

Race and Ethnicity hub:
LDS BAME session

James Davies, Liliana Torero Fernández, Roberta:

ROBERTA: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you so much for joining us today for another Black History Month event. So today, we have with us here Liliana Torero-Fernandez and James Davies from LDS. So, Liliana is a senior manager. And James Davies is director of commissioning in OU. And they are going to be talking to you about the LDS BME pilot.

So, after them, we have Shaun Daly. He's head of Resourcing Hub. And he's going to be talking to us about how people services are taking forwards some of the initiatives that have been tried within the LDS pilot. So, I'm sure we're going to have a great session today. And I'm going to pass it over to Liliana and James.

Oh, sorry, just before we start, I just want to say that we're going to have time for questions at the end. So please make sure to raise your questions at the end. And we will also be asking you to complete an evaluation form. So, we would really appreciate if you could take the time, as this will help us to shape our future events. OK, so thank you. And I'll to James and Lillian.

JAMES DAVIES: That's great. Thank you, Roberta. Welcome, everybody. And thank you for taking the time to be part of the session today. We really hope that it's useful to you. And both Liliana, Shaun, and I really happy to respond to your questions during this session and outside of the session as well, if you want to follow anything up.

OK, what are we talking about? We want to tell the story of a pilot program that we've been running in ODS with support from People Services. And Liliana and I will talk about things from the LDS perspective. And Shaun is going to talk about some of the results and also the challenges and opportunities of supporting the initiative from within People Services and working collaboratively to do so.

We've got 13 slides to share with you. Liliana and I will share the first nine. And Shaun will close with the final four. And Roberta's going to help us out with facilitation, or if we make any estimating blunders or make any mistakes.

So, our story for this started back in 2018. The LDS Executive meets monthly. And as part of that monthly meeting, the fundamentals of the unit are reported-- how we're doing with our projects, are we meeting our main commitments, what does the output of the unit that like, productivity, finances, everything you could think of in terms of keeping oversight of a unit. And one of those key elements is the demographics of the unit.

On a quarterly basis, People Services supported us with a breakdown of the demographics of LDS staff. And we looked at this a number of times previously. But for some reason, in that particular meeting, we really were zooming in on our diversity or, quite frankly, our lack of diversity.

For quite some time, we had noted that there was a real lack of diversity right across the unit, but particularly from our senior management level upwards. As a unit, we're doing OK with our gender balance, up to grade nine. But in terms of ethnicity, ethnic diversity, we had a very poor level right across the unit.

And we touched on this before. And we talked about what we could do and how important it was to do something. But for some reason, in that meeting, we really dwelt on this a bit longer. And I think we were quite honest about some of the lazy assumptions that we've made, or certainly that I had made.

So, I'll give you an example. We have quite a high level of staff movement in LDS. A lot of our staff work in a media environment. There's something about that environment and the career path that people move on in their roles quite frequently. And so one of my lazy assumptions had been, well, in a matter of time, because we have a high level of movement within the unit, we'll see people recruited who bring more of a balance to our diversity just because we're following all of the OU recruitment selection process and all that we should be doing.

But that didn't happen. We didn't see an increase in diversity. We saw those levels remain the same, even though diversity levels across Milton Keynes had greatly changed during this period. And at MK, the main place we get a lot of our staff applying from had become much more diverse. But we weren't seeing that in our recruitment. So, we were really concerned about this and, quite frankly, didn't know what to do.

One member of the Executive pointed out that actually we had two members of staff who co-chair the OU BAME network. So that's Liliana and Sas. And so, we started to meet with Liliana and Sas and talk about some of the challenges the unit has and what we could do to support and address those challenges.

It became apparent really quickly that there wasn't a silver bullet. There wasn't going to be one thing we could do that was going to change everything. But we needed to develop a program of different measures, different ideas, and then just monitor those to see which ones helped and which ones didn't make a difference. So that's what we started to do. I'll just move the slides on.

We grouped the challenges around these three different sections. So first of all, a lack of BAME representation in senior management-- we had a lack of diversity through our recruitment intake to address that. And then we had a real need to provide a different level of personal development support for our BAME colleagues, as well as looking to support our line managers as they were the key and main or primary supporters of BAME colleagues throughout the unit.

So, we started to then explore different ideas under those three headings about what would make a difference and what we wanted to pilot. We developed those ideas into a pilot program, presented them back to the ODS Executive, who gave their full support for us to put them in place. And we've been running with them and monitoring them ever since.

