

Inclusion Matters Advisory Board Meeting 2
Monday 10 February 2020

Minutes

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

Apologies : Patrik Ohberg (PO) Jeremy Sanders (JS), Javad Yazdani (JY)

	Item	Action
1.	Welcome Brief introduction of attendees.	
2.	Declarations of Interest A declarations list to be circulated. The completed list should be publically accessible on the Project website. JW to liaise with Leeds for publishing of the Declarations list.	JW JW
3.	Minutes of the last meeting Agreed as correct. To be published on the project website.	JW
3.1	Actions arising from the last meeting 3.1.1 ToR – amended to include reporting. No further comments received from the Board. Project end date to be updated to reflect the extension granted by EPSRC. 3.1.2 Performance monitoring – the Board have requested a dashboard report style for future meetings which reports on progress against KPIs. 3.1.3 EPSRC meeting summary report. Following the October 2019 visit. Verbal update given which covered the key points of the visit. Written report to be circulated prior to the next Board meeting. 3.1.4 Advisory Board Deputy Chair. 2 nominations: 1. Bernadine Idowu-Onibokun 2. Javad Yazdani	JW JW RA/JW

	<p>Minutes to note that the Board supported the appointment of Bernadine Idowu-Onibokun as Deputy Chair. Chair to contact Javad Yazdani regarding the outcome.</p> <p>Documents and website to be updated accordingly.</p> <p>3.1.5 Data Management Plan – document received, no comments.</p> <p>3.1.6 ECR Definition – document received, no comments.</p> <p>3.1.7 Participant Selection process – documents received, no comments.</p>	<p>SJ</p> <p>JW</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Future Meetings</p> <p>Locations agreed as follows:-</p> <p>Meeting 3 – Monday 22 June 2020, London (BI)</p> <p>Meeting 4 – Thursday 15 October 2020, Durham</p> <p>Meeting 5 - February 2021, TBC</p> <p>JW to contact BI regarding arrangements for June meeting.</p> <p>JW to contact partners with Doodle Poll for February date and location suggestions.</p>	<p>BI</p> <p>JW</p> <p>JW</p> <p>JW</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Workstream Updates</p> <p>The Board received written updates from all Workstreams and the Project management (general).</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Key Areas of Discussion</p> <p>RA gave a general update on the project and key priorities for the Stakeholders going forward:</p> <p>Recruitment</p> <p>Across the piece has been slower than anticipated. This theme had been echoed at the EPSRC visit in October where EPSRC shared that other projects within the Call had experienced some recruitment issues.</p> <p>Durham had a visit from another project, Strathclyde (6-7 Feb 2020) where they had outlined their preliminary findings around participation issues which highlighted identity (a wish to be seen as a Scientist and not identified by a characteristic) ability to take time out (workload), Supervisor support and encouragement, and a reluctance to disclose in the case of a hidden characteristic.</p> <p>There may be reticence to speak out (mentoring), or be associated with a project related to under-representation amid concerns this could be damaging to the individual's career. There had been an instance where an image bank asset (which had full consent for general use within the University), was</p>	

	<p>subsequently withdrawn as the individual was not comfortable with their image associated with a project related to under-represented groups.</p> <p>Leeds previously raised concerns about the length of the sign up questionnaire, however this includes evaluation data which must be gathered as baseline in order for the research and evaluation to take place.</p> <p>Continuity across the partnership may have impacted momentum, due to changes in key personnel and partners across various workpackages from the outset, and the Project Manager being out of the business for an extended period.</p> <p>What has worked well: direct approach to participants, change of focus, where the benefit of an individual activity has been highlighted, rather than an invite to sign up to a project with a high level overview.</p> <p>Next Steps</p> <p>The next Stakeholder meeting will focus on recruitment and drawing up a solid recruitment plan for immediate implementation, across all partners including those who are not leading on workpackages.</p> <p>Sustain the interest of people who we have signed up already and ensure we do not subsequently lose them from the project.</p>	
7	<p>Questions from the Board</p> <p>A lengthy discussion followed around how the Board could support and enable the work of the project partners to achieve the objectives set out in the original bid.</p> <p>A number of questions were raised by the Board on the verbal Project update and from the project update reports:-</p> <p>Recruitment</p> <p>Are the recruitment issues felt to be around nomenclature, is this a wider issue around the project offering itself, or is it a communication challenge.</p> <p>Clarity on the recruitment comments being project-wide or relative only to Reciprocal mentoring. Confirmed that this was a project wide issue.</p> <p>What can the Advisory Board do enable recruitment within the Project? There is a risk mitigation issue here for the Board, who require assurance that recruitment will take place and steps are being taken to enable this.</p> <p>Clarity was sought on the different types of participant, and how recruitment was undertaken with each of the types, noted:</p>	

- Early Career Scientists – all activities. Recruitment through online sign up with all recruitment signposting to the Online Registration process;
- Established Career (WP1 mentoring participants) Recruitment through online sign up with some standard and some direct recruitment approach, directed to the Online Registration process;
- Senior Leaders (WP2 reciprocal mentors) direct approach signed up through a matching interview.

Is the Project adequately resourced (finance, people) to drive recruitment, and what communications channels and expertise are open to you?

The Board were advised that resources are limited, there is limited ability to vire between funding pots. Specialist recruitment expertise is not considered key to success. It is more effective when Stakeholders promote the activities. Within own organisations, and supporting recruitment for their workstreams at partner organisations. Done by making direct approaches, and providing platforms to publicise the project are key to raising awareness and promoting the activities. The available time of people to do this is a constraint, particularly with in kind time committed to the project for the majority of workstreams.

