

School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED)

Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Pulse Survey Report - 2021

Introduction and background:

Since 2020, SEED have put additional resource and energy into improving Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI), through the creation of the Associate Director for EDI role, ensuring that the Staff EDI group meets regularly through the year, the creation of a new student EDI group, and the formation of our Athena Swan Self-Assessment Team. There have been several new initiatives in this period, in the form of the Inclusive Recruitment Pilot, EDI focused PGR supervisor training sessions, and ongoing work into multiple areas, including reviewing student admissions data; creating resources for PGR supervisors on working with students who are taking parental leave; creating an EDI marketing strategy for the school; and analysing workload data through an EDI lens.

As part of monitoring the impact of this work and how well we are doing in relation to EDI, we wanted to 'check in' with staff and hear experiences of the EDI culture within the school. To do this, we ran the EDI Pulse Survey at the end of semester 1 in 2021, using the seven new Advance HE Athena Swan core survey questions. Going forward, we plan to run this short survey annually in October, followed by a report on the findings to Senior Leadership in November/December, and then a written report to staff, like this one.

In this report we summarise the 'take home' messages and describe the action points we (the EDI team in SEED, including the AD for EDI, the EDI staff committee, and the SR Director) have already agreed arising from the findings of the survey, followed by a presentation of some of the data in a little more detail.

If you have any questions or want to talk more about the Pulse Survey, or any of the ongoing EDI work in the school, please do not hesitate to contact us at edi.seed@manchester.ac.uk.

Response rate:

The overall response rate to the survey was 21%. Whilst as a percentage of staff in SEED, this figure is quite low, it is relatively good for a survey of this nature in the school. We are aware of concerns raised by some staff around not feeling comfortable completing the survey in case they were able to be identified. There is a clear and widely understood tension between the desire to collect detailed data on the characteristics of survey participants (which potentially then facilitates the best EDI outcomes) and the need to protect colleagues' anonymity. We had hoped that the limited number of people with access to the dataset (the Associate Director for EDI, the Director of Social Responsibility, and the School Data Analyst) would have helped to reassure colleagues. However, we have taken on board the feedback we have received on this, and we will be reviewing this ahead of the next survey. Ultimately, the aim is for everyone to feel they can take part.

Summary findings and action points:

Action points

In terms of immediate actions, we are looking at:

- **Continuing to address issues of bullying, harassment, and discrimination across the school.** Last year we published the SEED guidance on this, defining these issues and making clear that we would not accept bullying, harassment, and discrimination in the school. The University Report and Support platform allows people to report in both an identifiable way and anonymously: <https://www.reportandsupport.manchester.ac.uk/> - this can then involve talking with a trained harassment support advisor.

The EDI committee have discussed this area in several meetings and we want to ensure that all members of staff feel they have someone to talk to should any of these issues arise. The full list of staff in the SEED EDI team can be found on the intranet [here](#). Staff can approach **any** of these individuals if they wish to informally discuss EDI issues including harassment, bullying and discrimination. See also the point below about EDI training.

- **We want to support staff from across the school to set up networks such as those seen at a University level** (e.g., a SEED LGBT network). Anyone who wishes to set up a network like this should contact edi.seed@manchester.ac.uk to discuss how to get this established and the support required.
- We have recently reviewed and edited the **SEED Core Hours policy** to make the requirements clearer. This will be re-circulated to all staff soon.
- At a SEED level we have encouraged people to complete the relevant **EDI training** provided by the University (details of which can be found [here](#)). Whilst this is not mandatory, we continue to push for making this possible at a University level. The emphasis on EDI training in the new University EDI strategy in development is also indicative of its importance. We have fed back the specific point about EDI training on HNAP below, and SEED staff are also involved in creating and providing new HNAP EDI focused inputs. At a Faculty level, no HNAP training is currently mandatory and staff can pick all workshops to make up their 18 unit credits. We continue to work on providing further EDI training for staff at a SEED level (for example the PGR supervisor training in 2021, and the open conversation with DASS for teaching staff in 2022), and to encourage that *all members of staff attend* these training sessions.