And Liliana will now take you through some of those specific initiatives.

LILIANA TORERO-FERNANDEZ: Yes. Hi, everyone. Let me put my camera on. OK, yes, here I am. Yes, so Sas and I, we had the opportunity to come with a plan based on recent statistics that referred to the lack of minority ethnic representation within the senior management. And these correlated with some key issues highlighted in recent public statistics about the lack of black and ethnic minority staff across the higher education sector.

So, some of the recommendations presented to the LDS Executive team and that have now been approved are to include a quality objective in the CDSA and for all the staff. This is intended primarily to line managers to support development and progression within the teams.

A weekly development hour-- demographic data demonstrated that there were a number of staff from black and ethnic minorities in LDS who did not have support for personal development and therefore showed a lack of progression on past surveys. Ring-fence development budget-- the same recommendation for underrepresented staff in LDS as part of a plan for increasing representation at senior level. Action learning sets-- this was to offer opportunity of establishing a peer supportive environment that motivates LDS staff development.

The mentoring scheme-- the idea was based on the Aspire mentoring scheme developed by the Equality and Diversity team a few years ago. The data gathered from this experience

showed success amongst participants. This time, though, we are exploring the idea of reverse-mentoring, which will give a different ground to our mentoring.

The plan is pairing two members of the staff at different levels of experience so that they would learn from each other. And diversity of our interview panels-- this recommendation was based on improving the selection prospects for all underrepresented staff. A pool of BAME staff has been selected to participate on the interview panels.

We also proposed as compulsory that all interview panels must have completed the Unconscious Bias Training. This was to decrease the chances of bias influencing shortlists and also based on results from research on the influence of stereotypes in workplaces. A blind short-listing, removing all information from CVs and application forms to decrease the chances of conscious or unconscious bias that might influence the process.

Volunteer mediation role-- this was a recommendation for a first point of contact member of staff to support BAME colleagues in case of any concerns raised regarding unfair treatment. Support for BAME pupils in the local schools and community via the Worktree Career WorkOut-- this was an experience which took place pre-Covid. And it tried talking to young people in local schools about developing their career expectations. The inclusive curriculum tool for staff involved in curriculum design, curriculum delivery, and assessment, which will address inclusiveness in the curriculum. And opportunity for underrepresented groups, teacher LDS strategy and strategic coordination groups.

Now, I will hand over to James.

JAMES DAVIES: Yeah, that's great. Thanks, Liliana. So those are the things that we set out to do. We pulled them together in a program and gained the LDS Executive's approval to implement them. And where we needed support in terms of budget or time from people, we gained that as well. So that was great. So now, I'm just going to talk you through what worked, what we learned, and where we're at with some of these items because we haven't implemented all of them completely.

So, I'll start with the equality objectives in CDSA. So, we did this part way through the year in the previous financial year because we didn't want to wait until the start of the CDSA process. So, we added it as an addendum, as a cover sheet to the existing CDSA. But this time around in this cycle, we have we have separate EDI objectives. So, every member of LDS staff now has one, if they've had the CDSA or shortly will do.

But we're aware that, with busyness and workload, sometimes the CDSA process can get squeezed out from people's time. And so we're monitoring the completion of CDSA meetings

and objectives sign-off this year to ensure that, if we have any areas of the unit which are struggling because of workload reasons or capacity and haven't been able to systematically go through the CDSA or their staff, we'll know.

And therefore, we can provide support or just look at what the blockers are to ensure that this isn't just one of those initiatives that someone says to do something somewhere, but actually nothing happens. So, we're monitoring that closely. And the Q1 results will be in shortly for us to look at and to present to the Executive.

The weekly development hour-- so this was an idea that has been in place in Library Services for quite some time. And we struggled a little bit to roll this out across the unit. The idea was initially that everyone would kind of down tools at the same time on the same day every week and do some development. It would be linked to their CDSA objectives and their personal development plan. It would relate to their role. It wouldn't be completely random.

But it could be of their choice-- studying a course, watching a video, reading something, doing something with colleagues to strengthen their development. But it hasn't been possible to run with that in quite that way because of workloads and commitment. So it's still something that I think we need to do a bit more thinking about to ensure that everyone can say that they are developing on a regular basis.

The third item is ring-fenced training budget. So we were aware, from research that was shown to us, that individuals from groups that are characterized by protected characteristics are less likely to put their hand up to be put forward for training courses, particularly if there's a cost associated with that. It's just far less likely to happen.

