always understand how their disabilities were impacting their studies.

7.1.3 Sex / Gender

Students on the primary education courses suggested that more male students should be used in adverts to promote the programmes and address the underrepresentation of male teachers in primary schools.

7.1.4 Race and culture

The participants from minority ethnic backgrounds do not feel that the University is an inclusive place to study. Although there were no accounts of direct discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity, some students spoke of 'segregation' they observe across the campus:

> "It is not segregation times anymore. But usually what I see here, which I'm not judging, if you're an Asian student, and you don't know where to feel safe, you're going to stick with Asian students, if you're a black student, you don't know where to feel like accepted, you're going to stick with those black students. So, I just see clumps of people of what appear to be of similar ethnic groups together, and not really diverse friend groups, like it's the UN." (FC01)

One student explained that they felt 'alienated' when an email was sent asking staff and students to observe a minute silence to mark a year of Russian war in Ukraine:

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

"I think that's really an important step in order to condemn a military invasion of another country. But there are other countries around the world where the situation is really horrible, like Palestine, Yemen and Syria. Why don't we see the same happening or the same stance of solidarity with other contexts where there's kind of imperialist intervals in these countries? It's like double standards, just because of my skin colour, or that I'm not white. And it's insulting and it makes me feel excluded. I felt alienated from QMU, and this is the last thing that I want to feel in this space, where I'm undertaking my three-year journey." (FC06)

A white student in that group said, "we're going to support Ukraine, because they're European…just be upfront about it". They went on to state that was their "personal discomfort around confidently stating that QMU is inclusive". All the participants in FC06 felt that the University needed to make a 'declaration of intent' in relation to the IHRA definition of antisemitism. They agreed that many Palestinian and non-Palestinian students who support Palestine have been smeared just for liking a tweet on Twitter, regarding Palestine, and they were labelled as antisemitic.

7.1.5 Religion or belief

One student argued that the University preaches a lot of inclusivity, but this is not always practiced. The student explained that one of their lecturers had sent out an email to say Happy Eid and someone on the course complained about it, saying that "it was inappropriate". This incident resulted in a minority ethnic student being victimised because they were overheard discussing that matter with an Asian staff member. Other students in this facilitated conversation spoke about the incident and expressed that "someone should not be victimised because they're celebrating their culture and religion" (FC02). They felt that it is wrong that the attitude of some staff and students make other students and staff feel 'excluded'.

> "I don't celebrate Christmas, but I wouldn't stop someone saying Happy Christmas. You have to be open about everything. And I think, fine, there was that one incident, but it was the way it was handled, or, I guess, not handled at all, and how that lecture actually got in trouble for talking about it." (FC02)

7.1.6 Perceptions of the curriculum

Most students said that the curriculum needs to be more inclusive. Some felt that the element of inclusivity at QMU felt like a 'tick box' exercise.

> "Sometimes it does feel like they will include, like an inclusivity module. And it's like a tick box. Like, we've covered it, that that's and they move on. There's never like, adding inclusivity through everything. It's like we've literally had a module called Inclusive Practice. And then you move on as like, box ticked, let's move on. It should be on every exam; it shouldn't be a specific module." (FC05)

Students wanted inclusivity to be mainstreamed and embedded in the curriculum so that they could explore and understand equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) issues and feel more confident to deal with situations that they face on campus and on placements.

One minority ethnic student expressed that the academic staff needed to be educated on "how to deal with racism". In addition, it was suggested course did not always include sufficient content on inclusion and diversity.

> "Even the racism stuff that we have learned has been very focused on historic stuff, like slavery, which is important, but what about right now? It's like the racism is not happening. It's happening right now every single day. Why are we not covering that? You know, that's where my real issue lies, I think because it does often get brushed under the rug." FC03

> "Why is the inclusivity module that we've been given not enough? Nothing, I sat in all those seminars we've had over the four years that had to do with racism, they did not teach you a single thing on how to actually deal with racism in the classroom." (FC02)

Some students felt that the University should 'normalise' talking about EDI and that they wanted access to EDI resources so that they could learn how to respond if they were, for example, "confronted with situations of microaggression" or better support "transgender children".