In the discussion of the quantitative findings (below), we also highlight other areas that the SEED EDI team are going to investigate further, following this survey.

1. Qualitative summary findings:

Below we summarise the main areas where we received qualitative feedback, illustrating with brief quotes.

Achievements:

A number of comments showed that staff recognised positive EDI related changes in the school recently:

“Good to see more diverse staff being recruited to department in terms of gender, ethnicity and nationality.”

“I think we do a good job of promoting EDI, but stress that this is a continually evolving conversation and one that needs ongoing review.”

Core hours:

The importance of scheduling meetings within core hours was noted, highlighting that we must ensure that people are aware of and follow the policy on this:

“There are still expectations for meetings out of core hours from some line managers. This is not inclusive [of] those with caring responsibilities who rely on the flexibility that the University offers.”

Bullying, discrimination and harassment:

There were some comments about bullying, discrimination, and harassment within the school and concrete suggestions of how we can improve our management of this:

“SEED & university more widely: I think there is a strong culture of referring colleagues (and students) to online links, webpages, lengthy written guidances when it comes to addressing EDI issues, including discrimination, harassment, bullying, stress and anxiety, etc. I feel more 'personal touch' approaches, e.g., having someone experienced and trained to consult or get support from, would be beneficial”

“Bullying complaints are not investigated or taken seriously.”

“...there have been multiple events of discrimination, bullying, harassment and microaggression by a specific powerful member of staff towards students and other staff that everyone knows about and no one does something about it. It is clear to me that you need to rethink the means and reassurance you provide as a University in order for students and staff to submit formal complaints.”

Representation:

There was a suggestion that we could do more to ensure that staff feel represented and included at a local level:

“As an LGBT+ person I struggle to see a presence of my community beyond pride month. the EDI in SEED is fantastic and I feel supported with my identity but it would be nice to connect with other LGBT people, researchers etc. who share similar identity and life experiences. I know there is the UOM LGBT network but maybe a SEED one would be good?”

Training:

Questions were raised about requirements for EDI training and whether such training is mandatory:

“Training has been made available but the people attending are those already working on the area. Our HNAP training had an EDI session that was NOT mandatory to attend (one of the only sessions that was not) and the issues discussed were only a single point of EDI (how to respond if a student discloses sexual assault). This means most people have not had sufficient training in these areas and those engaging are those most actively working on it already.”

2. Quantitative summary findings:

Where possible (i.e., where group response numbers are sufficient), the following data have been tested using standard statistical methods to identify patterns in between-group responses to the questions. No statistically significant patterns were identified across the dataset. Nevertheless, it is important to recognise that:

- A lack of significant findings does not ‘prove’ that systematic patterns between groups do not exist. It simply demonstrates that we do not have sufficient evidence *in this dataset* to reject the hypothesis that these patterns do not exist.
- It is quite possible that statistically significant differences between groups could have been observed were response rates higher (particularly in those groups that had very small numbers, and so could not be tested).
- These results (which are concerned with population-level patterns) do not detract from the important qualitative findings mentioned above (which are concerned with individual experiences).

Overall

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Overall	3.82	3.37	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.59	4.46

Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI

Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team

Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team

Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff

Q5 – My line manager supports my career development

Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team

Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

All scores sit within a range from 3.25 – 4.46 (on a 5-point scale with 5 indicating strongly agree). The questions relating to career development and flexible working (Q5 & Q7) scored most highly across all respondents. The lowest scores, whilst still sitting in the neutral range on average, were around bullying and harassment, and gendered COVID-19 impact (Q2 & Q4). It is notable that these are the questions that were identified by colleagues as not applying to everyone; and in the absence of a ‘N/A’ option we have an over-representation of ‘neither agree nor disagree’ answers, which may have lowered the average in these cases. More details on this issue are given in the limitations section below.

