Inclusion Matters Advisory Board Meeting 1
Tuesday 24 September 2019

Minutes

In attendance : Susan Johnson, Chair (SJ), Bernadine Idowu-Onibokun (BI), Cheryl Millington (CM), Dorothy Monekosso (DM), Patrik Ohberg (PO), Derek Wann (DW), Claire Warwick (CW),
       Rachel Archbold (RA) (Project Lead)
       Julie Wilson (JW) (Board secretary)

Apologies : Jeremy Sanders (JS), Sarah Sharples (SS), Javad Yazdani (JY)

	Item	Action
1.	Board Introductions Brief introduction and overview of background from each Board member. RA delivered an overview of the 3 members who had sent apologies.	
2.	Declarations of Interest A declarations list to be compiled. SJ to provide a form for circulation to capture any interests of the Board members, with emphasis on those of a pecuniary nature. JW to circulate. The list should be publically accessible on the Project website. JW to liaise with Leeds for publishing of the Declarations list.	SJ JW JW
3.	Terms of Reference The Chair invited comments on the draft ToR and requested comments from the Board on any perceived omissions or revisions to scope. Requested consideration to be given to the role of the Advisory Board and the purpose of the meetings.	
3.1	CM commented that the Board should be clear on the purpose of the Project and what success looks like. RA advised the initial bid document set out a high level overview of the project, Work Packages (WPs) and activities within each WP had since been honed. Revisions to delivery had been made due to issues such as loss of partners and changes to the core team in the project. Agreed - the Board should monitor performance, ensure KPIs are clear and use reporting to ensure the project deliverables are on track. JW to add to ToR document and circulate for approval *(appendix 1)*	JW

3.2	Reporting to EPSRC	
	RA confirmed that EPSRC have required reporting which is understood by the Project lead team, such as Researchfish and regular financial reporting. Delivery of which will be advised on and supported by Durham University's Research Innovation Services (RIS) team.	
	RA advised EPSRC are due to undertake a full day visit to the Project on 31 October.	
	Agreed that following the EPSRC meeting a summary report will be circulated to the Board. To include an overview, key points arising, actions arising, project objectives, key deliverables and probability of achievement.	RA/JW
3.3	Advisory Board Chair and Deputy Chair	
	The Board logged formal agreement of Susan Johnson's appointment as Chair of the Advisory Board, as per ToR.	
	Self nominations for the role of Deputy Chair are invited. To be submitted by all interested parties to Julie Wilson at inclusion.matters@durham.ac.uk within two weeks of receipt of minutes.	ALL
3.4	Meeting minutes and agendas	
	Agreed that minutes and agendas will be published on the Project website. Appropriate redaction of minutes may be implemented in line with GDPR requirements.	
3.5	Review of Constitution and Working Arrangements	
	Agreed will be subject to a mid-term review. To be tabled for Meeting 3 Agenda.	JW
3.6	Duties at the end of the Project	
	Agreed ToR would be updated to include: 'At the end of the project ensure proper closure, to cover due diligence around data repository requirements, clarity on where the research is held and that all funds are audited and accounted for'. JW to update ToR.	JW
4.	Work Package Updates, Exceptions and Risks	
	Verbal updates received from all WP leads.	
4.1	WP1 – Leeds (Shared Characteristics and/or Interests Mentoring)	
	Stephen Scott (SSc), Vania Dimitrova (VD), Robert Adams (RAd)	
	SSc gave an overview of the activity. Designed to support retention of under-represented groups in STEM, in the North across both Industry and Academia. All preparatory work has been undertaken, SUMAC to be used for participant matching. Training, face to face and online through the Platform will be delivered to participants. There is a handbook to support participant engagement.	

Target of 45 mentoring pairs across the consortium, average 5 per project partner. Not limited to academic partners, the mentoring should also support industrial retention and progression.

Proof of concept undertaken with a pilot of 2 pairs, prompting amends to the initial focus, which was shared characteristic, feedback given indicated interests feature prominently in successful matching and mentoring relationships.

Internal recruitment has commenced with emails to staff networks and presentations at events. Leeds plan to use social media to align with the push out at Durham.

Following the first allocation panel today, 4 participants have been registered to the WP.

Risk – concerns that the need to register again in SUMAC to enable matching may be off-putting for participants as they have already signed up through Online Survey and completed the registration and evaluation questionnaire.

