Circular

Evaluation and Review of Institutional Race Equality Policies Overview Report

04 October 2007   **Ref: W07/40HE**

To:	Heads of higher education institutions in Wales
Summary:	This circular accompanies the dissemination of the Gus John Partnership 'Evaluation and Review of Institutional Race Equality Policies Overview Report'.
Further information:	Contact: Vikki Burge Telephone: 029 2068 2218 E-mail: vikki.burge@hefcw.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

1   This circular accompanies the dissemination of the Gus John Partnership 'Evaluation and Review of Institutional Race Equality Policies Overview Report'.

2   The Overview Report is attached as **Annex A** and will also be available in the consultation section of the HEFCW website: www.hefcw.ac.uk.

BACKGROUND

3   In September 2006, we commissioned The Gus John Partnership (GJP) Limited to review Race Equality Policies (REPs) in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Wales. GJP had conducted a similar exercise for the Equality Challenge Unit on behalf of the Higher Education Funding Council in England in 2002/2003 and for the Scottish Higher and Further Education Funding Councils in 2003. As agreed with us, GJP's approach was developmental and was geared to assisting institutions to build upon good practice, identify gaps and eliminate barriers to progress.

4   This evaluation was designed partly to ensure that all institutions in Wales are now complaint with the requirements of the Act and to identify ways in which they might individually and collectively develop. The exercise also reviewed current approaches and identified good practice across the sector in both race equality and equality and diversity practice more generally.

5   We wished to assist institutions in developing their equality policies in a holistic and coherent way. This pointed to a need for effective links to be made between staff and student issues and actions within institutions, and between different aspects of equality. In a Welsh context, this included addressing issues related to the Welsh language. Generic areas for further development within institutions, as with institutions elsewhere in the UK, included the need for advice on impact assessment, monitoring and consultation practice.

6   We are now formally publishing the overview report of the review, which is also available on our website.

THE OVERVIEW REPORT

7   The report states that the sector in Wales is showing increasing evidence of good practice in implementing the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (RRAA) 2000, with institutions appearing arguably more confident about their practice than evidenced in other sectors.

8   The report focused on the way in which institutions dealt with race equality to meet the requirements of the Act, including the identification of good practice. Some further issues raised included the following:

   i.   Most institutions presented a clear policy and action plan identifying the General (And Specific) Duties of the RRAA 2000;

   ii.   The majority of institutions demonstrated evidence of engagement with the specific duties of the Act, especially with regard to functions and monitoring data relating to students;

   iii. Several institutions reflected the race equality policy and the provisions of the RRAA in their institutional and corporate plans, ensuring that promoting race equality was fully integrated with their strategic goals;

iv. The networks established by Equality/Diversity Managers and by Human Resources staff have been instrumental in improving practice and developing key areas of research;

v. Most institutions included a focus on recruiting more home based Black and Minority Ethnic students, especially from among the groups that do less well in the schooling system;

vi. Few institutions provided evidence of engagement with the third strand of the duty to promote good relations between people of different racial groups;

vii. In the majority of cases, the University Council or Governing Body had an appropriate degree of involvement in the institution's efforts to meet the requirements of the legislation and relate those to wider institutional goals;

viii. Two-thirds of the institutions identified residential services, estates, catering and security as functions with relevance for race equality with other parts of the equality agenda, including consideration of multiple identities;

ix. Across the institutions, there is clear evidence of training and support for staff and students.

9   In addition to the written report, the findings were also reported to the sector via a sector-wide dissemination event in Cardiff on 10 May 2007.

10   The Council is committed to funding through this mechanism for a period of three years in the first instance, with an annual rise to take account of GDP.

HEFCW'S ROLE AND RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW

11   HEFCW has assisted the higher education institutions in Wales to develop, maintain, monitor, and report on the operation of their race equality policies since 2002. We have a role under the RRAA in monitoring the performance of the sector through the publication of data on the racial groups of teaching staff in funded institutions. However, given our wider statutory responsibilities with regard to the governance and management of funded institutions, we have also adopted an active role in monitoring compliance with the requirements of the Act and assisting institutions to go beyond their statutory duties to secure the benefits of diversity. Robust action has been taken to address any areas of weakness or non-compliance identified in the study, including support and guidance from the GJP.

RESPONSES TO THIS CIRCULAR

12   Any queries regarding this review and/or circular can be made either via email or by post to the following contact:
     Vikki Burge
     Disability and Diversity Coordinator
     Higher Education Funding Council for Wales
     Linden Court
     Ilex Close
     Llanishen
     Cardiff
     CF14 5DZ
     Email: vikki.burge@hefcw.ac.uk

Higher Education Funding Council for Wales

The Gus John Partnership Limited

Evaluation and review of race equality policies and action plans within Welsh Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in relation to the requirements of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000.

Overview Report on the Performance of the Sector in Implementing the RRAA 2000

Summary Assessment

Preamble

i) The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 placed a duty on public bodies to have in place a race equality scheme/policy, to publish the policy and an implementation plan to demonstrate how that policy will be implemented and its impact assessed. Public bodies in England and Wales, including Higher Education Institutions, were required to publish their policy/plan by end May 2002.

ii) In the first half of 2006, The Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW) signaled in a circular: Race Equality Policies, Action Plans and Reports (ref: W06/20HE) its intention to commission consultants to undertake an evaluation and review of Race Equality Policies and Action Plans and annual monitoring reports within Higher Education across Wales. In September 2006, The Gus John

Partnership (GJP) Limited was awarded the tender for the review. GJP had conducted a similar exercise for the Equality Challenge Unit on behalf of the Higher Education Funding Council in England in 2002/2003 and for the Scottish Higher and Further Education Funding Councils in 2003.