> "There needs to be more in-depth, preparation for students around inclusivity, not just the sort of big talk. And you know, it's throwing all these words around, but then in practice, nothing is happening. Because you don't feel prepared, leaving knowing that you can handle any issue that gets thrown at you in the classroom. You don't feel prepared. Is it that the onus is on you to go and seek that information or should there be resources accessible through the University?" (FC02)

Students believe that having access to a suite of resources and toolkits would help both staff and students engage in more meaningful dialogue and develop greater understanding of EDI issues in different contexts.

7.2 Reporting & support mechanism

All students stated that they were unclear about how and where to report incidents of discrimination, if witnessed or experienced. When asked where they think they could report or turn to for help, most students said that they would consult their Personal Academic Tutor (PAT). Few students said that they would utilise the Students' Union. One said that the Student Services are 'pretty awesome', and another student said that the Students' Union is 'really good'.

> "There's something at the Students' Union called Help Zone. I think that's what you can approach. And they say that they're independent from QMU, so they can really advocate for you. But I don't know if there's an official QMU channel." (FC02)

One international student said that this was not covered in their induction:

> "If you want to make an anonymous complaint, or if you experience racism, or xenophobia or anything, like they didn't really flag that specifically, which I think is important, because lots of international students face that, whether on campus or not." (FC01)

Students questioned the use of PATs because the person might not be someone that they 'can confide in about such issues'. Some said that the issue would be 'handed off to so many different people' and this puts them off from speaking up about discrimination or microaggressions.

> "You're just gonna be passed on to someone, like, somebody who wants to deal with it. Because there's this feeling that nobody wants to deal with any of these kinds of issues. And whose job is it to deal with it? Yeah. Are they trained? Because if you were to go to your PAT about this matter, would they have understood how to deal with it?" (FC02)

Students said that there needed to be better signposting for support around EDI. They suggest there is some "ambivalence in the attitudes of staff" which "comes from fear" because staff "do not know how a situation will turn out" and they fear that "they will say the wrong thing". A student gave an example of how her PAT did not handle a mental health situation.

> "I've got a family history of depression, and everyone in my family has been to Uni and ended up in hospital. So, I was really stressed and had a lot of things going on and so I emailed my PAT, basically just looking for support. And my email back was a reply saying, 'watch the Secret Life of Three- and Four-year-old'. And that was it, no support or anything else. If you email somebody else, they'll say speak to your PAT. Like, I don't know where you go after that point." (FC02)

Another student said that they would email the lecturer they "feel closest to, then it can be moved on accordingly from that email". Other students expressed concern about lack of trust or comfort in discussing sensitive issues with your PAT:

> "I know that some friends that I've got, like, they've never actually had a face-to-face conversation with their PAT. That's essentially so sensitive, someone like they're probably not going to feel comfortable to do that." (FC03)

Chapter 8: Conclusions and Recommendations

The conclusions are recommendations of this EDI Culture Review are set out below.

8.1 Conclusions

This EDI Culture Review was commissioned by Queen Margaret University not in response to any negative incident or 'event', but rather as a proactive move by the senior leadership team to understand, inter alia, staff and students' overall experience of equity, diversity and inclusion at the University.

To gain a better understanding of issues of concern to staff and members, and to be able to make appropriate recommendations, the Institute for Educational & Equity worked closely with the Race Equality Steering Group (RESG), which doubled as the Project Steering Group (PSG), to undertake a review of quantitative datasets, develop and deploy a survey to students, review a sample of University policies, and to conduct a series of 'Facilitated Conversations' among staff and students.

In terms of methodological limitations, only **48 staff** and **150 students** participated in this EDI Culture Review, and some groups are missing from some datasets (e.g.: no Black students participated in the Students' Facilitated Conversations). We cannot be certain therefore that the issues identified by participants in this EDI Culture Review are the only concerns among staff and students at Queen Margaret University. Notwithstanding, despite the small sample, the detailed findings illuminate key structural and cultural concerns among staff and students. Furthermore, the review achieved its purpose of feeding back to the University through an assessment of different quantitative datasets, review and feedback on policies, and through engaging participants in a process of reflection and thinking ahead concerning inclusivity within the culture, systems, policies, and processes at the University.