Risk – matching will require human intervention in addition to the SUMAC questionnaire. This is a single point of failure as this activity sits with one person who has recently resigned from the project (but will stay within the organisation). Recruitment activity to find a replacement will be done.

Board Questions
Mentoring relationship length?
Minimum 6 meetings at 4-6 week intervals determined by the pair at the first session. Handbook covers expectations management.

What happens if the relationship does not work?
Mentoring Training Officer is first point of call who will support, or challenge.

Matching is this purely a paper exercise?
No, personal intervention works better – a mentee's list of requirements may not look achievable and this is where discussion comes into play. SUMAC will offer 3 matches and the mentee will review and select the one they feel is the best match.

How is success measured, will you monitor, modify and change throughout?
The pilot set the scene, there will be little in flight adjustment. The Project Evaluation Team will give more information on measures of success.

What is the escalation route for issues such as a mentor raising concerns about mental health issues?

	The handbook contains advice on avenues of support, Leeds already run a mentoring scheme and support is available from Leeds Organisation Development team. *Is there any obligation to inform/involve the employer?* No. *Why widen the scope to include shared interests?* Supported by the literature review carried out by the Evaluation team. Cultural sensitivity can be achieved by someone who doesn't share a characteristic, based on their previous experiences of others, sometimes the shared interest is of more value although a shared characteristic can lend itself better to empathy.	
4.2	WP3 – Leeds (Platform) Vania Dimitrova (VD) We identified at the first meeting that the Platform needed to support training materials, communication forums, provide access to industrial partners. We then determined that there needed to be a web presence from which participant recruitment could be done and project management space. Research was undertaken which identified 2 suppliers who could cover the scope of requirements. Following pricing quotation and spec a decision was taken to go with WebAnywhere as the supplier. We then decided a website was needed to cover off initial participant sign up and provide a web presence for the project, and that the Platform would be held separately with participants given sign in details following acceptance onto an Activity. The basic Platform is ready to go live now, and will grow and improve as the project develops. *Questions* GDPR – what provision has been made with regard to compliance and data management and security? (VD) No personal information is held in either the Platform or Website. (JW) Confirmed all personal information is held in Online Survey, administered by the Evaluation Team at Durham. Noted – the Board were assured that data management regulatory requirements were fully complied with. The Board requested sight of the data management plan, along with detail of accountability at each level and approval/sign off. *(appendix 2)*	 JW
4.3	WP4 – Newcastle (Networking and Leadership Development) Sharron Kuznesof (SK), Judith Rankin (JK)	

	An overview of the two strands of work contained within the WP was given (SK)	
	Networking and Leadership – maximum 10 participants. Formulated using best practice literature, with an action learning approach. The first of 2 meetings will provide a career conversation using the GROW model, supporting production of a Personal Development Plan. The second meeting will discuss the potential offering for development activities from across the partners supported by a small budget for travel etc. Will run from Jan – Aug 2020 with a mid term check and debrief at the end.	
	Advisors are being trained, with evaluation after training and an evaluation workshop at the end, to give us an understanding of best practice. Northumbria is the evaluation partner, and will be at the training workshops and develop a protocol.	
	1 Day Workshop – taking place at Newcastle in April 2020. To support ECS participants in developing a personal leadership narrative, reflecting on what they aspire to be and to explore what leadership means to them. A mix of activities and talks.	
	Sustainability is a key theme for Newcastle as they have just embarked upon the New Act 5 year Fellowship scheme and hope to draw some learning from this activity.	
	Board Questions *Is the workshop a mixed gender group?* Yes – Early Career Scientists as per the definition within the scope of the project. See ***(appendix 3)***	JW
	How will impact be measured from a 1 day workshop? Pre-session and Post-session questionnaires.	
	What is the Networking spread? How will you map out the reach and ensure participants are able to leverage their expanded network, have you considered public sector organisation board positions? This is a challenging piece. For most the focus is on external visibility and the networking opportunities are primarily within the 16 Project partnership. We do need to think about accommodating goals as far as possible and consider all avenues and development opportunities.	
	How are participants selected for the Activities? This is part of the overall selection process undertaken by the Allocation Panel. See selection criteria ***(appendix 4)*** and Process ***(appendix 5)***	JW