Findings

iii) The Sector in Wales is showing increasing evidence of good practice in implementing the Act. Institutions are arguably more confident about their practice than we have experienced in other parts of the United Kingdom. Of the 12 institutions whose progress we evaluated on the basis of an examination of their policy and their monitoring reports and visits to the institution, two were found to be non-compliant with the requirements of the RRAA. By 'non-compliant', we mean that they do not demonstrate sufficient evidence of carrying out their functions with due regard to the requirements of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act. Corrective action has been recommended for them. That is at one extreme and is counterbalanced by exemplary work being done in many other institutions. This work is giving rise to examples of good practice that are of immense value and have policy implications not just for the sector in Wales but across the UK generally.

iv) The sector in Wales enjoys the advantages of small size, whatever the disadvantages might also be. There are impressive collaborations between institutions and much sharing of good practice. The networks established by Equality/Diversity Managers and by Human Resources and development staff (when they are not the same people) are instrumental in improving practice and developing key areas of research, as is the Equality Challenge Unit's Welsh Liaison Group.

v) Some areas of concern remain, however.

a) The tendency to be fixated on the Specific Duties of the Act and see attracting more black and ethnic minority students and staff as the primary focus of action to promote race equality, thereby encouraging the impression that the Act has nothing to do with white people once they behave well towards black people. It is

2

important for institutions to bear in mind that the Specific Duties are essentially the means by which the General Duty is to be discharged and evidence provided of engaging with each of its three strands, each of which relates to white people as beneficiaries, no less than black people.

b)   The tendency to see promoting race equality through the curriculum, teaching and learning as principally geared towards securing more equitable education outcomes for black and ethnic minority students, home base and overseas, while presumably leaving the majority white group untouched at worst, or at best benefiting equally from the high quality teaching, etc., that would have secured those better outcomes for black students.

c)   The failure to link race equality with other parts of the equality agenda. This is of concern both in relation to staff and students with multiple identities who, clearly, experience their daily living holistically, as well in relation to the way institutions respond to the requirements of the different strands of equality legislation.

d)   The failure to actively encourage black and ethnic minority students and staff, domestic and overseas recruited, to use the RRAA and act in their own self interest as well as in support of the institution's equality goals which benefit everyone.

e)   Not enough evidence of middle managers embracing responsibility for mainstreaming race equality in their areas of responsibility.

f)   Not enough emphasis on the need to celebrate, respect and validate majority cultures even as one ensures that they do not seek to displace the cultures of the heterogeneous groups that constitute the so-called black and ethnic minority communities. In this connection, given the evolving social, economic and cultural scene in the new and equally heterogeneous nation that is Wales, the Welsh Language Scheme and the issue of national and regional identity, one would wish to see greater links being

made between that phenomenon and the statutory responsibility institutions have to implement the RRAA 2000.

g) Most if not all institutions are in the market for overseas students, the majority of whom are from ethnic groups other than white. Many come from learning cultures where the relationship between student and teacher and the dynamics of assessment are vastly different from what they encounter in Britain. Moreover, in an increasingly globalized learning environment, the design, content and delivery of curriculum cannot be seen as having nothing to do with the profile of the student population or of the teaching staff. In this regard, the work being done at the University of Glamorgan and elsewhere on internationalization and its implications for curriculum planning, content and delivery is especially pertinent.

h) Given the extent of the interactions at all grades and levels of seniority across the sector in Wales, it should not be possible for two institutions to be non-compliant with the RRAA 4 years after the Act became effective.

Additional Issues Emerging from the Review

vi) Language

a) We found terminology in use in some institutions which was disturbing. Specifically, we found repeated references to 'non-whites' and to 'ethnic people' when referring to black and ethnic minority people.

b) Some institutions had difficulties with the wider issue of language. Terms such as "racial ethnic minorities" or "people of different races" were commonplace.

vii) Positive Action

a) There is some confusion about Positive Action with some institutions seeing this as being the means by which to achieve race equality. Few demonstrated a clear understanding of the concept as being a mechanism by which proactive steps are taken to correct imbalances and that, as such, it is a strategy that invariably results from monitoring, impact assessment and evaluation. It was not generally understood that to adopt positive action measures in the absence of information about an institution's performance with respect to black and minority ethnic target groups could be a form of stereotyping that presupposes certain actions or attributes as associated with those groups.

Summary Recommendations

viii) We recommend that HEFCW monitor the performance of the two institutions judged to be non-compliant, having already indicated the active steps they should take to make rapid improvement, to ensure that the CRE does not have to identify them and stipulate action for improvement.

ix) Institutions need to define more clearly the objectives within functions through which race equality will be promoted, the activities that will deliver those objectives and the measures that will be put in place for monitoring performance against them.

x) There is a need to embed notions of antiracism across all of the institution's functions that are identified as race equality relevant and for these to be seen to be tied to the RRAA General and Specific Duties.

xi) Training must be shown to be reflective of the above and also focused on race equality principles and values as well as on roles and responsibilities, especially of senior and middle managers and members of Governing Boards.

xii)   Front line and ancillary staff and all stakeholders must be assisted in   an appropriate manner to develop an understanding of the Race Equality Policy and the responsibilities it places upon them. There should be clear systems of support for such staff as they seek to operate within the provisions of the Policy.

xiii)   All institutions should ensure that external collaborators such as placement providers and training partners are subject to protocols, at   least, that define the relationship between the institution and them in a manner reflective of the institution's policy or their own, assuming the institution judges the latter to be appropriate.

xiv)   Communication and consultation, especially with internal stakeholders, must be seen to be interactive and not just about passing on information or posting it on the website.

xv)   There needs to be a greater stress on curriculum, learning and teaching in terms of establishing benchmarks and defining criteria for teaching and learning from an anti-racist perspective, irrespective of the number of black and ethnic minority students and staff in the institution.

xvi)   Institutions may wish to consider establishing procedures and processes to allow examination boards and internal and external moderators to interrogate not just courses but policies such as the Race Equality Policy, Equal Opportunities Policy, Inclusiveness Policy, etc., and the extent to which they are reflected in course content, delivery and assessment and in tutorial arrangements and other forms of student support.

xvii)   Policies/Plans should indicate more clearly how good practice (e.g., in relation to conducting impact assessment) would be shared across the institution.

xviii) The Council/Board of Governors should have written in to the institution's race equality policy/plan how they would collect the evidence that shows the institution to be compliant with legislation and to be operating in all its functions in accordance with their strategic aims.

1.0   Review of Performance across the Sector

1.1   The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 placed a duty on public bodies to have in place a race equality scheme/policy, to publish the policy and an implementation plan to demonstrate how that policy will be implemented and its impact assessed. Public bodies in England and Wales, including Higher Education Institutions, were required to publish their policy/plan by end May 2002.

1.2   The HEFCW provided guidance to the HE Sector as to how institutions should approach the task of formulating a Policy/Plan. That guidance supplemented the circulars and Code of Practice from the Commission for Racial Equality that explained the requirements of the Act and how institutions in the Sector should set about ensuring that they were meeting them.

1.3   Guidance was also provided by the Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) both in writing and through planned inputs from officers in the ECU.

1.4   In 2003, ECU evaluated the policies and implementation plans submitted to HEFCW by the Sector in Wales and provided confidential feedback to each Institution. Following that evaluation, institutions received advice and guidance from ECU and HEFCW either at arm's length or through visits to individual Institutions.