The findings from the review of policies and guidance procedures suggests the University is on an intentional attempt to ensuring its staff and students enjoy a positive experience. The **context** of the policy provides two important insights. First, a historical and contemporary context of Queen Margaret University. Second, an institution on a journey to protecting and delivering the best interests of staff and students. The **text** of the policies reviewed is overwhelmingly positive. However, deeper analysis highlight tensions and gaps that can be addressed through updating (regularly), in consultation with multiple stakeholders and through engaging with contextual data. The 'Fitness for Practise Policy -ITE' appears somewhat disjointed in places and convoluted in others. The potential **consequences** of the policies are addressed by a series of questions. Potential power imbalances between staff/ students, and minority ethnic/ white staff, line managers and staff, for example, are noted. The 'Regulations Governing Disciple', in its current form, appear to carry significant risks for the University. However, the 'Appropriate Contract Use Policy (Including procedure for end of a Fixed Term Contract)' appears to be the least contentious of policies reviewed.

Although based on varying numbers per category, the findings from the internal quantitative data (staffing) shows several pay gaps by ethnicity, job role, job function, job level. The internal staff data also showed that 92.3% of the University's staff are white, which is higher than the local demographic profile of Edinburgh at the last population census[11]. The data also showed some inconsistencies in how staff ethnicity data is coded. For example, some staff of Arab heritage are coded as 'White Other' and some 'Other'.

Overall, the findings from the **student survey** suggest students think the University is both inclusive and anti-racist. Response rates across the survey however were quite small. Notwithstanding, the findings appear to show a faultline in the experience of Asian students, many of whom experience and witness racism on campus (including in the curriculum). Some White students reported experiencing racism on campus, suggesting both cultural and ethnicity-based racism are on campus. On the whole, students agreed that they had been given good support from the University with White British students the most satisfied and Asian students the least satisfied. Black students found access to University support most easy whilst Asian students found access more difficult than the other identified groups.

Overall, the findings from the **staff 'Facilitated Conversations'** suggest staff think the University is inclusive. The University's provision of services for staff and students with disability was seen as 'effective' although this area also came up for much criticism. Some processes, for example, for changing names, were criticised as being inflexible and was flagged as potentially leading to wellbeing concerns for transgender staff and students. Cisgendered females raised concerns about physical safety in gender neutral toilets, and debates about trans people were described in terms of a 'war'. Several concerns were raised about line managers' interpretation and application of policies and procedures governing leave, especially bereavement/ compassionate leave. There was lack of clarity regarding systems and/or processes for reporting discrimination. Some staff reported experiencing racism at the University, and some raised concerns about the retention of BAME staff and the absence of BAME from senior leadership roles.

Overall, the findings from the **students' 'Facilitated Conversations'** suggest they think the University is inclusive. However, students called for greater diversity in staffing (e.g., Trans staff). Students on the primary education course recommended that more male students should be used in adverts to promote the programmes, which could help address under-representation of male teachers in primary schools. Some students of minority ethnic backgrounds do not feel the University is an inclusive place to study, and some reported feeling 'excluded' and alienated. Most students criticised

---

[11] As with all cities in Scotland the largest single ethnic group in Edinburgh is White. In total at the time of the 2011 census 91.7% of people in Edinburgh were White. White: Scottish was the largest subgroup. A total of 70.2% of people were White Scottish in 2011. A further 11.7% were Other British, 7.9% were Other White and 1.8% were Irish. White - 91.7%; Asian - 5.5%; African - 0.9%. The largest non-White ethnic groups in Edinburgh were Asian (5.5%), African (0.9%), Mixed (0.8%), Other Non-White (0.8%) and Caribbean / Black (0.2%). In total, 8.2% of Edinburgh's population reported that they were Non-White in the 2011 census. This percentage has more than doubled from 4.0% at the time of the 2001 census. Edinburgh Population 2023 (worldpopulationreview.com)

the curriculum as not being inclusive and suggesting attempts to make it inclusive felt like 'tick box'. Students generally believe that the Students' Union is more responsive to concerns raised about discrimination. Students were asked what the University could do to make its support services more accessible, and they suggested improving signposting and communications, being more consistent across localities and departments, anonymising forms and creating links with other local universities in order to help integrate overseas and students of minority ethnic heritage, and being more proactive in its support from the International Office.