Staff Role/ Department

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Academic	3.86	3.36	3.90	3.23	4.26	3.53	4.43
PS	3.72	3.46	4.16	3.38	4.44	3.80	4.56
Overall	3.82	3.37	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.59	4.46

Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI

Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team

Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team

Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff

Q5 – My line manager supports my career development

Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team

Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

Department (Academic)

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
ARCH	2.00	1.50	2.25	4.00	4.25	3.00	4.75
GDI	3.86	3.35	3.76	3.24	3.88	3.76	4.65
GEOG	4.06	3.35	3.76	2.71	4.29	3.12	4.53
MIE	3.95	3.39	4.08	3.36	4.31	3.61	4.32
PEM	4.17	3.83	3.83	3.08	4.42	3.42	4.33
Overall	3.86	3.36	3.90	3.23	4.26	3.53	4.43

Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI

Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team

Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team

Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff

Q5 – My line manager supports my career development

Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team

Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

It should be noted that individual departmental numbers are quite small in most cases. The starkest observation are the scores in Architecture for Q1-3, which are concerning, though arise from a very small number of responses.

Disability

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Yes	3.69	3.56	4.00	3.19	4.19	3.25	4.31
No	3.85	3.34	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.61	4.47
Overall	3.82	3.37	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.59	4.46

Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI

Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team

Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team

Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff

Q5 – My line manager supports my career development

Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team

Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

Ethnicity

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Asian - Indian	3.25	2.88	3.25	3.25	3.88	4.00	4.38
Black - African	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Black – Caribbean	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	1.00
Chinese	4.75	4.00	4.25	3.75	4.50	4.50	4.75
Mixed – White/Black Caribbean	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	5.00
Other Asian	4.00	3.67	3.67	3.00	4.67	3.67	4.67
Other	3.67	3.67	3.83	3.00	4.00	2.83	4.00
Other Mixed	3.67	4.33	4.33	3.00	4.67	3.67	4.67
Prefer not to say	3.38	3.08	3.44	3.07	4.19	3.38	4.25
White	3.96	3.38	4.09	3.28	4.35	3.58	4.54
“BAME”	3.70	3.52	3.78	3.26	4.15	3.70	4.30
Overall	3.82	3.37	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.59	4.46

Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI

Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team

Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team

Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff

Q5 – My line manager supports my career development

Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team

Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

This includes the data ‘as collected’, as well as the composite “BAME” category (highlighted). Whilst we recognise that “BAME” has multiple issues as a grouping and as terminology (and as an EDI team we avoid it where possible), it has been included here to provide a composite category to aid comparison between white staff who form the majority in the school, and those from minoritised ethnic backgrounds.

It should be noted that the numbers in most of these groups are very small: eight of the groups have 8 or fewer replies, and six of them 4 or fewer.

Gender

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Man	4.14	3.74	4.26	3.66	4.40	3.70	4.68
Non-Binary	4.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	4.00
Prefer not to say	3.14	3.00	3.43	3.08	4.29	3.43	4.21
Woman	3.77	3.19	3.83	3.03	4.21	3.56	4.36
Overall	3.82	3.37	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.59	4.46

Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI

Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team

Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team

Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff

Q5 – My line manager supports my career development

Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team

Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

The number of responses in the non-binary category are extremely low. Nevertheless, responses to Q4 & Q6 would benefit from future consideration.

Grade

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
2	3.00	3.33	4.00	2.67	4.33	3.33	4.67
3	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
4	4.20	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.40	3.00	3.60
5	3.00	3.14	3.43	3.43	4.57	4.00	4.71
6	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.60	4.40	4.40	5.00
7	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	3.50	4.50
8	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Overall	3.82	3.37	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.59	4.46

Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI

Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team

Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team

Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff

Q5 – My line manager supports my career development

Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team

Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

Position

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
GTA	4.50	3.67	4.50	3.17	4.33	4.17	4.67
Lecturer (T&R)	3.86	3.36	3.64	2.79	4.21	3.50	4.43
Lecturer (T&S/TF)	3.96	3.37	4.07	3.36	4.25	3.54	4.39
Post-Doc Researcher	2.86	3.14	3.14	3.57	4.43	3.86	4.00
Professor (T&R)	3.80	3.80	4.53	3.53	4.40	3.67	4.73
Reader (T&R)	4.00	3.00	3.67	2.33	4.00	2.67	4.00
RA	3.67	3.00	3.11	2.78	4.00	3.11	3.78
Senior Lecturer (T&R)	4.00	3.00	3.69	3.23	4.23	3.38	4.46
Senior Lecturer (T&S/TF)	4.14	3.29	4.57	3.14	4.86	3.86	4.86
Senior Tutor	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00
Overall	3.82	3.37	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.59	4.46

Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI

Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team

Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team

Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff

Q5 – My line manager supports my career development

Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team

Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

Religion

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Christian	4.24	3.76	4.21	3.59	4.45	3.62	4.48
Hindu	3.20	2.80	3.00	3.20	3.80	4.20	4.20
Muslim	4.50	5.00	4.50	3.00	4.50	3.50	5.00
Sikh	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
Spiritual	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.00
Other	2.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
No religion	3.88	3.31	4.02	3.25	4.30	3.65	4.51
Prefer not to say	3.19	3.00	3.44	2.71	4.25	3.13	4.38
Overall	3.82	3.37	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.59	4.46

Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI

Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team

Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team

Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff

Q5 – My line manager supports my career development

Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team

Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

Service

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
< 3 Years	3.81	3.40	4.00	3.17	4.35	3.77	4.33
3 – 5 Years	3.74	3.31	4.00	3.33	4.48	3.59	4.52
5 – 10 Years	3.91	3.00	3.83	3.32	4.43	3.52	4.57
10 – 15 Years	3.88	3.56	3.69	3.13	3.88	3.38	4.50
> 15 Years	3.84	3.56	4.08	3.36	4.08	3.48	4.44
Overall	3.82	3.37	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.59	4.46

Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI

Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team

Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team

Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff

Q5 – My line manager supports my career development

Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team

Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

Sexual Orientation

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Bisexual	4.00	3.60	4.00	2.90	4.50	3.50	4.00
Gay Man	4.00	3.71	4.29	3.43	4.71	3.86	4.86
Gay Woman	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	5.00	2.00	4.00
Heterosexual	4.00	3.48	4.04	3.44	4.25	3.69	4.58
Other	2.67	2.67	3.67	3.00	4.33	4.00	3.00
Prefer not to say	3.23	2.84	3.55	2.75	4.23	3.09	4.23
Overall	3.82	3.37	3.96	3.25	4.30	3.59	4.46

- Q1 – The Department/PS Team leadership actively supports EDI
- Q2 – I am satisfied with how bullying and harassment are addressed in my Department/PS Team
- Q3 – My contributions are valued in my Department/PS Team
- Q4 – My Department/PS Team has taken action to mitigate the adverse gendered impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on staff
- Q5 – My line manager supports my career development
- Q6 – My mental health and wellbeing are supported in my Department/PS Team
- Q7 – The Department/PS Team enables flexible working

Though response numbers are very small in several groups, the scores for Gay Women stand out in relation to other groups and require further investigation.

Survey issues raised by colleagues:

Some survey participants identified that some of the questions did not apply to everyone, and that there was not a suitable option for this. According to reports from colleagues and following the analysis of the data, this appears to have resulted in a distortion of our data towards the “neither agree nor disagree” option. To take a conservative approach that ensures no issues are erroneously overlooked, we have not taken action to correct or control for this effect in our analysis, which means that our analysis is likely to be less favourable than reality.

The questions in the survey were taken from Advance HE’s Athena Swan survey “core questions”. We chose to stick to these questions alone in order to ensure brevity and outcomes that could meaningfully contribute to our current work towards the Athena Swan Silver Award. However, colleagues identified that another impact of this decision was that the survey was primarily focused on gender, and that other key issues (e.g., ethnicity) were not given the same prominence. We will seek to better reflect this in future surveys, which is also consistent with the approach in the Athena Swan – it has historically focused on gender and is now adopting a more intersectional approach.

Some colleagues reported they were unsure of the meaning of Q4, which may have an impact on results for this question.

Finally, some colleagues communicated their belief that this was ‘just a survey’ and would not contribute to any meaningful change. We hope that this report and the actions arising from it is able to provide confidence in colleagues that issues that emerged will be addressed with concrete actions.