1.5   In 2004, HEFCW received from institutions Race Equality Policies and Action Plans that had been revised on the basis of the ECU evaluation as well a monitoring report covering the year 2003-2004. Since then, an annual monitoring report and, if appropriate, updated Race Equality Policy or Action Plan has been submitted to HEFCW each July.

1.6   In the first half of 2006, HEFCW signaled in a circular: Race Equality Policies, Action Plans and Reports (ref: W06/20HE) its intention to commission consultants to undertake an evaluation and review of Race Equality Policies and Action Plans within Higher Education Institutions across Wales. In September 2006, The Gus John Partnership (GJP) Limited was awarded the tender for the review. GJP had conducted a similar exercise for the Equality Challenge Unit on behalf of the Higher Education Funding Council in England in 2002/2003 and for the

Scottish Higher and Further Education Funding Councils in 2003. The HEFCW agreed the evaluation tool the GJP proposed to use for the review and provided the Partnership with the policies/plans and monitoring reports submitted by the Sector. GJP was not given the confidential evaluation reports produced for institutions by the ECU from their 2003 review.

1.7 It was not within the remit or the scope of this review to examine the extent to which institutional practice and the way black and ethnic minority people, individually or collectively, experience the institution matched the content of the policies and monitoring reports we reviewed. We therefore did not examine individual cases, live or closed, nor did we conduct one-to-one interviews or focus group discussions with students and staff. It means, therefore, that even in institutions where we have identified and commended good practice, there could well be complaints from black and ethnic minority staff and students about what they experience as discriminatory conduct.

2.0 Method

2.1 The Gus John Partnership conducted an evaluation of the bundle of documents for each institution which the HEFCW provided and produced a preliminary evaluation report for discussion with designated personnel in each institution. Where necessary, that documentation was supplemented by information from the institution's website. Visits to the institutions provided GJP with the opportunity to seek further information or clarify issues arising from the examination of the documents submitted. They also allowed the institution to update or supplement information already provided and give GJP a fuller understanding of the approach to applying the Policy/Plan and promoting equality and diversity more generally across the institution.

2.2 In a letter to institutions in October 2006 seeking their support for the review, Professor Philip Gummett, Chief Executive of HEFCW, gave the remit and scope of the review as follows. To examine:

- Whether each institution's race equality policy and action plan is aligned with the requirements of the RRAA and is adaptable to changing cultures and policy constraints

- Whether the institution understands the robust requirements of the RRAA and are implementing them through an equally vigorous Race Equality Policy, which is implemented in practice throughout the institution

- The extent to which the institution's articulation of its vision and strategic goals is informed by Equality and Diversity values and principles

- The extent to which the institution's race equality policy is embedded in and informs other institutional functions and policies and the wider life of the institution

- The efficiency and effectiveness of institutional monitoring procedures, including race equality impact assessment, and how the results of such monitoring are used to inform change and/or consolidate good practice.

2.3   Following discussion with the institutions, GJP revisited the preliminary evaluation reports, taking into account the information and any further documentation provided by the institution, and produced a confidential evaluation report for the HEFCW.

2.4   The evaluation provided to each institution, therefore, indicates:

- the extent to which the Policy/Plan submitted is considered capable of assisting the institution to meet the requirements of the legislation and make race equality integral to its culture and functions

- the extent to which annual reports and monitoring data relate to the actions to which the institution committed itself in the previous or current action plan

- the relationship between the institution's approach to promoting race equality and its other institutional goals, including its response to other areas of equality legislation

- where additional work is deemed necessary to improve the policy and action plan and to enhance the institution's capacity to fulfill the requirements of the Act and mainstream race equality, making it organic to the way the institution functions

2.5   As agreed with the HEFCW, GJP's approach was developmental and was geared to assisting institutions to build upon good practice, identify gaps and eliminate barriers to progress.

2.6   In addition to the discussions GJP had with the institutions, we also held discussions with the National Union of Students (Wales), the University and College Union, Unison, Equality Challenge Unit, the Equal Opportunities Commission, the Disability Rights Commission and the Commission for Racial Equality. In relation to the first three of those, GJP sought to gain an understanding of the issues their members and officers have identified with respect to implementation of equality legislation and the way institutions respond to the needs and circumstances of members of target groups. Following telephone interviews, a brief questionnaire was sent to each organization requesting monitoring information. We also held a telephone interview with the Welsh Assembly Government.

2.7   In reviewing institutions' Policy/Plan, GJP used a template that allowed each institution to be provided with a summary evaluation and overall assessment as well as a more detailed analysis of evidence in the Policy/Plan and monitoring reports to support the requirements of the legislation.

2.8   <u>Rationale</u>

The analytical "tool" was developed from the broad assumptions that institutions should:

➢ Understand that the RRAA was born out of the Macpherson Report and its stress on institutional forms of racism (and has been seen by many to be a corollary to the formal specification of Indirect Discrimination within the Race Relations Act 1976).

➢ Understand that, in consequence, institutions should be able to isolate, analyze and review all of their functions in relation to the RRAA, the significance of institutional racism in general and principles and concepts of antiracism and race equality in particular.

➢ Be in a position to demonstrate that they have not only carefully considered the fundamental requirements laid upon them by the RRAA but they have reflected on them in such a manner as to demonstrate how they are actively putting them into practice. Specifically, this includes providing evidence of active engagement with each of the three strands of the General duty.

➢ Understand that while it has become customary to link equality with 'diversity', promoting diversity is not the same as eliminating institutional racism or other forms of institutional discrimination and promoting race, disability, or gender equality.

➢ Be able to locate the processes and procedures through which they are mainstreaming race equality and that are inherent within the broader functions of:

  ▫ <u>Communicating</u> and interacting with all significant constituents and stakeholders

  ▫ <u>Targeting and monitoring</u> specifically identified change related activities within functions

  ▫ <u>Impact assessment</u> of the whole policy in terms of the General Duty and addressing racism, antiracism and promoting equality of opportunity

  ▫ <u>Training and needs analysis</u> in relation to the whole policy cycle exercise, where communicating, targeting and monitoring, impact assessment and training and needs analysis are seen to be the essential generic ingredients of any institutional policy development cycle.

<u>Checklist</u>

The policy analysis "checklist" (applied at the end of the analytical overview of the documents submitted) was developed as a further, more detailed tool with which to analyze more precisely the manner in which the criteria above were being applied.

Pro-active engagement with the General Duty,

- to eliminate racial discrimination
- to promote equality of opportunity
- to promote good relations between people of different racial groups

➢ Definition of relevant functions and the integration and mainstreaming of racial equality through these functions

➢ Plans for an inclusive communication and consultation strategy

➢ Procedures for analytical target setting and monitoring

➢ Procedures for impact assessment and regular review, together with definition of responsibilities for further action, and procedures for publication

➢ Plans for support and training, including analysis of training and development support needs where necessary.