As a whole, the findings of this EDI Culture Review are important because they highlight a range of structural factors (e.g.: policies, systems, processes, etc), and cultural factors (e.g.: line managers' use of discretion in implementing policies, staff engagement with curriculum inclusivity agendas), which, together, have shaped and/or influenced the experiences of staff and students in both negative and positive ways. They also confirm that staff and students believe their University is inclusive, although they demand more in this area.

An outcome of this review was to provide focused and actionable recommendations to improve policy and practice in EDI at Queen Margaret University. Although this review was not commissioned to confirm or reject 'structural' and/or 'institutional' inequality, the evidence suggests these forms of inequalities exist at the University and are manifested in their daily lives.

The main findings from this EDI Culture Review are that:
- Staff and students generally consider the University to be an inclusive environment
- The University has a number of staff pay gaps
- Staff and students are concerned about ethnic and gender representation in the University's leadership structure
- The ethnic profile of staff is below the census data for Edinburgh (e.g.: there are few BAME staff at Queen Margaret University compared with the population of Edinburgh)
- A number of students have either witnessed and/or experienced racism in clubs and societies, teaching spaces, at student Union events, on placements, accommodation, from other students, from academic staff, and from the curriculum.
- Some students didn't always feel their curriculum is inclusive
- There appears to be a faultline in the experience of international students and students of South Asian heritage
- Students felt the Students' Union is more responsive to concerns about discrimination compared with the University
- Systems for reporting discrimination are not well known by staff and students
- Whilst some policies reviewed appear non contentious, other appear convoluted and unclear and some appear to carry a degree of risk if not changed (or if tested)

Finally, it is important to highlight three areas of good practice highlighted during the 'Facilitated Conversations'. First, students describe the Help Zone offered by the Students' Union as an inclusive and supportive space for them. Second, staff and students acknowledge the work of the PALS team in supporting the successful orientation and integration of international students. Third, the series of

Institute for
Educational &
Social Equity

Capacity Development
Research
Institutional Support

seminars facilitated under the theme "Decolonising Now" are believed to be constructive and beneficial to staff and students interested in work on decolonising the curriculum.

8.2 Recommendations

The recommendations associated with this EDI Culture Review are listed in order of priority below. These recommendations are based on the quantitative data reviewed, the policies reviewed, the data from the 'Facilitated Conversations'. Where possible, actions should be prioritised according to the following timescales:

- P1, occurring within six months of the report
- P2, occurring within six to 18 months of the report
- P3, occurring between 18 to 36 months of the report

It is recommended that the University:

8.2.1 Systems and data

Collects data on staff at least twice annually, in order to get a more comprehensive and more accurate picture of the characteristics and profile of staff. [P1, P2]

Commits to encouraging staff to declare identity characteristics, whilst also implementing systems to streamline and 'tidy' the data. [P1]

8.2.2 Pay Gaps

Studies and eliminate multiple pay gaps across identified for (i) minority ethnic staff, (ii) female staff, and by (iii) job function, and by (iv) level, and (v) job role. [P1]

8.2.3 Staff contracts and grades

Examines and monitors staff contract type (e.g.: part time, fixed term, v permanent contracts) by gender and ethnicity. One way to do this could be through encouraging and offering targeted support to BAME staff to apply for Pay Awards [P1, P2, P3]

Examines and eliminates the disparity of the dominance of White UK staff receiving discretionary pay awards. [P1, P2]

8.2.4 Staff and diversity

Increases the overall percentage of staff of BAME heritage, including in senior leadership roles – academic and professional services to reflect and/or exceed the percentage of ethnic diversity within the student population; considers an ambitious aspirational 3 years rolling target. [P1, P2, P3]

Studies and understands how and why it has recruited far fewer UK born South Asian and Black staff compared with South Asian and Black staff who are migrants. [P2]