And so, this initiative was to calculate the proportion of BAME staff that we have within LDS and then to ring-fence the proportional amount within our training and development budget. We've since expanded that to cover other characteristics-- so disabled staff as well as LGBTQI+ staff to try to encourage people to make use of that training budget because it's there for their development. And we want to really communicate that it's there for them. And that is reported on to the LDS Executive on a quarterly basis. So, we can keep track of whether or not we need to put other things in place to encourage people in their development. All right, so I was talking about those first three items that you should be able to see on that slide 6 now. I'll just talk about the fourth item, which is Action Learning Sets. So, these sets have been running for quite some time. Oh, apologies for that.

And essentially, they are small groups of like-minded colleagues who are seeking to develop in their career and share experience, problem solve, and develop in the best kind of way that Action Learning Sets enable. And they're the self-selected. People can just ask to be part of

one. And perhaps they may use that time as part of their development hour, too. So, they've been running for quite some time. And what's interesting is the relationships and connections that have been developed through those sets, which become then part of someone's informal network of support, has a life of its own outside of the Action Learning Sets.

OK, the fifth item on this screen to tell you about is the mentoring scheme. And Liliana described as the reverse mentoring. So, we don't have that in development as yet. That's taking some time to put together and roll out. The idea, as Liliana described it, is to pair different colleagues with different points in their career, different experience, but specifically to try to ensure that the lack of diversity in LDS's senior management is supported and learns more about what it's like for a BAME member of staff in our unit-- thinking around impacts of policy, opportunities, communication, anything that could affect someone at work.

And so, the senior member of staff gets to really hear about the BAME colleague's experience and learn, essentially, so that, as they're making decisions, as they're discharging their responsibilities, they're more informed in doing so. We felt that this is a key one for us because we didn't expect that the senior management team would change in diversity overnight. So, we needed to try to do something now to support that team.

The sixth item, diversity on interview panels-- so this has been running for quite some time. Sas, Liliana, I think some others reached out across the BAME network and to colleagues in LDS to identify BAME colleagues who wish to, or are interested in getting more experience as interview panel members so that then the selection processes that we ran in LDS are more diverse interview panels, guarding against unconscious bias, and just ensuring we had a wider set of viewpoints into key decisions of hiring new staff. This has worked really well, and something that I think Shaun may touch on later in his slides that we'll be continuing within LDS with People Services support.

The seventh item there is Unconscious Bias Course. I could be wrong. I think that probably is mandatory now across the university. When we started back in 2018, this was not mandatory. So, within LDS, we made it a mandatory course for all interview panel members and now for all staff as well.

Blind short-listing, so anonymized short-listing under another name-- essentially, when an application is received for a job in LDS, the People Services team anonymize that application. So, names and any other details that might hint at someone's ethnicity and background would be removed so that an objective as possible decision could be made around the short-listing.

And I know, in Shaun's slides, he'll talk you through some of the stats that we've seen since this has been in place.

OK. And the last slide for me, just to run through these last three items-- we explored a mediator role. The idea here is that, for some disagreements, misunderstanding, and just dealing with issues at work, race can be a difficult factor. And people don't feel able to necessarily talk about it. It can make us feel uncomfortable. We're scared of saying the wrong thing, using the wrong words.

Sorry, the slides just jumped around there. So, I was pausing. And so the idea of this role would be an informal role, which we've reframed as a Dignity and Respect Advisor with support from the EDI team to come alongside individuals who have a concern about, say, an interaction with another colleague-- that might be with a line manager, it might be with someone else-- to talk through the situation and gain an objective third party perspective.

It may well be then that interaction line managers, again trying to keep those conversations in an informal space to try to promote an honest conversation and address any emerging issues, rather than it being an either or choice-- either I don't talk about it, or if I do talk about it, it has to go down a formal route immediately. So, we felt this could be a way of promoting those kinds of conversations and addressing issues more readily and more openly. We don't have that in place as yet, but we are pursuing it.

We jumped from 9 to 11 there. It's funny what you don't notice when you're-- well, it's funny what you notice when you're actually doing something for real. So, the 11th item, which should be the 10th item, is inclusive curriculum tools. So, this is being rolled out across some faculties. The tool in its development was led by Darren Gray in PVC Students Office and is being implemented by our Learning Design Team. So as and when they have early meetings with academic module teams, using this tool to identify areas of concern, what could be included in the curriculum, and just ensuring no unconscious bias, and taking a holistic view of what can be taught and how it should be taught.