3.0 Summary Evaluation and Overall Assessment for the Higher Education Sector

3.1 This overview assessment for the Sector uses the same criteria for evaluation as for the individual institutions.

3.1.1 Proactive engagement with the General Duty:
to eliminate racial discrimination
to promote equality of opportunity

to promote good race relations between people of different racial groups

Areas of encouragement:

3.1.2   Most institutions presented a clear policy and action plan identifying the General (and Specific) Duties of the RRAA 2000. Some had embedded the Duties in an imaginative and proactive manner. Where a robust Equal Opportunities Policy and corresponding institutional practices pre-dated the race equality duty, institutions imaginatively meshed the requirements of the RRAA with the principles and values that underpin their equal opportunities practice and are implementing the RRAA within an established Equal Opportunities framework. Not only is this good practice, it places those institutions in a much better position to embrace the challenges of the disability duty, the forthcoming duty on gender, etc.

3.1.3   Several institutions reflected the race equality policy and the provisions of the RRAA in their strategic and corporate plans, ensuring that promoting race equality was fully integrated with their strategic goals.

3.1.4   Some policies reflected the extent to which the institution had mainstreamed race equality and incorporated race equality objectives in its planning and monitoring of performance. Policies worked best and came alive, reflecting the way the institution functioned day by day, when they were dynamic rather than formulaic instruments for the guidance of staff and students.

3.1.5   Some of the policies maintained a clear focus throughout on racial discrimination and race equality and the more effective policies presented a discussion of values against a background of existing data and commitment. Some specified the role of departments in particular and the importance of managers owning the responsibility to show evidence of promoting race equality through functions. This was seen as a key part of the process of embedding race equality across the institution and ensuring that local managers embrace responsibility for demonstrating legislative compliance and for building a culture of equity.

3.1.6   The majority of institutions demonstrated evidence of engagement with the specific duties of the Act, especially with regard to functions and monitoring data relating to students.

3.1.7   Over half the institutions provided monitoring reports that gave considerable detail of the actions taken since the previous monitoring cycle and of the progress made in embedding race equality. Those reports contained statistical data that pointed to the impact of interventions to promote race equality and eliminate barriers that could amount to unlawful discrimination or could constitute institutional racism.

3.1.8   About half the institutions had robust and comprehensive monitoring data and made full use of it in assessing performance against objectives, identifying adverse impact and planning new actions as necessary.

3.1.9   In the majority of cases, the University Council or Governing Body had an appropriate degree of involvement in the institution's efforts to meet the requirements of the legislation and relate those to wider institutional goals.

Areas of weakness

3.1.10 Very few of the policies/plans provided evidence of the institutions' engagement with the 3rd strand of the General Duty in any practical sense. All institutions were very good at stating, at the start of the policy document, what the general and specific duties were and acknowledging what the Act required of them. Evidence of proactive engagement with the 3rd strand of the General Duty was lacking even when policies identified key race equality related functions, for the reason that no indication was given as to the specific activities and intended outcomes through which those functions would fulfill that key component of the duty.

Those activities could include:

14

- promoting understanding and awareness in the learning community of staff and students and in community and academic partnerships that promoting good relations requires there to be respect and validation of the cultures and identities of all racial and ethnic groups and a commitment to eradicating notions of racial superiority, cultural hegemony and racial prejudice, bigotry and intolerance

- promoting understanding and knowledge of how to function in a diverse world as part of an increasingly global population in Britain, especially as many students in Welsh institutions will live and work outside Wales at some time in their career

- specific actions arising from an institution's statement of its anti-racist values and principles and race equality goals, including:

i)   racial and cultural awareness briefing sessions
ii)   identifying and challenging racial bias and stereotyping
iii)   dealing with racist incidents
iv)   monitoring and responding to student complaints and counselling and supporting personal change in perpetrators of culturally insensitive and racially offensive conduct
v)   challenging the notion that 'Britishness equates with whiteness'
vi)   promoting the understanding that there was ethnic and cultural diversity in the British Isles long before racial diversity
vii)   exploring issues of racial superiority, cultural hegemony, racial prejudice, bigotry and intolerance in the context of the history of Wales as part of the United Kingdom
viii)   validating the Welsh Language and its status in the society as a national language and a medium of instruction
ix)   mechanisms for promoting teaching excellence
x)   measures taken in response to diversity in learning, teaching and assessment matters
xi)   challenging racism through building and delivering an inclusive curriculum across all disciplines
xii)   actively involving people of different racial and ethnic groups in the learning community and among community partners in

curriculum planning and delivery (not just international post-graduate teaching assistants)

3.1.11 Evidence of all of those activities was scattered not only throughout the functions of the majority of institutions, but also throughout the monitoring reports we examined. Institutions would find it helpful for monitoring and impact assessment purposes to be able to identify that evidence and report upon it. Since the evidence of engaging with this strand of the General Duty is generally lacking, institutions should set themselves the task of examining the range of activities within functions and through their consultation, community engagement, collaborations and partnerships in order to identify what constitutes promoting good relations between people of different racial groups and report upon it.

3.1.12 To a certain extent, recent discourse about 'community cohesion' has made this aspect of the RRAA even hazier. A small number of institutions felt that having 'no or a tiny minority ethnic population' was 'just cause' for not considering any action. The issue of how 'mono-racial' communities confront racism and deal with the reality that is multi-ethnic Britain has posed challenges to policy makers and service deliverers for some considerable time. While most if not all institutions would claim that they are preparing students for global living and for employment anywhere in the British isles, at least, a few still consider it logical to determine whether or not to tackle racism and promote racial equality solely on the basis of the demography of their immediate surroundings.

3.1.13 What is clear, however, is that many institutions are engaged in activities which, at least indirectly, promote good relations between people of different racial groups. In the individual reports we advise institutions (where necessary) to identify that evidence and evaluate it and report upon it.

3.1.14 Most institutions drew up their race equality policy without any reference to the context in which they are operating. While it is understood that Universities draw students from across the nation as well as from overseas, increasingly it is also the case that in Wales there is still a tendency for students to attend University close to their

homes. In some institutions, over 60% of the students live within 40 miles of the institution. What is more, many institutions point to the fact that the ethnic diversity of the area in which they are located is accounted for by their black and ethnic minority students, past and present. Others give examples of some excellent outreach work with the identifiable ethnic minority communities round about them. For those reasons, an indication as to the profile of the University's immediate community and of the wider community in Wales will help readers of the policy/plan gain an understanding of the context in which the institution is seeking to apply that policy.