The Board commented that if recruitment is driven externally, then this does not encourage the cultural change to be embedded institutionally at each partner organisation. There is a need for Workstream leads to draw on key people in their organisations to advocate and champion this, for there to be some longevity and continuation of change. Or once the project ends, everything stops.

The Board asked which standard ECR forums are accessed regularly by colleagues in the Sciences, and can we recruit/raise awareness through them?

Noted - VITAE, Research Development Framework, UKRI Research Development Concordat.

The Board asked the workstream leads to consider plans are in the event recruitment is not successful.

JW/RA

Project leadership and accountability

Discussed:-

Who does what at each partner institution;

Are all partners adequately engaged with the project;

Are all Workstreams adequately engaged with the project;

Is the PI engaging with the wider project and visibly leading;

Is there support at an institutional level.

	<p>Outcomes and impact</p> <p>The Board asked the Project Lead what would you want to change as an outcome of the project?</p> <p>Noted - shared practice and behaviour changes, which would lead to a more welcoming environment, so that all have a feeling of belonging, and feel supported to achieve their full potential. As well as across the partner organisations involved in this project, partners hope to disseminate the learning across the other projects funded under the EPSRC call. Engagement across the wider IM call network is taking place to enable shared learning.</p> <p>The Board asked for clarity on which of the workstreams will directly deliver that.</p> <p>Noted - expect all the workstreams will contribute to this. As well as practitioner focussed outputs, an ideal outcome for the project would result in a research paper which would provide a platform for us to work from with an academic context.</p>	
8.	<p>Comments from the Board</p> <p>Potential barriers to participation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supervisors, they are gatekeepers, or supporters. What convinces them that this is something which is of value? 2. Confidence, for someone at Early Career stage to converse with a Pro-Vice Chancellor about difficult issues – their instinct may be to run in the other direction. <p>Support from leaders is key. In some organisations there is strong support for activity of this kind, with leaders approaching people on a personal level to encourage them to take part.</p> <p>Partners in the project to identify who is the person in their organisation who will drive engagement with the project. Use these champions to bring people on board.</p> <p>Ensure that partner organisations recognise the project contributes as an enabler of strategy. Senior leaders need a clear line of sight showing how a shift in culture is an enabler of strategy, and that projects such as these are a way to achieve this change. It has to link to the growth and success of the wider organisation for the benefit to be appreciated.</p> <p>The Board recognise a programme of this size alone cannot change culture, 10 projects of this nature running concurrently may make a small dent, what is required is something which provides a starting point for change, EPSRC are</p>	

	<p>looking for longevity as an outcome of this funding. This is a pilot programme. An ideal legacy of this project would be to provide a couple of fantastic tools to be used to effect cultural change. This is a time limited window of opportunity in which to recruit and deliver meaningful interventions which will embed sustainable change.</p> <p>The Board discussed output types, both research and practitioner based. A suggestion was to position outputs as saleable products that can be marketed. For example, a flexible working policy makes a huge difference attracting and retaining people, the impact of which can be measured. The output does not have to be an academic one to have impact. There is a need to identify what will enable sustainability beyond the end of the project.</p>	
9.	<p>Recommendations</p> <p>The Board are keen to actively support and enable recruitment efforts. 2 Board members offered to act as ambassadors for recruitment and attend events/meetings where available to promote recruitment. Production of a video clip talking about the benefits of mentoring and role models for use in promoting the project was suggested as a marketing material.</p> <p>The project should define a recruitment plan at the next Stakeholder meeting, which supports recruitment for all activities, across all partners.</p> <p>Stakeholders to work positively to gain as much traction out of the next 6 – 9 months as possible. Identify the drivers within each organisation to gain support at a senior level for the project. Identify champions to drive recruitment and raise the profile of the project to aid recruitment, involving others to embed change.</p> <p>The workstream leads should revisit the original objectives outlined in the bid and confirm the activities are aligned to deliver against these objectives. Consideration to be given to longevity and impact – what will be the sustained benefit beyond the project end. Suggest a mapping exercise is undertaken.</p> <p>Identify what activity in the project will deliver new knowledge, articulated in a way the academic community values and understands – papers, outputs. KPIs, end of project actions.</p> <p>Increased interaction between the Board and the Workstream leads, including communication between meetings.</p> <p>Revised reporting format to the Board to measure KPIs and progress in each workstream, to give Advisory Board greater insight into activity.</p>	

	In person, or video conferencing workstream updates at the next Advisory Board meeting.	
10.	<p>Actions</p> <p>Reporting to the Board – requested Workstream leads and PI attend the next Advisory Board Meeting (virtual or in person).</p> <p>Revised information format – workstream progress reports to be pulled into a dashboard, presenting information on progress against KPIs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard KPIs relating to milestones and progress • Soft KPIs to be developed around culture change and positivity, measured through evaluation • RAG rated reporting <p>Arrange a call between the Chair and PI.</p> <p>Chair to write communication to PI & Project leads</p> <p>Feedback to the Advisory Board after the next stakeholder meeting, challenges, opportunities, reactions</p> <p>Produce a resource plan for the Advisory Board, roles, people, locations and type of contribution, DI, DA, in kind. 1 page summary.</p> <p>Advisory Board to advise of networks or contacts they have which the project can access to increase visibility and support the success of the project.</p> <p>Take forward actions with DW and BI regarding recruitment support and liaise with the workstream leads to facilitate this.</p>	<p>JW</p> <p>JW</p> <p>JW/SJ</p> <p>SJ/JW</p> <p>JW</p> <p>JW</p> <p>All</p> <p>JW</p>