And the last item, which is currently at a proposal stage to the LDS executive is this-- so we recognize that we don't have a great level of diversity across our senior management team. We feel that we're making progress with intake of new staff into the unit. But it's going to take some time before we see that percolate right across LDS and into our senior management team.

So, in the meantime, we want to explore providing opportunities for BAME staff to be able to chair some key coordinating groups in our unit. In the last year in LDS, we've developed and implemented a new strategic framework. It has six pillars to it. Each pillar has a coordinating group, which essentially prioritizes and plans the strategic work underneath that pillar.

So, the idea would be that, through positive action, we appoint chairs of those groups, who are identified as being from a BAME background, to enable their development and to give them more opportunity to develop leadership and management experience. And we would pair them with a senior manager who could support, coach, and mentor them as and when they needed. OK, Liliana, I'll hand back to you.

LILIANA TORERO-FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Just to say, going back, I didn't miss the number 10, I wanted to say. It was on purpose because it was to do with the schools, the visiting the local schools. Yeah, because we can't do it at the moment, so that's why I said, well, it's just repeating the same thing.

OK. Now, what I wanted to say was we thought also to highlight the fact that these new implementations are in alignment with some of the recommended Race Equality Charter actions, such as training for minority ethnic staff in their career progression, CDSA implementation, including equality objectives for all, a record of profile-raising opportunities for underrepresented staff, and staff recruitment implementing a diverse interview panel and compulsory unconscious bias training for panel chairs, panel members and also to include the anonymized short-listing practice.

So now, I will hand over to Shaun, who will be presenting the People Services work supported with some of the initiatives previously mentioned.

SHAUN DALY: Great. Thank you, Liliana. Thank you, James. Super. Well, firstly, thank you all for the opportunity to co-present with you and collaborate. And today, that's much appreciated.

For people who may not know me, I'll take a minute just to introduce myself. So, I'm sure daily I am head of Resourcing Hub within People Services at the university. I've been here for 18 months in the OU now, so relatively new. As well as my day job as head of Resourcing Hub, I also co-chair-- recently just appointed as co-chair of the LGBT+ Staff Network.

And I also lead People Services's own Belonging and Inclusion Workstream. There's a group of 10 of us leading various initiatives. Roberta works on that group with me as well. So I'm very passionate about getting inclusion and belonging right for People Services, but also for the whole university. It aligns very much to why I've come to work at the Open University, what I see our responsibility-- certainly from a staff perspective and obviously with the wider student groups and other stakeholder groups as well to really further the most inclusive practices and behaviors.

And what I would say is, since joining, I've noticed that, right from the start-- but certainly, latterly and with everything that's gone on in the last six to nine months, the debate, and the topic, and discussion around equality, diversity, and inclusion has really ratcheted up, as you would expect. And in my day job, I get to see what lots of different units are doing.

And what I would say is that sometimes it feels like there's not much change happening. But actually, when you see what lots of different units are doing-- and then I think what we're collectively starting to look at doing across the university now-- there is significant change happening. But sometimes, the changes aren't revolutionary. They are many changes, many small changes.

And the way I like to think of it as lots of little nudges, nudging people's thinking, and thought processes, and behaviours. And on that point, I would say that LDS have been very inspirational in my time here, in terms of leading the way, certainly one of the leading units, from my perspective, in terms of embracing and seeing the need for change and thinking through, from a strategic level and then right through to a practical day-to-day level, what changes-- what small changes can accumulate into significant bigger change. So, it's been great to collaborate with LDS as the unit and to support these initiatives as we go forward.

So what I wanted to do today was just to talk through some of the experience that we've had in my time here, in working with you on these initiatives, and how actually that's helped form some of my own thinking and nudge my own thinking along as well, in terms of what we can learn from what we've done and what we can then do as best practice for the rest of the university as well.

So firstly, to talk about the pilot for blind recruiting, which was done actually last year over a six-month period-- and you see the statistics here that relate to that period. Worth noting-- and I think, as James has already mentioned before-- it was well known that the representation wasn't as diverse and it wasn't where we would want to be for LDS as a unit and specifically and very definitely as we progress through to the more senior grades of staff, where you see the problem gets worse.

I chose, in looking at these statistics, to benchmark not against the OU's targets, which are publicly out there-- and they're admirable. But I think actually I wanted to highlight where our picture was against Milton Keynes, which James mentioned has really increased its diversity over recent years. But we as a staff body, locally to Milton Keynes, haven't kept up with that pace in our recruiting. And therefore, you'll see that we fall short across most grades in the number of applicants and ultimately the number of hires coming in from BAME communities.