3.1.15 Significantly, a number of institutions made reference to the work they had been doing on equal opportunities or on promoting race equality as part of their equal opportunities or inclusiveness strategy prior to the Race Relations (Amendment) Act. Yet, in every case, no indication was given as to what they had achieved through those approaches or the baseline from which they were now starting to implement that legislation with 'race' as its specific target.

3.1.16 A case in point is the number of institutions that have a track record of some standing in recruiting black and ethnic minority students from overseas. In the context of the RRAA and specifically the role of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning in promoting race equality, none made any reference to the impact the presence of such students over many decades has had on their curriculum development and delivery practices. 'Building an inclusive curriculum', therefore, is something which they are approaching wholly in relation to the implementation of the RRAA. What is more, the rationale for such a curriculum is quite often given as providing a curriculum of relevance to 'a growing number of home based and overseas BME students', rather than one that could extend the entire learning community.

3.1.17 Several institutions failed to see their Race Equality Policy as a 'living document', to be updated and amended continuously. What is worse is those institutions which made minimal adjustments to their original Action Plan and saw fit to be reporting in 2006 on actions that should have been completed in 2003. It is now almost 5 years since institutions were required to have a race equality policy and action plan in place. Annual reports and monitoring data should, therefore, provide

the HEFCW and the institution's Council/Board of Governors with an assessment of the institution's performance in mainstreaming race equality and eliminating institutional barriers in the preceding year. The race equality policy and action plan should be revised to reflect the changing situation in the institution as it makes progress or responds to new challenges. What impact, for example, would the age relations and the disability duty have on the content and objectives of an institution's race equality policy? How might the Framework Agreement and the Human Resources Strategy impact upon the race equality policy and action plan?

3.1.18 The second strand of the General Duty is 'to promote equality of opportunity'. All institutions had a very clear understanding of the denial of opportunity to black and ethnic minority people on the grounds of race/ethnicity, but on those grounds solely. The intersection of race discrimination with other forms of discrimination, e.g., on grounds of disability, age, sexual orientation, gender, religion/belief (not to mention socio-economic background) is not something to which most institutions have given a great deal of thought. No attention is paid, therefore, to how black people might require the protection of the law relating to disability or to age or to bullying and harassment, sexual or otherwise.

3.1.19 We would suggest, that in addition to capturing data along the various equality strands that provides a statistical breakdown of where different categories of staff are located, institutions should make attempts to obtain qualitative data (through surveys, focus groups and one-to-one interviews) that will tell them how individuals are experiencing the institution from within their dual or multiple identities.

3.1.20 For example, in certain circumstances, black and ethnic minority people could find that their disability is a more critical factor in their experience of discrimination and exclusion in civil society than their race. Black gays and lesbians are often victims of homophobia from within their racial group and from other ethnic groups, including whites. It would be helpful for the institution to state how the racial element is addressed in those other areas of equality legislation and vice versa, particularly given the new legislative requirements with respect to the

Disability Duty (December 2006) and the forthcoming duty on gender (April 2007).

3.2   Definition of relevant functions and the integration and mainstreaming of racial equality through these functions

3.2.1   Areas of encouragement:

3.2.2   Some institutions took the approach of 'the whole being more than the sum of its parts' and ensured that race equality was embedded in a meaningful way within individual functions, with evidence of performance monitoring being provided to the Equality and Diversity Committee or the Equal Opportunities Working Group. The institution was therefore able to demonstrate how it was promoting race equality and eliminating discrimination through its prioritized functions. It was most encouraging to see the number of instances where functions have been subjected to impact assessment and the results of that used to refine objectives and target setting within those functions.

3.2.3   Most institutions located their functions in relation to both staff and students. In relation to the latter, most had a focus on the support needs of international students and on recruiting more home based black and ethnic minority students, especially from among the groups that do less well in the schooling system.

3.2.4   Two-thirds of the institutions identified residential services, estates, catering and security as functions with relevance for race equality and some of those have subjected those functions to impact assessment.

3.2.5   Unlike in 2003, most institutions have now amassed reliable baseline data that allows them to plan interventions and set targets for mainstreaming race equality through functions. The continuous refinement of that data to which some institutions are now committed is producing some quite dazzling results.

3.2.6   Two-thirds of institutions are quite explicit about race equality objectives and activities within functions for promoting race equality.

Of those, the majority have monitoring systems in place that enable them to conduct impact assessment.

<u>Areas of weakness:</u>

3.2.7 A number of institutions were not able to set out their race equality relevant functions in an unequivocal way. Many were very comfortable with the requirements of the specific duties, notably ethnic monitoring of staff and students in terms of access, progression, etc, and publishing the race equality policy.

3.2.8 Even those institutions which properly identified functions with relevance for race equality failed to provide clear evidence as to the manner in which the particular function was going to be reviewed so as to meet race equality objectives, the activities that were considered relevant and necessary to ensure those objectives could be met, or the measures by which success in meeting them might be assessed. For those institutions, impact assessment is clearly proving to be a big deal, if only because there is no coherent approach to objective setting, the statement of intended outcomes and monitoring of performance in relation to those objectives and outcomes.

3.2.9 Several institutions failed to identify and prioritize residential accommodation, campus facilities (including catering) and estates as race equality relevant functions. Since, as many institutions have observed, black and ethnic minority students account for the ethnic diversity both within the institution and in the local area, their experiences of mainly white settings on and off campus are, among other things, matters of Health & Safety. Accommodation, cuisine, treatment at the hands of ground staff and security personnel, ability to access alcohol and smoke free environments on campus, all impact upon the student's well being and ability to concentrate on teaching and learning. For those reasons, campus and residential services are a key race equality relevant function. Like other functions, it should be prioritized, with suitable race equality objectives set, activities determined and performance monitored within the function. Given the turnover of students in halls as well as in approved accommodation off campus, the regularity with which the accommodation function is

impact assessed should be determined on the basis of student feedback .

3.2.10 Curiously, a number of Institutions failed to identify and prioritize Curriculum, Teaching and Learning as a function with relevance for race equality. One explanation given for this was that 'the rules governing that area are the same for everybody.., attendance at lectures, handing in work on time, avoidance of plagiarism, the lot…, so there is little room for unequal treatment'. Would it were that straightforward. In relation to this function, perhaps more than any other, there is a need to involve stakeholders in discussions both about objectives/activities and impact. Most if not all institutions are in the market for overseas students, the majority of whom are from ethnic groups other than white. Many come from learning cultures where the relationship between student and teacher and the dynamics of assessment are vastly different from what they encounter in Britain. Moreover, in an increasingly globalized learning environment, the design, content and delivery of curriculum cannot be seen as having nothing to do with the profile of the student population or of the teaching staff.