Set 3–5-year aspirational targets for increasing the numbers of BAME and female staff in senior leadership, in both academic and professional service roles. [P1, P2]

8.2.5 BAME staff recruitment (advertising and attracting)

Adopts and implements a range of recruitment methods and options to boost recruitment of BAME staff, including at senior level. These could include, for example:

Advertising [P1, P2, P3]

Use multiple platforms, including via:
- The Voice: Britain's Favourite Black Newspaper - Voice Online (voice-online.co.uk)

- BAMEed: BAMEed Network – Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic Educators

- Higher Education Race Equality Group (HERAG) and Principal Fellow Higher Education Academy (PFHEA) jisc listings

- EDI leads in other UK universities (accessible via AdvanceHE 'connect' portal)

- The following job sites could also be used: https://www.diversityjobsite.co.uk, Stonewall jobs board, https://diversejobsmatter.co.uk/ , https://www.evenbreak.co.uk/en, timewise and charity jobs.

Direct engagement with BAME Community [P1, P2, P3]
Asks academics and professional services staff of BAME heritage to share job adverts with people in their networks.

Direct recruitment [P1, P2, P3]
Uses direct recruitment. Within the UK Higher Education sector, this practice is quite common for senior white staff but less so for BAME senior. This might be more difficult for some professional services jobs.

Recruiters [P1, P2]
Requires that recruiters, where used, return a racially diverse shortlist, and make them aware of the University's priorities for increasing ethnic diversity in staffing.

Spell It Out on the Advert [P1, P2, P3]
'Invites' staff of BAME heritage to apply by stating it explicitly in adverts.

Shortlisting and interview panel [P1, P2, P3]
- Ensures that all members of shortlisting and interview panels undertake 'safer recruitment' training and/or training in 'Unconscious Bias in Recruitment'

- Ensures ethnically diverse panels are used as standard for interviews (even if this means inviting someone external to the University to join a panel or delaying an interview or both).

- Implements the Rooney rule principle – i.e.: interview at least one BAME applicant meeting the essential job criteria.

8.2.6 Training & development

Requires senior leaders and line managers (academic and professional services) to undertake a suite of anti-racism/ EDI training. [P1, P2, P3]

- Racism in HE, microaggression and anti-racism
- Allyship
- Unconscious bias
- Cultural competence
- Decolonising the University

Provides staff (professional services and academic), and students with:

- 'Space' and opportunities for staff to talk about EDI concerns and opportunities within and across teams to promote more and deeper connection among people at the University beyond their day-to-day roles [P1, P2, P3]

- Interactive (face to face) or synchronous training. [P1, P2, P3]

  o Racism in HE, microaggression and anti-racism
  o Allyship
  o Unconscious bias
  o Cultural competence
  o Decolonising the Curriculum
  o How to support students with additional learning needs and disabilities
  o How to support trans people (staff and students)
  o How to foster a sense of belonging among staff and students
  o Inclusive language (mandatory training for all staff recommended)
  o Policy review and analysis (to include a broad range of interests, including trade unions)

Provides, specifically:

- Academics with targeted training in curriculum inclusivity and practical ways of how to go about this [P1, P2]

- Personal Academic Tutors with training on how to address EDI issues raised by students [P1]

- Provide first and second year undergraduate with compulsory face to face training in EDI via dedicated EDI modules in both years, undertaken by all students; provide postgraduate students with compulsory online training [P1, P2]

8.2.7 Resource & support

- Commits to continued close working with line manager to engage in workforce planning, and to also work closely with trade unions to understand and alleviate concerns about staffing levels [P1, P2, P3]

- Provides grants to international students with disability who cannot access the UK government's Disability Students' Allowance (DSA) [P1, P2, P3]

- Supports and promotes a collaboration between the International Student Office, the PALS team and the Students' Union to implement targeted orientation support programmes for international students [P1, P2]

- Recruits an ethnically and culturally diverse staff team in the International Office, and provide existing and new team members with ongoing training in Cultural Competence in order enable them to better support the needs of international students, and to act as cultural brokers for them where necessary. Training however should not be a proxy for recruiting an ethnically and culturally diverse International Office team [P1].