Without going into lots and lots of the detail-- and people can ask me the questions on the statistics if they would like to at the end-- what you can see is a clear picture that I think two things happened during this trial period. I think, one, the anonymizing of applications and accompanying personal statements or letters, whichever you prefer to call them-- and therefore, taking out those opportunities for biased selections-- has resulted in better outcomes. But actually, something else also happened as well.

And I mention this because it is something that I think we need to and are starting to address as well, which is that we were starting to see more applications and more applications from BAME candidates. So, I think we had a twofold problem. We had the problem that everyone, no matter what they would like to think, has-- no matter how much training you do on unconscious bias, we are hardwired to make biased decisions, especially when we are making a lot of decisions. If we're reviewing 50 or 100 applications, our brains are having to process that information so quickly that they naturally take shortcuts and refer to the easiest, most readily available decision and outcome. And that's where you get biased decision making.

So, we can see that we have got more people coming through the funnel and getting through to the latter stages and potentially being appointed when we were running this process. But also, during that time as well, I think we've made a number of broader changes to the way that we recruit in the OU.

So, in terms of where do we go and look for people, what do we say about ourselves? When I joined, I inherited what felt like a very traditional way of recruiting, which was posting adverts in traditional higher education-focused places and just sifting through those applications.

So, we started to look in more places now. We started to use things like LinkedIn. So we started to, I think, appeal to a broader section of people, tried to take control of what we're saying about the OU as a place to work and take some care over the employer brand to try and represent ourselves-- present ourselves, sorry, as somewhere inclusive, where people might want to come and work.

So, I think, during that time, we've seen more people come through because of a better selection process and an unbiased selection process. And we've seen more people come through because we are starting to appeal to a broader audience. But are where we want to be yet? I don't think we are.

So I'm doing a lot of work at the moment with marcomms, tying into the start of the university's new five year strategy planning process and also the work that marcomms are doing around our brand and with People Services, the employer brand, because I think we

need to do a lot of work. If we think about recruitment as a funnel, at the very top of the funnel, you need more people coming in. And we need therefore to have more outreach, targeted outreach, positive action, and going and talking to people from underrepresented communities about what life and work at the Open University would and could be like for them.

And that needs to be a concerted effort. It's not just going to happen. But if you don't ever increase the appeal at the top of the funnel, then actually you can put as much work into the selection process as you like, but ultimately, if you haven't got enough candidates to choose from, from those backgrounds, then you're very unlikely to see a real significant increase in the eventual outcome of a successful appointment. So, we're doing a lot of work on that. And that's very formative stages at the moment.

But then I got to thinking about also some of the practicalities of how we did this trial as well and looking at some of the things that we could learn from whether we would look to replicate this across the university. I've had many discussions with Liliana and Sas and the BAME network about if this could replicate and further roll out across the university. It would certainly help any future submission for Race Quality Charter again.

And one of the things that I looked at and evaluated from it was that actually our methodology wasn't perhaps as good as it could be. The way that we redacted, manually redacted personal information from documents was very labour-intensive. It wasn't really very smart actually.

And actually, when I was reading up, and researching, and talking to other organizations and peers of mine in and recruitment about what they do, it really occurred to me that actually we were slightly missing the point by just redacting information. So, it's a very valid point that, when we look at a CV, we make very snap judgments about who this person is, where they studied, what their profile is, what their social status is, their personal interests. There's a lot of biased decisions that we can make just by seeing a CV.

And actually, the places that were really seeing some success with this type of process were actually removing the CV certainly from the formal stages of the recruitment, the initial stages of the recruitment. So really, it got me to thinking that actually what we needed to do was to restart another trial and do it differently. And that's what we're doing now.

So obviously, LDS are a forerunner in this. And we're doing this now for LDS as well. But also, for the rest of the university, we're now offering the opportunity to do a completely anonymous recruitment process. And I've specifically called it anonymized recruitment or anonymous recruitment as opposed to blind. I do think blind recruitment is a well-known term.

But I also think that potentially it has some connotations that I think, from a really, truly inclusive perspective, that we perhaps would want to move away from.

So, I'm calling it anonymous recruitment. And effectively, what we're doing here is asking candidates to apply without a CV or personal statement. So, the first few roles that we've done are with academic services and also now with LDS as well. And what we do is we'll work with the chair of the panel or the hiring manager to really understand what are the key essential requirements in terms of skills, experience, and motivation actually as well, and ask candidates to write their answers to those questions as the application, rather than a traditional CV and cover letter.