3.3 Plans for a communication strategy and continuing consultation

Areas of encouragement:

3.3.1 Some institutions have well developed strategies for consulting with students and staff across the board and with black and ethnic minority students and staff in particular. A few institutions have active involvement with black and ethnic minority communities and networks and have succeeded in involving them in the life of the institution and in supporting institutional efforts to promote race equality and widen access. Given the 'consultation fatigue' that could so easily beset ethnic minorities in Wales, multi-agency approaches to such collaborations and community partnerships are clearly sensible. It is encouraging to find a number of institutions taking the lead to work with communities in this way.

3.3.2 The Community and Race Relations Group convened by the University of Glamorgan, made up of black and ethnic minority individuals and representatives of organizations, representatives of other public agencies (e.g., South Wales Police and the Valleys Race Equality Council) and University staff is a fine example of an institution taking the lead to build and nurture an effective community partnership.

3.3.3 Much more could be done to encourage black and ethnic minority staff and students to see themselves as key internal stakeholders within the meaning of the RRAA 2000, such that they see the strategic importance of engaging in communication and consultation and being involved in monitoring and impact assessment. Some institutions have sought to formalize their relationship with their BEM staff and students along those lines. It is important that those staff and students get a genuine sense that the institution is not seeking to manipulate them and secure their involvement purely on its terms or in relation solely to its concerns, however pressing.

3.3.4 In general, continuing consultation with internal and external stakeholders is implied and quite clearly intended in Policies/Action Plans, especially with regard to impact assessment and the response to the results of same.

Areas of weakness

3.3.5 Most institutions could not point to an inclusive communication and consultation strategy to support the implementation of the RRAA, albeit they were able to describe how they had consulted on the revised policy/plan. There is a danger that as policies bed down and race equality actions become more routine, consulting with stakeholders (internal ones especially) becomes more haphazard. It is important to ensure that where policies and planned actions relate to outcomes for black and ethnic minority students or staff, people who are broadly representative of black and minority ethnic experience or have expert understanding of issues to do with race and ethnicity, or discrimination

and oppression are engaged in communication and consultation on the proposals or activities in question.

3.3.6 Ways in which the whole process of communication and consultation will be interactive within the functions and in relation to key stakeholders and collaborators are not explicitly stated in the majority of cases. Apart from a communication strategy that engages stakeholders, including external partners, institutions need to ensure that their race equality principles, values and specific activities are embedded within functions and are understood by all those associated with those functions. Most policies/plans fail to provide evidence of how that will be or is being done.

3.3.7 One aspect of communication and consultation that just about every institution failed to address is the part that white students and staff must play in the institution's efforts to promote race equality and eliminate unlawful discrimination. There is a danger that activity to promote race equality and build a culture of equity could go on around them, with their role being perceived as taking corrective action so as to deliver opportunities for black and ethnic minority people, rather than being actively engaged in a process that involves them in exploring how they may, by default, be implicated in perpetuating institutional racism and cultures of exclusion and what they could personally do about it.

3.3.8 The focus on white students and staff in the documentation is very much in relation to what the RRAA constrains them not to do and the behaviours the institution expects. While there are references to awareness raising in relation to the provisions of the legislation and the contents, objectives and intended outcomes of the race equality policy, there is little said about how race equality goals and anti-racist principles and values relate to white people's experience (or not) of confronting racism and dealing with the gaps in their own education and upbringing as far as coming to terms with 'race' in British society is concerned.

3.3.9 This situation is further accentuated in our view by references to Equal Opportunities and Diversity training, sometimes in a manner which suggests that it is co-terminus with training in combating racism and

promoting race equality, or that such training automatically encompasses issues to do with understanding ideology, exploitation, discrimination and anti-racist values and principles.

3.4.0 Procedures for analytical target-setting and monitoring

<u>Areas of encouragement:</u>

3.4.1   Some institutions have the most sophisticated data gathering and data analysis systems in place and can therefore influence micro- as well as macro-level interventions to sustain progress and enhance change. Inasmuch as institutions are encouraging managers to own responsibility for implementing the Policy/Plan within their areas, more needs to be done to assist managers at local level in making sense of such data and using it strategically for planning and evaluation of performance.

3.4.2   Those institutions that identified curriculum, teaching and learning and assessment as a key function for promoting race equality clearly saw that cluster as an important area for monitoring and target setting. Learning and Teaching Committees (or strategy groups) in some institutions are engaged in quite detailed work on building an inclusive curriculum and ensuring that that is done from an avowedly antiracist perspective.

3.4.3   The area in which most institutions display the greatest confidence is in pursuing the Specific Duties and conducting ethnic monitoring in terms of employment and student access/achievement and progression. Most institutions set very clear targets in relation to increasing the number of black and minority ethnic staff and students and are increasingly adopting 'positive action' measures to attract recruits from among that population, especially outside Wales.

3.4.4 Very few institutions described process in relation to these procedures, with emphasis being placed principally upon the collection of baseline data. Some institutions were very clear about the race equality objectives they were pursuing within functions, others much less so. Consequently, the tracking of performance, the identification of barriers to progress or/and of factors contributing to desired outcomes was much less focused and coherent. In too many cases, therefore, institutions relied on statistical improvements as evidence of progress. When such statistical comparisons are not matched by the capturing of qualitative data (via semi-structured interviews, focus groups, questionnaires, etc.), a quite misleading picture of progress could result.

3.4.5 For several institutions, especially those where mainstreaming race equality is not yet even partially embedded, while there might have been procedures in place, in the sense of looking at the policy and prioritized functions and deciding what targets were appropriate, the absence of criteria for target-setting and their relationship to race equality principles made it impossible to judge what would be happening at the implementation stage.

3.4.6 It is a matter of considerable concern that, nearly five years after putting in place their initial race equality policy/action plan, several institutions still do not have baseline data on the basis of which to plan interventions, set targets or engage in any meaningful monitoring.

3.5.0 Procedures for impact assessment and regular review, together with definition of responsibilities for further action, and procedures for publication

Areas of encouragement

3.5.1 Impact assessment across the public sector induces high levels of anxiety, especially in situations where external regulators seek evidence of rigorous monitoring in order to identify and eliminate any

evidence of discrimination, especially in its less obvious, indirect and institutional forms.