- Refocuses the role of International Office staff from one of perceived recruitment and compliance to taking on a more active role in supporting students when they arrive at University [P1]

- Signposts available services aimed at protecting students' and staff mental health [P1]

- Designs and signposts opportunities for students and staff to engage in cross-cultural mixing, collaboration and learning [P1, P2, P3]

8.2.8 Curriculum

- Continues to develop and promote new programmes that will attract and retain a more diverse range of students (e.g.: skills-based programmes) [P1, P2, P3]

- Intensifies work on decolonising the curriculum; involves students in co-creation activities [P1, P2]

- Ensures students are introduced to a range of real-life EDI scenarios and content on their courses (e.g.: the Gender Recognition Act and other legislations crucial for practice-based professions). [P1, P2, P3]

8.2.9 Communication, Culture & Community

- Raise profile of EDI/ Anti-racism across the University through a co-ordinated and resourced 'Communications and Engagement Plan.' [P1]

- Includes male students in programme adverts, especially in disciplines where male students are underrepresented (e.g.: Primary Education, Allied Health). [P1]

- Works with students to co-create an inclusive language guide; seeks input from the Students' Union for this activity [P1, P2]

- Promotes and celebrates festivals, religious and otherwise, beyond Christianity; develops a calendar and central hub for advertising these [P1, P2, P3]

- Designs and promote two-way EDI learning and engagement opportunities for the local community and the University (e.g.: the University could lead and/or support EDI conversations with its partners, e.g., health providers) [P2, P3]

- Supports the launch a disability staff network [P1, P2]

- Clarifies its stance regarding the definition of antisemitism put forward by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) [P1]

- Upgrades the Pride Progress flag used by the Students' Union [P1]

- Raises awareness of its reporting process, and monitors user engagement in order to ensure communication is getting through and that the processes are adequate [P1]

- Convenes a Working Group (e.g.: a sub-Committee of the RESG) to better study and understand what appears to be faultlines in the experience of Asian students and international students; works with the International Office and the PALS team to address concerns identified [P1, P2]

- Convenes a Working Group to examine the feasibility of conducting teaching in Gaelic and for translating published and online materials and resources into Gaelic [P1, P2]

8.2.10 Leadership of EDI

- Establishes clear EDI/ Anti-racism priorities and commitments for the senior leadership team, and members of University Court, including in areas of visibility, commitment and accountability. [P1]

- Invites the members of the PSG/ RESG to serve as a reconstituted Project Oversight Group or Project Delivery Group. A Project Oversight Group would oversee the implementation of the EDI Plan and ensure funding and other accountability mechanisms are in place. A Project Delivery Group would have an active role in supporting the delivery of the EDI Action Plan, and would report to the Project Oversight Group. It is important to ensure work undertaken in these roles is properly accounted for in staff workload [P1]

- Facilitates the appointment of an EDI Lead or Ambassador at unit level (e.g.: academic Schools and Professional Services Directorates) to more effectively mainstream and embed EDI in unit level work processes and across the University. Members of the Equality & Diversity Committee, and ILTA Champions might be relevant here [P1, P2]

- Ensures the newly appointed EDI Adviser has autonomy to make decisions and receives adequate resources to successfully undertake the demands and opportunities of the role [P1]

- Mandates that EDI is placed as a Standing Item on the agendas of all formal meetings of Committees and units (e.g.: academic Schools and Professional Services Directorates), and discussed, such that EDI becomes a normal part of language and practice [P1]

- Implements changes to the policies and procedures reviewed as part of this review; ensures other policies and procedures are reviewed and updated [P1]

- Integrates EDI into annual PER objectives for all staff regardless of role or level [P1]

8.2.11 Progression and careers

- Continue to support part-time staff with targeted Continuous Professional Development (CPD) opportunities, likely to improve their chances of promotion/ progression [P2, P3]

8.2.12 Accessibility

- Provides more user-friendly desks for wheelchair users in seminar rooms [P1, P2, P3]

- Makes the University's website more accessible [P1, P2]