And what we do then is create a model answer and a scoring system based on that. And then all of the applications are screened and scored on that basis. And depending on the appetite of the chair and the panel to then see a certain number of selected applications, we'll put forward a selection based on that. And actually, the panel then will do their selection based on that information as well. So, they'll further whittle that selection down to those that we're going to short-list.

And only once applications have then been progressed to the interview stage would we ask the candidate to submit a CV. So, the panel can then have the candidate's CV and the application information ready for the interview. And some people might say, well, surely are you just opening the door again to have an opportunity to bias because you've reintroduced the CV?

But the key thing to remember here is that bias does exist. And I applaud LDS for making the Unconscious Bias Training mandatory because it's actually not mandatory across the university. So, it is very much down to a unit by unit basis to decide if they will. So, I applaud LDS for doing it. Likewise, we're doing it in People Services, making sure that it's a mandatory training for all of our staff who join panels.

So, the CV will be reintroduced back in that stage because actually you're then only potentially dealing with looking through, in detail, the CV's of, say, five individuals. And you've got more time to process that information, more time, as a panel, to question yourselves, and question your assumptions, and challenge each other as well. So, I'm not so concerned that, at that stage of the process, bias will play an undue influence.

The other reason I wanted to restart a trial and do it this way as well is most of you, I would imagine, are obviously aware of the upcoming implementation of SuccessFactors for CSR. So that'll be our new HR operating systems. And at the end of the year, we're going to start getting into the explore and design phase for the recruitment and onboarding component of

SuccessFactors. And I've already spoken to SuccessFactors and people using it elsewhere about how they facilitate anonymized recruiting and what you would do with SuccessFactors to make it happen.

So, I really want to take the learnings from this way of doing it into the design and build of SuccessFactors. At this stage, what I think is most likely to happen is that, when we build the recruitment process within the new system, actually we'll have the ability to do different processes so that potentially there will be slight variations to the recruitment process, depending on what you are recruiting.

And I think that makes sense because, if we think about the anonymized recruitment process as we're envisaging it, it's probably not feasible to do that for some of the academic roles we have in the university. So, the thought that you would potentially recruit a professor without any indicators of educational track record, or institutions, or publications would be probably not feasible. So, there might be other things that we have to do with that type of recruitment to mitigate the effects of bias. So this will be a really good opportunity, working with our LDS and, as I said, with other units across the university as well to see what benefit we can gain from this, what learnings we can get from it, and use that to influence our thinking as we go into the next stage of CSR.

The other thing that we have expanded, again, based on LDS being forerunners with implementing this, is the Diversity Panel Database. So, LDS were, as I said, a forerunner in terms of working with the BAME network to ensure there were more diverse panel members available. And we have now rolled this out.

As of October-- sorry, as of September, mid-September, we put out a request across the university on OULife seeking volunteers to complete, or who have already completed, both the Effective Recruitment and Interviewing Skills Online Course and the Unconscious Bias Course who were prepared to volunteer to be on panels, but also volunteer to have their membership of an underrepresented group. And we did target BAME, disability, neurodivergent, and LGBT initially, but not to say that that's exclusive to other groups as well.

So, we've had now people volunteer who are part of one of those groups, but also perhaps are carers, for instance. So, it's not exclusive. But we did focus on groups where we have known underrepresentation of targets to try and redress.

So, this is now underway. It's very new still. We have, to date, got just under 60-- I think it was 58 last time I checked. What do I have written on the image? I wrote it to myself. Right, that's it, 58 volunteers in the database. 28-- sorry, 26 identifying as BAME and 10 from LDS. So again, really great to see early adoption and support for this from within LDS. And hopefully,

LDS will also benefit from having panel members come from other parts of the university as much as donating, if you like, their volunteers to support colleagues across the university with providing a much more diverse panel of selectors for future recruitment.

And I think that brings me to an end of updating how LDS and People Services have worked together to really refine, if you like, some of the initiatives that have been really started and where LDS have been an instigator in leading the way. And that's really helped us to think about how the university as a whole can benefit from these experiences and, as I said, nudge further forward the thinking and behaviours across the university to make us much more inclusive.

JAMES DAVIES: The essence really, to distil the essence of all of this collaboration with People Services, what we've been trying to do, and also hopefully to inspire because you will have noticed that a number of things that we put in place were not massive, costly changes.

They're small changes. But then added together, our hope is that actually they will make a difference right across the unit.