3.5.2 Even those institutions that have had sophisticated performance review and quality assurance systems in place have tended to see impact assessment as a new and hugely complex requirement. They therefore have a tendency to start erecting a set of elaborate mechanisms for assessing the impact of applying their race equality policy without any reference, in the majority of cases, to the performance review measures already in place. Seldom do they begin by asking the following questions:

- Do the existing measures and systems have the capacity to provide us with the information we need about the result of the activities we set in train in pursuance of these race equality objectives within these prioritized functions?
- If not, what do we need to amend or to add in order that we might adduce the information necessary to enable us to assess impact?
- How can we ensure that we correlate what our data gathering mechanisms are telling us with how our key target groups experience the particular function(s) or the institution as a whole?

3.5.3 Some institutions decided to demystify impact assessment and adopt this approach even before they had access to impact assessment guidelines. They now conduct impact assessment as a routine activity and use the results as a measure of their success in implementing the RRAA and marrying up specific race equality objectives arising from that legislation with broader institutional goals around promoting equality of opportunity and social inclusion or widening participation.

3.5.4 It is important that good practice and lessons learnt from conducting impact assessment are shared more widely across the individual institution and among institutions so that anxieties could be allayed and competences developed. One cannot emphasize too strongly, though, the importance of setting clear objectives, underpinned by anti-racist

principles and charting the actions taken within functions to promote race equality as the precursor to impact assessment.

3.5.5   Where one is equality proofing existing policies/procedures or ones under construction, it is equally crucial to be clear about the values and principles informing the judgments that are being brought to that process and to ensure that they are congruent with the race equality objectives and wider strategic aims of the organization.

3.5.6   With regard to publication, while too many institutions remain dependent solely on their website, others engage in good practice by publishing the results of impact assessment in hard copy and in Welsh, at least, and making such copies available to community and other partners as well as to those who request them within the institution itself.

Areas of weakness:

3.5.7   A number of Institutions still equate the assessment of the impact of their race equality policy with monitoring (and more precisely ethnic monitoring). The emphasis appears to be on the question: what difference has this policy made to black and ethnic minority people, as distinct from the much wider question: how has the application of this policy impacted upon the organization, its culture, structure, policies and operations such that both black and ethnic minority people and the rest of the learning community experience the institution differently and understand their role in combating racism and delivering equal opportunity? In one sense, the emphasis in the impact assessment guidelines on identifying the cause (s) of negative impact for black and ethnic minority stakeholders, while evidently critical and in keeping with the purpose of the General Duty, rather tends to reinforce this approach.

3.5.8   Details of how impact would be assessed and the rationale for employing the particular method of assessment were lacking in some

cases, as were plans for disseminating and acting upon the results of impact assessment. In the majority of cases, scant information was given about the manner in which key stakeholders would be involved in the process of impact assessment and in analyzing and acting upon the results of the assessment. Procedures for communicating with key stakeholders about impact assessment and thereafter for interacting with them about the results and future action arising therefrom were generally not made explicit, even in institutions that had very serviceable consultation mechanisms. For too many institutions still, involving stakeholders in impact assessment is seen as simply a matter of reporting what had been found.

3.5.9 Many institutions are still struggling with race equality impact assessment (REIA) as a process. Some had conducted pilot assessments and analyzed the results. Some indicated their intention to conduct 'regular review' and others "on-going" review, without any indication of what this actually meant or when the process would begin. This is something the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales should address in collaboration with the Equality Challenge Unit and in consultation with the Welsh Assembly Government's Strategic Equality and Diversity unit which is working to develop effective impact assessment approaches for itself and across the public sector in Wales. Apart from anything else, it is now five years since institutions were required to begin implementing the RRAA. HEFCW should therefore stipulate that annual monitoring reports must provide the results of impact assessment and evidence of actions indicated in the previous action plan being followed through and evaluated.

3.5.10 Even if an institution is not yet capable of conducting effective assessments, whether through lack of training or the absence of reliable monitoring data, it should show evidence in monitoring reports of identifying the factors that impede their capacity to conduct rigorous assessments, e.g., poor quality of baseline data, weaknesses in monitoring procedures and in communication and consultation arrangements, lack of clarity about actions to promote race equality, and of planned action to eliminate such barriers.

3.5.11 It is important, furthermore, that in addition to assessing impact at local level, i.e., in relation to activities to promote race equality in Schools or

Service Directorates, impact assessment is conducted at a more strategic level. This means subjecting the organization's performance on meeting its strategic goals and pursuing its agenda for change to race equality impact assessment.

3.5.12 Most institutions were explicit about who would be responsible for future actions flowing from impact assessment, but none spoke of the qualifications or experience of that person to do the job. A number of institutions inferred that the Equal Opportunities Working Group or the Equality and Diversity Committee would be involved in planning future action based upon the results of impact assessment. Typically, those institution-wide bodies report to the Council or the Board of Governors and are chaired by a Pro-Vice Chancellor or another member of the Senior Management Team. Responsibility for determining actions to be taken within functions as a result of impact assessment should, however, rest primarily with the manager in whose area that function falls.

3.6 Plans for support and training, including needs-analysis where necessary

<u>Areas of encouragement</u>

3.6.1 Across the institutions, there is clear evidence of training and support for staff and students though in general there is no indication that they are built around antiracist principles. Rather, they tend to lean too heavily in the direction of 'diversity'.

3.6.2 It is commendable that most institutions show evidence of valuing the partnership between themselves and their Students Union, not least in the training opportunities they provide for SU staff, sabbatical officers and volunteers. The involvement of the Students Union in staff development and training in order that they themselves might better fulfill their obligations in respect of equality legislation and be more effective in their representative roles on course committees, consultative groups, Equality & Diversity Committees, Council, etc., is sound practice.

3.6.3 The initiative taken by some institutions to produce handy manuals for staff and students in support of the training function and to facilitate individual learning is an example of the very sound practice we found across the sector. Worthy of note in this regard are:

- The 'Race Relations and You' booklet produced by staff at Swansea University and

- The 'Diversity in the Workplace' information booklet produced by members of the Equal Opportunities Working Group' at the North East Wales Institute of Higher education (NEWI)

Both these booklets are of special value to front line and ancillary staff and to those who have difficulty accessing online training.

3.6.4 Given the rate at which equality legislation is expanding and the need to train staff to meet statutory obligations and operate in an equity environment, a number of institutions are beginning to make extensive use of E-Learning packages to ensure that as many staff as possible receive training.