4.4	WP5 – Northumbria (Industry Collaboration) Roger Penlington Established in order to share best practice and engage the community directly in the activities. 3 strands of activity. Began by collating public facing information of an EDI context from the Industry partners, with an aim of seeing how this led to practice within the workplace. At first engagement was slow due to the long lead time in from application to activity, this has since picked up pace considerably. Work shadowing – whilst with the host on a designated activity of mutual benefit , participants will also gather information on how EDI policies translate into practice on the ground – what works and what doesn't within an organisation and do the policies reflect the environment or is there a disconnect? Workshops – being prepared for Business. To prepare participants to carry out collaborative research with industry. Opportunities to engage with partners, develop collaborative working relationships to develop joint funding applications., Running January to May 2020. EDI within EPS – full day event, 12 December 2019. Covering a range of topics such as progression, imposter syndrome, influencing policy and culture, developing resilience. ***Board Questions*** *How many participants in each activity?* Workshops, 50 participants per event. Work shadowing – target 6 placements. There is limited scope and invariably interest lies around range of activity such as Big Data for example, it has to be mutually beneficial for the Industry partner. *Why the term 'Shadowing'* Placement indicative of a fixed/regular time period, we didn't want to constrain by implied timescales. *On the ground testing of the public facing EDI statements – how do you intend to extract the lived experiences from the publicised information?* Through the evaluation activity in WP6. We don't self evaluate in WP5. There will be discussion with participants throughout activities, and the industrial partner engagement will help us with that. *Define 'public facing'.* This means EDI policy statements, which may be internally facing to staff members. The Industry partners provided all policies and procedures, things which don't fit into statutory reporting. They are very open to share and fully	

	aware there are 2 levels of what goes out. Stanley Black and Decker for example have global policies and statements but on a local level, distinct differences are apparent.	
4.5	WP6 – Durham/Northumbria (Evaluation) Helen Cramman (HC) We will evaluate both the impact and the process of implementation. We are gathering data around HEI EDI policies, process and training. We monitor and observe the Participant Allocation Panel (PAP). Evaluation across the activities will be in the form of questionnaires, interviews, surveys and observations, with an emphasis on making the burden as light as possible on participants. WP6 will do a rigorous job of collecting the data. Evaluation have not defined what success looks like, this is determined by WP leads who have been asked to define, what success looks like, the aim for participants, universities and industry partners. Sequence of activity is to administer the Baseline Survey (which is shared only with the Evaluation Team), follow up with evaluation activity into the summer, in September we will pull all the data, evaluate and write the end of project evaluation report in December 2020. The literature review done at the outset was used to inform evaluation as well as assist partners in developing the activities. Outputs will be defined by the Publications Board and we expect that as well as Journal outputs we would expect to see practitioner materials as an outcome. (RA) sustainability is a key consideration for us in how we pragmatically take the findings and build upon these through alternative funding and support. Durham has funding available for impact related. (HC) Risk – lack of engagement across partners, we have requested HEI data and information on policies, procedures and training but as yet have had only 2 responses. Even to confirm that data doesn't exist or is disproportionate in effort to extract.	
4.6	WP2 – Durham (Reciprocal Mentoring) Rachel Archbold (RA) Hull were originally a partner in leading this WP, however they pulled out in the early summer due to staff departures following restructure. This has resulted in a significant rework of how the training element of the activity will be delivered, and places additional burden on Durham as the remaining WP lead.	

	It is a reciprocal mentoring arrangement where both parties contribute and learning is undertaken on both sides. 2 participant types, Senior Leaders (in roles which can influence change, policy and culture) ECS – early career participants with a caveat that this may extend to individuals more established in their career who are looking for the next step in their leadership career. There will be a bespoke training element and pairs will commit to a minimum of 2 mentoring sessions within a 6 month period. This may lend itself to more but we need to be realistic around the time commitment that can be made by those in senior leadership roles. The relationship will need to be self-defined but we would hope to see an extension of this to include other activities such as shadowing opportunities. We expect around 20 pairs and would hope to attract up to 3 Senior Leader participants per organisation.	
5.	Schedule of future meetings JW to send current availability to SJ to see if any additional dates can be accommodated. JG then to circulate agreed dates and suggestions for venues to the Board	JW JG