3.6.5 It is worth remembering, however, that although e-Learning has many advantages, especially when one is rolling out a training programme for large numbers of staff, it also has its limitations. In the field of equality, diversity and human rights, it is crucial that e-Learning is supplemented and supported by targeted line management input. There is an onus on line managers to monitor not only who has undertaken training, but the understanding, skills and competences the training has enabled them to develop and how they are applying that training in all aspects of their work. Failing that, although the institution could satisfy itself that its staff have all been through a training programme, it would be less certain as to whether that training enhances their capacity to promote and mainstream race/disability/gender equality within their various areas of responsibility. The institution therefore runs the risk of simply putting people through the motions and consequently of obstructing real progress, if not inducing cynicism and reinforcing negative attitudes to promoting race equality.

3.6.6 Most institutions pointed to the induction they provide for black and ethnic minority students and staff from overseas. However, few institutions made mention of training and support for staff recruited overseas as far as the RRAA is concerned. Clearly, their status as staff places greater responsibility and liability upon them than it does on overseas/international students. Attention should be paid to the specific training needs of that body of staff, as well as to assisting black and ethnic minority overseas students in understanding the RRAA and the leverage it gives them as key stakeholders.

3.6.7 It was encouraging to see most institutions record what they had done to provide training for the University Council/Board of Governors in respect of their awareness of the provisions of the RRAA and the obligations it placed upon them as a statutory body.

Areas of weakness

3.6.8 A number of institutions described the initial training offered to their governing body, senior management team and staff on general race awareness or on equality and diversity. In most cases, managers ensured that the training covered the RRAA and participants' responsibilities and liabilities in relation to the Act. Very few institutions in their action plans or monitoring reports made clear just how much of a focus there was or would be in the training on race equality objectives, employing anti-racist perspectives, mainstreaming policies on 'race' and concepts of equity, inclusiveness, etc.

3.6.9 Even more concerning is the fact that the focus of the training a number of institutions provided for their staff was in the generic area of 'equality and diversity', with no indication given of whether or how issues of combating racism and discrimination and promoting good relations between people of different racial groups in a majority white context would be addressed.

3.6.10 Institutions demonstrated too little evidence of establishing links between one area of equality legislation and others. Training on the RRAA seldom appeared to address other forms of oppression black people might face. In the context of teaching and learning which is after

all the core business of Higher Education Institutions, for example, non-visible disabilities such as dyslexia impact massively upon black students' performance. To some extent, the same is true of a condition

such as sickle cell anemia that induces debility and impacts upon performance. To monitor educational outcomes for black and ethnic minority students without having regard to the intersection of disability and race in some cases could result in a somewhat distorted picture. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the race discourse is often so self-contained that there are no openings for black people with disabilities to even introduce these considerations.

3.6.11 Judging from the comments in action plans, we would warn against an over emphasis upon training relating to the broad principles of equal opportunities awareness raising, and diversity, as opposed to training that was specifically targeted at enabling stakeholders to understand and to meet their responsibilities under the RRAA. The first strand of the General Duty is to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination. Quite often, the approach to race awareness and diversity training eschews consideration of racism and how it should be tackled in its structural, cultural, institutional and personal manifestations. Training in the context of implementing the RRAA should therefore have a clear focus on defining race equality objectives, understanding and applying anti-racist principles, the practice of anti-racism as well as promoting race equality.

4.0 Recommended Checklist for Improving Policies/Plans across the Sector

4.1 Individual institutions will have been given clear advice (as necessary) with respect to improving their Policy/Plan. What follows is a summary of the critical issues we feel the Sector needs to address:

4.2 As regards the two institutions judged to be non-compliant, HEFCW has already indicated the active steps they should take to make rapid improvement. We recommend that HEFCW monitor their performance

to ensure that the CRE does not have to identify them and stipulate enforcement action.

4.3 There is need to define more clearly the objectives within functions through which race equality will be promoted, the activities that will deliver those objectives and the measures that will be put in place for monitoring performance against them.

4.4 A need to embed notions of antiracism across all of the institution's functions that are identified as race equality relevant and for these to be seen to be tied to the RRAA General and Specific Duties. In this connection, institutions should demonstrate how they would make 'race equality' integral to the life, culture and working practices of the organization. One obvious way of so doing is to make it a requirement that the race equality policy and action plan translates into measurable objectives and actions within Departmental or School Development Plans, or, in the absence of those, in the work plans of Heads of Schools/Departments etc.

4.5 For monitoring tools to be effective they need to be reflective of (4.3).

4.6 Training must be shown to be reflective of the above and also focused on race equality principles and values as well as on roles and responsibilities, especially of senior and middle managers and members of Governing Boards. In this regard, institutions' monitoring reports should provide information on:
- who received training,
- whether that training was provided on the basis of training needs analysis,
- the type of training received,
- whether it was all done on-line,
- whether the training was mandatory,
- whether 'refresher' training was provided and, if so, at what intervals,
- whether training is routinely followed up through the line management/supervision process.

4.7 Front line and ancillary staff and all stakeholders must be assisted in an appropriate manner to develop an understanding of the Race Equality

Policy and the responsibilities it places upon them. There should be clear systems of support for such staff as they seek to operate within the provisions of the Policy.

4.8   All institutions should ensure that external collaborators such as placement providers and training partners are subject to protocols, at least, that define the relationship between the institution and them in a manner reflective of the Policy. If they could be expected to have a policy of their own, the onus is still upon the institution to make sure it is congruent with the terms of the protocol and that students or staff could expect to be protected by it while in the placement situation.

4.9   Communication and consultation, especially with internal stakeholders, must be seen to be interactive and not just about passing on information or posting it on the website.

4.10   There needs to be a greater stress on curriculum, learning and teaching in terms of establishing benchmarks and defining criteria for teaching and learning from an anti-racist perspective, irrespective of the number of black and ethnic minority students and staff in the institution. There is need, in particular, to interrogate the planning, development and delivery of curriculum and the policies and practices of those layers in the organization that have responsibility for validating new courses, monitoring existing ones and determining methods of assessment.

4.11   Institutions may wish to consider establishing procedures and processes to allow examination boards and internal and external moderators to interrogate not just courses but policies such as the Race Equality Policy, Equal Opportunities Policy, Inclusiveness Policy, etc., and the extent to which they are reflected in course content, delivery and assessment and in tutorial arrangements and other forms of student support.

4.12   Policies/Plans should indicate more clearly how good practice (e.g., in relation to conducting impact assessment) would be shared across the institution.

4.13 The Council/Board of Governors should have written in to the institution's race equality policy/plan how they would collect the evidence that shows the institution to be compliant with legislation and to be operating in all its functions in accordance with their strategic aims.

The Gus John Partnership Limited
17 April 2007